The following-named Woman Reserve officer for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Frances B. Newman.

Howard W. Harrington from the temporary disability retired list for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer (W-2) in the Marine Corps subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

On request of Mr. Johnson of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 9, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Johnson of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which is investigating the automobile industry, was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour, subject to a limitation of 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PYRETHRUM

A letter from the Acting Commissioner, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of the proposed disposition of approximately 75,000 pounds of pyrethrum (20 percent) extract now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of January 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SIRC. HENRY F. PERBY.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Sirc. Henry F. Perry (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF A CERTAIN ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a confidential order issued in the
case of Michael Isaac Mortimer Sanders, relating to his temporary admission into the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, AS AMENDED, AS TO PARTIES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the adoption of a uniform bankruptcy act, is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

BY THE VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Attorney General of the United States to place the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the subversive list for reasons set forth herein

"Whereas the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee reveal records of affiliation with the Communist Party in the fields of education, labor, farm, merchant union, city, defense, relay, newspaper, and arts; and whereas the files of the California and Colorado State Un-American Activities Committees reveal records of association of 29 of 47 directors, the president, the chairman of the board; the executive secretary, the special counsel, the assistant special counsel, the state director of public relations and 2 field secretaries andading:

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therewith), That the Legislature of Mississippi unequivocally expresses a firm determination to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of this State, against every attempt, whether foreign or domestic, to undermine and destroy the fundamental principles embodied in our basic law by which this Government was established, and by which the liberty of the people and the sovereign States, in their proper spheres, have been long protected and guaranteed;

"That the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the Mississippi explicitly and peremptorily declares and maintains that the powers of the Federal Government are limited, and valid only to the extent that these powers have been conferred as enumerated in the compact to which the States are principals, as limited by the plain sense and long recognized intention of the instrument creating that compact;

"That the Constitution of Mississippi firmly asserts that the powers of the Federal Government are limited, and valid only to the extent that these powers have been conferred as enumerated in the compact to which the various States assented originally, and to which the States have consented in subsequent amendments validly ratified;

"That the inherent nature of this basic compact, apparent upon its face, is that the ratifying States, parties thereto, have agreed voluntarily to confer certain of their sovereign rights, so-called State sovereignty, to a Federal Government thus constituted; and that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, have been reserved to the States respectively, or to the people;

"That the State of Mississippi has at no time, through the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, or in any manner whatsoever, delegated to the Federal Government its right to educate and nurture its youth and its power and right of control over the school system, or of the other public institutions and facilities, and to prescribe the rules, regulation, and conditions under which they shall be conducted;
province of the court to determine because the court itself seeks to usurp the powers which properly belong to the government, and therefore, under these circumstances, the judgment of all of the parties to the compact must be taken. Evidently the court does not think the Supreme Court is not a party to this compact, but a creature of the compact, and that any right therein raised; the question must be settled by the creature seeking to usurp the power, but by the parties to the compact who are the people of the respective States in whose ultimate sovereignty finally repose, be it further "Resolved, That: "When a belief be obtained and the wrongs and injuries inflicted be alleviated, we invite all of our sister States to join in this movement and render necessary the grave question of contested sovereignty herein raised; the State of Mississippi declares that the Congress has the duty and authority to protect the rights of the States from the unwarranted encroachment upon their reserved powers to govern the internal and domestic affairs of the States; the State of Mississippi further asserts that the Congress has, on many occasions in the course of its history, encroached by the judiciary upon the legislative and executive branches of government, and it is the responsibility of this body to likewise protect the States when their constitutional rights and privileges are endangered; "The State of Mississippi declares emphatically that the sovereign States of the Nation have never surrendered their rights and powers to govern the public schools, hospitals, and other public institutions; therefore, when an attempt is made to usurp these powers, the people of Mississippi, by object and resolve to keep the Congress from further encroaching by the judicially upon the legislative and executive branches of government, and it is the responsibility of this body to likewise protect the Congress that the preservation of this Union of States, as the compact intended it should be, depends upon the preservation of the sovereignty of the States; "The compact intended ours to be a government of the people, for the people and, above all, a government by the people; if the right to govern and control the local affairs to decide questions of public health, morals, education, and safety are taken from the States, then a fatal blow has been dealt State sovereignty and the States are nothing more than vassal provinces, subject to a central government; "The State of Mississippi declares that it is the duty and paramount duty of a State to object to the aforesaid invasion of its rights and does hereby interpose its sovereignty to protect its internal and local affairs, it is the duty of Congress to halt such practices and save these rights; and if such cannot be obtained What shall we do? Shall we appeal to the Federal Constitution, we appeal to the Congress, in the exercise of the power granted under article 6 of the Constitution, to initiate and submit an appropriate amendment direct to the 48 States for ratification by three-fourths of the legislatures thereof, declaring that the States have never surrendered their rights and powers to control their public schools, colleges, and other public institutions and functions, and the Government or department or agency thereof, but such powers are reserved to the States; and until such time, if ever, as such powers are surrendered to the General Government, the Constitution of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and therefore, are considered unconstitutional, invalid, and of no force and effect within the confines of the State of Mississippi; "We declare further, our firm intent to take all measures, in the event a constitutional amendment is constitutionally available to us, to void this illegal encroachment upon our rights, and we do hereby urge our sister States to take prompt and deliberate action to check further encroachment of the Constitution of the United States, through judicial legislation, upon the reserved powers of all States. "The Governor of Mississippi is respectfully requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Governor of each of the States, and to the Members of Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States. "Adopted by the Senate February 29, 1956. "CARROLL GARTIN, "President of the Senate. "Adopted by the house of representatives February 29, 1956. "WALTER SILLER, "Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

"House Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act for the District of Columbia

"Whereas the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act has, in the short time since it was adopted, been adopted by a majority of the States of the United States, but has not been enacted by the Congress for the District of Columbia; and

"Whereas the beneficial effects of this statute have been amply demonstrated by its operation in the States, both as a means of providing for dependents abandoned by those legally responsible for their support; and

"Whereas the failure of an adjacent jurisdiction to adopt this statute results in a heavier burden on public funds for the support of such dependents: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia (the Senate concurring), That the Governor of Virginia be, and is hereby, requested to memorialize to the aid the authorities of the several States in securing, for their citizens, the benefits of support to which they are legally entitled from those legally and morally responsible therefor by enactment for the District of Columbia of the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of delegates is directed to send a copy of this resolution to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States; to the Governor of each of the States; to the Governor of the District of Columbia; and to the board of directors of the Sheridan County Republican Convention." Very truly yours,

JOHN E. DAVIS, Acting Secretary, Sheridan County Republican Convention.

By the time this reaches you we may know what action was taken on the bill reported out of the committee. We all hope it will receive majority consideration.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FARGO (N. DAK.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. LANGER, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from John E. Davis, acting secretary, Sheridan County Republican Convention, embodying a resolution adopted by that convention at McClusky, N. Dak., relating to wheat prices.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MCCLUSKY, N. DAK., March 7, 1956,
Senator WILIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The Sheridan County Republican Convention, holding a meeting at McClusky on March 6 in the courthouse in McClusky at which time a short resolution on wheat prices was adopted, hereby requests that the resolution be transmitted to you. The resolution is as follows:

"Whereas the Sheridan County Republican Convention shall go on record to support 90 percent of parity on wheat on the national program and copies thereof be sent to all Senators and Representatives in Congress from North Dakota."

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. DAVIS, Acting Secretary, Sheridan County Republican Convention.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FARGO (N. DAK.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. LANGER, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the board of directors of the Fargo (N. Dak.) Chamber of Commerce, relating to a workable price support program and wheat production.

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

Whereas the national affairs committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo, N. Dak., has studied Senate bill 3183 and discussed its possible effect on agricultural economy in North Dakota and the Nation; and Whereas the committee unanimously agrees with the concept of acreage reserve; and Whereas the committee wholeheartedly supports the Young amendment to Senate bill 3183 providing for price supports of wheat based on quality classification; and Whereas the committee realizing that the farmer is caught in a serious cost-price squeeze believes a workable price support program is of absolute necessity at the present time, for the businessmen of North Dakota as well as the farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo, N. Dak., do hereby respectfully urge that Senators Langen and Young and Representatives Bonnack and Krusner support Senate bill
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Summary of Bills
S. 3417. A bill granting the consent of
S. 3419. A bill to provide for the estab-
chair, Mr. DODGSON when he

By Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LEMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MC-
S. 3420. A bill to authorize the approipa-
tion of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain timber access roads, to permit reforestation by the Secretary of Agriculture of national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. NAGIB, Mr. NAU-
sberger, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LEMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MC-
S. 3421. A bill to introduce persons who
S. 3422. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain amounts from unclaimed payments on United States Savings Bonds to the fund created for the payment of Government losses in shipment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WATKINS: S. 3423. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States; S. 3424. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of certain corporate mergers; and S. 3425. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER: S. 3426. A bill for the relief of Jose Sanchez Camano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES: S. 3427. A bill for the relief of Shirley Dorothy Brye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN): S. 3428. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the feasibility of establishing the Arkansas Post State Park as a national park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN): S. 3429. A bill to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shore of the State of New York from Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DODGSON (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. DOUG-
S. 3418. A bill to authorize certain beach

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted, and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. PROCTOR: S. Res. 228. Resolution to provide for electrical voting in the Senate Chamber; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FEDERAL COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the 83d Congress, I introduced a bill to establish a Federal Advisory Commission on Civil Rights and Privileges. We had some hearings in the subcommittee and, as I recall, the bill was reported to the full Committee on the Judiciary. No further action was taken. I did not reintroduce the bill in the 84th Congress. I think, however, under all the circumstances and in view of the attention the bill had received heretofore, the bill ought to be reintroduced. So I introduce the bill now, for appropriate referral.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3415) to establish a Federal Commission on Civil Rights and Privileges to promote and protect the civil rights of all individuals; and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ARTS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVEs], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill proposing the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. This bill is similar to several bills which have been introduced in the House, and on which hearings have recently been held. I hope that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will act on this bill in order to expedite action on this important matter during the present session of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement I have prepared relating to the bill, be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3419) to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. DOUGLAS, 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 the Congress hereby finds and declares, and it is the policy of the Congress in enacting this act—
(1) that the growth and flourishing of the arts depend upon freedom, imagination, and individual initiative;
(2) that the encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts, and of a widespread participation in and appreciation of the arts, is essential to the general welfare and the national interest;
(3) that as workdays shorten and life expectancy lengthens, the arts will play an ever more important role in the lives of our citizens; and
(4) that the encouragement of the arts, which is a necessary part of making the world a better place, is an appropriate matter of concern to the United States Government.

Sec. 2. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Advisory Commission on the arts (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall be composed of 24 members appointed...
by the President, from among private citizens, who are widely recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, one or more of the arts. Three shall be the representatives of each of the following 7 major art fields: music, drama and dance; literature; architecture; painting, sculpture, and other visual arts; photography; and radio and television. And 3 members shall be persons with outstanding achievement in any of the art fields listed above, and general interest in the arts, 2 of whom shall have special interest in dance; literature; music; drama and the visual arts; architecture; photography; and radio and television.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including expenses of professional, clerical, and stenographic assistance. Such appropriations shall be available only for expenditures authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. sec. 55a).

Sec. 7. This act shall not be deemed to invalidate any provision in any act of Congress or Executive order vesting authority in the Commission of Fine Arts.

The statement presented by Mr. Lehman is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

The welfare of our Nation's arts has become an important matter for the concern of Congress. Since the end of World War II there has been a widespread recognition that the Federal Government of the United States gives less recognition to the role of the arts in our national life than do many other nations—or even many smaller nations. By the arts I mean to include all seven major arts: music, drama and dance; literature; architecture and its allied arts; painting, sculpture, and graphic and applied arts; motion pictures and photography; radio and television; and any subdivision of these arts.

It is self-evident that the rapid progress of automation and industrialized scientific research will occupy the hours of our citizens, and the work that man must spend in the factory or on the farm. This will leave more time for other pursuits, and a larger number of our citizens will turn to the arts. It is also clear that the continuing and epoch-making discoveries in science and medicine will appreciably lengthen the life of the average citizen. The prerogatives of youth in the world of sports do not apply to the practice of some of the arts.

Our arts have attained a very high level of accomplishment without the government's support and promotion which they generally receive under some form of the professional leagues, although they are given the big chance before the grandstands of the world series. But the American people, the American public, the whole world, and the American homes. Perfected mass communication has reduced attendance at concerts, symphonies, plays, and operas. Great American homes. Perfected mass communication has reduced attendance at concerts, symphonies, plays, and operas. Performers suffer. Many thousands may listen to a single broadcast by a handful of performers. Many of our best artists, for lack of employment or patronage, have turned from creative work in their art to other occupations, at least for a good share of their energies. It is from the broad base of hundreds of performers and practitioners that the few great artists have emerged in any country at any period in history. The wellspring and the pipelines for our Nation's cultural growth, and for the recognition of the value and dignity of the natural resources of our country for the benefit of all our people. Likewise, I believe the status of the cultural conscience of the nation is fostered and developed for the enrichment of all.

The arts. We must remember that the creative achievements of a nation's arts are the most enduring products of its civilization.

It is alarming that at a time of unprecedented nationwide prosperity the situation for some of the arts in the United States is more serious and their development more endangered, due to the insecurity of the creative artists who are the keystone of our creative culture. The Federal Government's assistance is of the utmost importance to the future of our arts. The foremost artists are the sons and daughters of our people. They remain like the baseball heroes who develop on the sandlots and school playgrounds, who are later discovered and used in the professional leagues, against the United States for its lais¬ce attitude toward the arts. This challenge should be met. Our new policy of the United States makes it possible to do this. A major purpose of this new policy of the U.S.S.R. may be the desire to catch us off guard.
During the past 2 years utilization of the arts has become part of our foreign policy. My distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HORDON], and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILKIE], have introduced two bills, S. 3116 and S. 3172, to the purposes of which I fully subscribe. They are for the propagation or encouragement of cultural relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs. The original purpose of the bill which I intend to place before the Senate for consideration is to strengthen and to augment the cultural resources here at home. Unless this is done, by whatever means, unless the development of our arts is accelerated, the benefits we derive from the above international cultural exchanges may fall short of expectations sooner than we think, and some of our arts may eventually fail us on the cultural battlefields of the cold war.

Since I have referred to the international political aspects of the maintenance and strengthening of our cultural resources through legislation for the arts in the United States, I must say that so far the Senate legislation is and should always be kept beyond the pale of domestic and party politics. The neutral and non-party approach applies equally to the implementation of art legislation and to the administration of any or all federally sponsored art programs.

President Eisenhower in his State of the Union message for 1955 referred to the growing and significance of the Communist cultural attack was widely recognized, stated that the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. He recommended the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

There are now before the House two parallel bills to do what the President requested. These are: H. R. 7073 (Thompson, Democrat, New Jersey) and H. R. 8291 (Wainwright, Republican, New York). The proposed Commission would establish special committees of experts from the various fields of the arts to study and recommend to the President legislation that would encourage the performance, practice, and appreciation of the arts, and, upon request made by the President, a special governmental approach applies equally to the implementation of art legislation and to the administration of any or all federally sponsored art programs.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record, at this point, a document prepared by the National Council on the Arts and Government, an organization consisting of prominent representatives of each of the seven major arts. It is described, by example, the plight of some of the arts in the United States today and also suggests some of the areas of study which the Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts might investigate.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SUGGESTIONS FOR EARLY CONSIDERATION BY THE PROPOSED FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON THE ARTS

(Prepayed by the National Council on the Arts and Government, Clarence Derwent, chairman; Harold Weston, vice chairman; 22 West 54th Street, New York, N. Y.)

MUSIC

There are many national problems in the field of music in the United States which might well have the attention of a special committee on music under the Commission. Foremost among these is the present economic situation of the performing musician. Although the country as a whole is enjoying an almost universal period of prosperity, the economic position of the performing musician seems to be greatly deteriorating. The cause of this may be sought partly, but not exclusively, in the type of organization of musical performances. Musical recordings and broadcasts over the radio and television are a form of music appreciation in the United States, but at the same time they have discouraged music lovers from concert attendance where live music can be heard.

The average income of a symphony orchestra musician is somewhere between $1,400 and $1,500 per annum. Musicians in our financially better-off major orchestras, of course, receive more than this, but we must take into consideration that there are now over 600 community orchestras in this country serving the smaller cities and towns. It is impossible for a symphony orchestra musician to support a family on such a meager income as that mentioned above.

The result is that many talented young persons who would go into music if it offered a living wage are being forced into other occupations. In one city in the Midwest, the symphony orchestra musician is constantly growing older. The problem of keeping our young musicians in the arts is made more acute with each season. As of now, they seem to arise, like the Phoenix, every year from their own ashes. Whether Government can do anything to solve this problem at a federal level is the answer to this dilemma a question which remains to be solved.

The result is that many talented young persons who would go into music if it offered a living wage are being forced into other occupations. In one city in the Midwest, the symphony orchestra musician is constantly growing older. The problem of keeping our young musicians in the arts is made more acute with each season. As of now, they seem to arise, like the Phoenix, every year from their own ashes. Whether Government can do anything to solve this problem at a federal level is the answer to this dilemma a question which remains to be solved.
deprive great sections of the country of a form of culture they once had, and continue a policy that tends to formalize and aban-
don almost all civilized nations.

DANCE AND BALLET

There is not nearly enough activity on the professional stage (opera, theater, television, etc.) to give those who need full-time employment to the talented youth that is already prepared or is training for a career in drama. A choreographer needs from 4 to 15 dancers and holds an audition, anywhere from 200 to 1,000, to try out for the part. This group of 80 to 90 percent may qualify when less than 10

Ballet companies are limited in number and the need for their work almost constantly to stay alive. In the past few years, the United States has been overrun with foreign dance companies, almost all government-sponsored: Sadler Wells Opera Ballet Co., Sadler Wells Ballet, Kabuki Theater, Yugoslavian Dance Co., Canadian National Ballet Co., Danish Ballet Co., and Spanish Ballet Co. The Soviet Union has suggested sending

productions of the following suggestion.

The United States has lagged far behind European countries in the use of art in conjunction with public buildings. The current term "Federal Art Program" in "Federal buildings" clearly indicates that the art is not an integral part but stuck in as an after

thought. Cooperation between architect and sculptor is not the norm nor is such integration a part of the planning stage, which is rarely done here. It is just as reasonable to call in the artists who will ultimately see the setting of the effect of the building as a whole work of art as it is to consult the engineer on stresses and strains. Frequently in the United States the architect assumes sole judgment whether the embellishment adds nothing to mankind's need for spiritual nourishment.

Several thousand acres set aside by statute a proportion of the budget allocation for public buildings to be spent on murals, mosaics, etc. The regulations for open competitions, including pro-
tection of the artist's interests as well as the architect's. The municipalities make appropri-
ations for statues in public parks. The worst in these fields of art, additionally so

various decisions and negotiations concerning the selection of artists from these fields who might be invited for fellowships for American writers and artists.

Motion pictures

No medium of artistic expression or mass communication has had greater impact on the world of the 20th century than the motion picture, and American films have from the beginning held a position of dominance in the world market. Yet it cannot be said that the wisest use of these films has been made in either home or foreign territories - or even in less dramatic terms of showing America as it really is to countries uncom-promised in the use of art in the world of the

sister arts with architecture by State, Federal, and even what might be called nationally. A complete cross section of art in America-—not just one type—is what was desired. These dance groups might or might not be

fittering awareness of the attitude inherent in any system of Federal sponsorship of the arts, but there is an awareness of the fact that these programs may be subject to some form of governmental control and political dictation, or at least limitation of esthetic freedom, necessary for the sincerity of the project. The use of art is made to harness the arts to serve a na-
tional government, as in the Soviet Union, life ebb from the arts, unless they are basically too open. It is sug-

governments hold by the members of these special committees, by the administrators of any Federal art program, and by Members of Congress. The special program of these programs. Reasonable administrative con-
trols are of course necessary and expected. The special committee is careful to guard against any instruction to the writers which seems worthy of considerable expansion—fellowships for American writers and artists.

lack of encouragement to the writers who might thereby give greatest cultural re-

funds might be considered abroad as peculiarly American. A complete cross section of the arts

proper use of the best films we make for the best interests of the country.

In the matter of international film festivals, the possibilities for their use both inside this country and abroad are so great, so exciting that only an agency of this kind—divorced from special pleading—can take full advantage of them. As an example, the Commission could form a special committee consisting of the best talents of both the governmental and documentary fields and request it to prepare recommendations for educational films, even as the Army and the Navy used such talents in the prepara

tion of training films and in the making of films for the Army-—and Navy. War II.

RADIO AND TELEVISION

In the fields of radio and television, the Commission can be of value in the general activity of raising professional standards, not in any way interfering with the basic

countries and provinces. If the USIA has turned for advice and assistance to the National Commission, a determination concerning what kinds of exhibitions should be sent and the selection of the examples to be

includes. There should be a panel of experts to whom the USIA can turn for advice and help. It is suggested that the composition of such a panel should be subject to fair representation and change and its members nominated by the Federal agencies of the arts in the appropriate field. If the USIA so requested this could be a special committee established by the special committee.

It is also suggested that the Department of State might request the Commission to undertake the special project of deciding concerning the selection of artists from these fields who might be invited for fellowships for American writers and artists.

One method by which the Federal Govern-

ment might give assistance to the proposed motion to American artists in these fields is by providing suitable housing for the National Collec-
tion of Fine Arts, an adequate appropriation to expand its program of activities. Legislation for the construction of a museum for this purpose in Washington, D. C., has been introduced in Congress. The National Collection of Fine Arts has under considera-
tion an ambitious outline of increased ac-

tivities. The Smithsonian Institution has recently been approved for a study of the nature of the relationship between the arts and architecture. A special committee might be established by the special committee suggested for writers.

MOTION PICTURES

No medium of artistic expression or mass communication has had greater impact on the world of the 20th century than the motion picture, and American films have from the beginning held a position of dominance in the world market. Yet it cannot be said that the wisest use of these films has been made in either home or foreign territories - or even in less dramatic terms of showing America as it really is to countries uncom-promised in the use of art in the world of the

As for educational and documentary films, the possibilities for their use both inside this country and abroad are so great, so exciting that only an agency of this kind—divorced from special pleading—can take full advantage of them. As an example, the Commission could form a special committee consisting of the best talents of both the entertainment and documentary fields and request it to prepare recommendations for educational films, even as the Army and the Navy used such talents in the prepara

in the selection of films to be shown, thus removing the selection from the inevitable-and inevitable-commercial pressures that have forced such se-

lection in the past. Also, it may be the proper agency to do the job of having the best

can film festival, which has long been talked about, but never put into effect because of commercial pressures.

As for educational and documentary films, the possibilities for their use both inside this country and abroad are so great, so exciting that only an agency of this kind—divorced from special pleading—can take full advantage of them. As an example, the Commission could form a special committee consisting of the best talents of both the entertainment and documentary fields and request it to prepare recommendations for educational films, even as the Army and the Navy used such talents in the prepara

in the selection of films to be shown, thus removing the selection from the inevitable-and inevitable-commercial pressures that have forced such se-

lection in the past. Also, it may be the proper agency to do the job of having the best

can film festival, which has long been talked about, but never put into effect because of commercial considerations.

In the fields of radio and television, the Commission can be of value in the general activity of raising professional standards, not in any way interfering with the basic

countries and provinces. If the USIA has turned for advice and assistance to the National Commission, a determination concerning what kinds of exhibitions should be sent and the selection of the examples to be

an area which has already made remarkable strides, with which admittedly has a long way yet to go. Certainly in the field of overseas activity the coverage of the United States Information Agency makes good results.

As foreign television stations and networks continue to expand, the best of American programing can be made available to the many European and Asian countries and experience. The USIA recently announced the great popularity and official appointment of the first television stations of television which it has conducted in the smaller countries of Europe and Asia. This is a result of cleverly applied television. For instance, the use of closed-circuit telecasts in countries which face the problem of mass education, has been applied in an age of teachers and equipment. There are tremendous opportunities for the development of better international understanding through the use of television in a highly intelligent way. The Commission could assist the Voice of America, the USIA, and other agencies by providing a special committee of experts to recommend the best uses of these opportunities to develop a better understanding through the use of television media. It should be stressed that the Commission's function would not infringe upon the terms of reference of any agency, but would be complementary and as requested.

**GENERAL**

1. **Art in education**

No group has greater responsibility than teachers of art at all educational levels for developing a populace enlightened in art understanding. It is essential that art educators be kept closely informed on developments related to the arts. The teaching of art, unfortunately, often has to be assigned to persons who have not had adequate art training for this task or who lack the necessary qualifications for enforcement. A study might be conducted by a special committee of the Commission to recommend improvements in the art education in the public schools of the District of Columbia. Such a pilot experiment would serve as an example for consideration by State and local school authorities.

During recent years there has developed a widespread exchange of artwork by schoolchildren in the United States with those of other countries. The propaganda value of these exchanges is incalculable. They show the creative and imaginative side of American life. The National Art Education Association has attended to the arrangements for the tours in connection with UNESCO. The Staff of the Department of State. Participation has not been on a nationwide basis for the selection. This program is comparatively inexpensive but needs coordination, if it is to be expanded. The Commission could establish a special committee to recommend how the most effective use of this project can best be achieved.

2. **Appraisal of Federal art programs**

The Commission might be requested by Congress to conduct a survey of Federal art programs under Federal sponsorship (exclusive of those under the guidance of the Commission of Fine Arts) in relation to their effectiveness and the fact that there is a lack of sufficient understanding of the function of art education on general lines, whether impartial expert advice is available, and whether there is need for coordination. In doing so the Commission members would become acquainted with this rather complicated field and would also be able to provide valuable information to the administration and Congress. It is suggested that an expert committee, later, later include all new or proposed programs for Federal assistance to encourage the arts, should be in the form of annual reports to

The President and to Congress. Such annual reports could be made available to the United States Information Agency and be used to counteract adverse propaganda by the Soviet Union.

3. **Adjusting inequity to artists**

There is a service which the Commission might perform for artists in all fields. Cases of injustice or inequity to the artist due to the necessities or circumstances of his profession should be studied. If the Commission concludes that these situations could be rectified by the recommendations to any other group of citizens, the Commission could make its recommendations to the appropriate authorities. An instance of inequity is the present income-tax regulations in relation to the highly irregular annual income of most artists. Several countries congregate the artist to apportion his earnings over a span of years. Another area for study is the amendment of the tax as applied to musical and theatrical performances. This tax, imposed as an emergency wartime measure, has not been repealed. The United States is the only country which taxes music, for instance. Other countries subsidize music and the theater as cultural assets.

**CONCLUSION**

The foregoing gives evidence that Federal recognition of the importance of our national welfare has been sadly lacking in America; that there is urgent need to establish such a Commission on the Arts; that there are many fields of art in a serious situation today in our country and that there should be means of way to ameliorate these conditions; that the Commission could be of assistance to those agencies or departments charged with programs to make more effective our national understanding; that all these advisory services of the Commission would not infringe upon the terms of reference of any agency, but would be complementary and as requested.

The suggested immediate studies which might be undertaken by the Commission are on the following: maximum economy in distributing the arts to the American people; that there is urgent need to establish a special committee to recommend the best uses of access roads; that there is urgent need to establish a special committee to recommend the best uses of access roads; that there is urgent need to establish a special committee to recommend the best uses of access roads.

**TIMBER ACCESS ROADS**

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Washington [Mr. MURPHY and Mr. JACKSON], my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMA], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out the provisions of section 3731 of title 18, United States Code, relating to appeals by the United States in criminal cases. The bill deals primarily with appeals from rulings on matters of procedure. However, the bill does not specifically provide that no appeal under this provision shall lie where there has been a finding of not guilty on the merits by the jury, or by the court where a jury trial is waived or not recorded, or where the court has entered a judgment of acquittal for insufficiency of the evidence to sustain a conviction, pursuant to rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

The second bill is drawn to amend the Clayton Act by requiring prior notification of certain corporate mergers. The third bill, to be called the "Anti-trust Civil Progress Act of 1956," would authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigation for the enforcement of antitrust laws.

Both of these latter bills are designed to facilitate the continued efforts of the Justice Department in their stepped-up enforcement of the antitrust provisions of the code.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.
The bills, introduced by Mr. Watkins, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3423. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to appeals by the United States; to amend the Clayton Act as amended, by requiring prior notification of certain corporate mergers; and to extend the power of the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes.

SURVEY OF HISTORICAL AREA SURROUNDING ARKANSAS POST STATE PARK, ARK.

Mr. Fulbright. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), I introduce this bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a survey of the historical area surrounding and including Arkansas Post State Park in Arkansas County, Ark. The bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to investigate fully the historical significance of this area and report to the Congress on the feasibility of establishing it as a unit of the national park system.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, at the conclusion of my remarks, an article by Mr. Ted R. Worley, secretary of the Arkansas Historical Commission, which contains the historical background of Arkansas Post.

The Vice President. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3423) to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the feasibility and desirability of establishing the Arkansas Post State Park as a national park, introduced by Mr. Fulbright (for himself and Mr. McClellan), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The article presented by Mr. Fulbright is as follows:

ARKANSAS POST AS A HISTORIC SITE

(By Ted R. Worley)

Arkansas Post has the distinction of being not only the first settlement within the boundaries of the present State of Arkansas but also of being the first settlement within the bounds of the territory embraced in the Louisiana Purchase, and overlooked by all the vast region drained by the western tributaries of the Mississippi River. The Post was founded 32 years before New Orleans, and is older than Memphis and St. Louis.

The first Arkansas Post was set up by Henri De Tonti in 1689 on the north side of the Arkansas River, probably in what is now Township 8 North, Range 2, West (Spanish Grant No. 2351), in the immediate vicinity of the present fort. Overflows led to the relocation of the fort several times.

In 1718 John Law's Compagnie d'Occident, better known as the Mississippi Bubble, settled a colony of Germans in the neighborhood of the post. The colony failed as a business venture and ended within 2 years. When the French explorer, Bernard de la Harpe, visited the Post in 1721, John Law's Germans were gone but a French settlement of 47 people centered about the fort under French command.

The first white child of record born in Arkansas was born at Arkansas Post on December 5, 1742, to Marie and Jean Marie Landrony. The earliest Arkansas vital records known to be in existence consist of the records of baptisms, marriages, and deaths of which are now located in Ottawa, Canada. The oldest records in the custody of the historical area is a bound volume of like­wise records of the Post, dating from 1797 to 1819.

In 1748 the French garrison numbered 30 men, having been reduced from 50 because of disease. In 1752 the Post was rebuilt a few hundred yards to the northwest of the location of 1748 and near the site of the present Lake Dumond, which was then a part of the channel of the Arkansas River. In 1756 the garrison was reinforced by the addition of 60 soldiers under Captain d'Emville. In 1759 the settlement about the Post consisted of a half dozen houses.

By treaty in 1763 all Louisiana Territory was ceded by France to Spain, but Spain did not actually take command at the Post until 1769. During this period Philip Pin­ man of the British army visited the Post. We sketched a map of it and described it as follows:

"The Post is situated three leagues up the Arkansas, and is built with stockades, in a quadrangular form; the sides of the exterior polygon are one and one-third miles long and one 3-pounder is mounted in the flanks and faces of each bastion. The buildings within the fort are: a blockhouse for the soldiers, commanding officer's house, a powder magazine, and a magazine for provi­sions. These buildings are surrounded by the commis­sary, all of which are in a ruinous condition. The fort stands about 200 yards from the waterside, and is garrisoned by a captain, a lieutenant, and 30 French soldiers, including sergeants and corporals. There are eight houses without the fort, occupied by as many families, who have cleared the land about 900 yards in depth; but on account of the sandiness of the soil, and the lowness of the situation, which makes it subject to be overflowed, they do not raise their necessary provisions. These people subsist mostly by hunting, and every season send to New Orleans great quantities of bear's oil, tallow, and salted buffalo meat, and a few skins."

At its various locations the fort was over­flowed and changed. In 1769 it was rebuilt at a site about one-half mile south of the present remains of the village of Arkansas Post, and now the site of the Spanish Post.

The commission perhaps did all it could. The amount was wholly inadequate to the job of making the site of Arkansas Post fit for a national park. The commission perhaps did all it could. The amount was wholly inadequate to the job of making the site of Arkansas Post fit for a national park.

In 1803 Spain surrendered control of the Arkansas region to France. In the same year, by the Louisiana Purchase, the United States acquired the Territory from France.

On December 31, 1818, the County of Arkansas was formed and "the village of Arkansas" was named the county seat. Arkansas Post was laid off as a town in 1820 by William O. Allen. Robert Crittenden, secretary of Arkansas Territory, and Elijah Morton were among the party of men who produced the maps of the site. Under the terms of the Lewis and Clark expedition of 1803-1806, which crossed the United States from St. Louis to the Pacific Ocean, the Post was the most westerly point reached by the expedition.

The first newspaper in Arkansas, the Arkan­ساس Gazette, was started there by William E. Wolcott in 1819. The newspaper was not profitable and the newspaper moved to Little Rock in 1828. The first newspaper in Arkansas, the Arkan­sas Gazette, was started there by William E. Wolcott in 1819. The newspaper was not profitable and the newspaper moved to Little Rock in 1828. The first newspaper in Arkansas, the Arkan­sas Gazette, was started there by William E. Wolcott in 1819. The newspaper was not profitable and the newspaper moved to Little Rock in 1828. The first newspaper in Arkansas, the Arkan­sas Gazette, was started there by William E. Wolcott in 1819. The newspaper was not profitable and the newspaper moved to Little Rock in 1828. The first newspaper in Arkansas, the Arkan­sas Gazette, was started there by William E. Wolcott in 1819. The newspaper was not profitable and the newspaper moved to Little Rock in 1828. The first newspaper in Arkansas, the Arkan­sas Gazette, was started there by William E. Wolcott in 1819. The newspaper was not profitable and the newspaper moved to Little Rock in 1828. The first newspaper in Arkansas, the Arkan­sas Gazette, was started there by William E. Wolcott in 1819. The newspaper was not profitable and the newspaper moved to Little Rock in 1828.

One of the most important battles of the Civil War west of the Mississippi River was fought at Arkansas Post in January 1863, when Union forces garrisoned the fort and troops destroyed the fort and placed the town.

By railroad traffic from the post, Arkansas Post became a ghost town. The final blow came in 1903 when the shift of the river left the post high and dry.

In 1863 the Spanish fort was swallowed in a jungle. The place was all but forgotten when the Arkansas Legislature in 1929 set up a small county fund sponsored by the Arkansas Federation of Women's Clubs, consisting of J. W. Burnett of DeWitt, chairman, Dallas T. Herndon, Little Rock, secretary, and the following members: Mrs. J. F. Weinman, Mrs. Charles Miller, Miss Janie Woodruff, Mrs. M. F. Sigmon, Mrs. J. L. Rosencrans, Mrs. George C. Lewis, Mrs. C. J. Brain, Mrs. W. W. Lowe, Fletcher Chenuait, and S. G. Callett. Under the leadership of this commission the site of the park was cleared of brush and weeds and the caretaker was built, and other improvements made. The work was paid for in part by contributions made to a park fund sponsored by the Arkansas Federation of Women's Clubs, consisting of Mrs. H. G. Currey, of Arkansas County. The American conservation corps of the Federal Government worked on the grounds. The commission, which acquired about 20 acres of land from Mr. and Mrs. Fred Quandt as a gift, added 21 acres by pur­chase. The commission perhaps did all it could. The amount was wholly inadequate to the job of making the site of Arkansas Post fit for a national park.

Establishment of the original French fort.

First capital of Arkansas Territory.

Battle of Arkansas Post, 1863.

First home of Arkansas Gazette. Site of the Arkansas Post branch of state bank.

The Arkansas Post State Park cannot be reached by any hard-surfaced road. Since there is a hard-surfaced road does run within 3 miles of the site. The approach to the park must be made by a dirt road that skirts the site. Difficulty of access and the lack of adequate development of the park itself
have combined to make almost unknown, even to the people of Arkansas, one of the most important historic sites in the Mississippi Valley.

**ELECTRIC VOTING-MACHINE SYSTEM IN THE SENATE**

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to provide for the installation of an electric voting-machine system in the Senate Chamber.

Last Friday night, on an issue affecting the livelihood and welfare of millions of America's wheat farmers, a mistake which resulted in a parliamentary snarl that actually could have altered the outcome of the question at stake.

Such a situation is intolerable in what has been referred to as the greatest parliamentary body on earth. Many State legislatures—I think 23 to be exact—have and are employing some form of the foolproof device known as an electric voting machine. This machine makes it possible for a legislator to press a button at his desk, to either "yes" or "nay," and to be heard and counted and above all, accurately. The time has come for the Senate of the United States to be no less progressive and up to date in its methods than many State legislatures. Furthermore, I am told that last Friday was not the first time that inaccuracies have occurred in the counting of rollcall votes. After all, under the tensions and strains frequently prevailing in the chamber, such mistakes are by no means strange, and they do not reflect on the able people at the desk.

The solution, Mr. President, is an electric voting system, and I hope my resolution will be favorably considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 226) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolutions associated with the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is hereby directed to install in the Senate Chamber such devices and equipment as may be necessary electrically to record votes cast by Members of the Senate with respect to matters considered by the Senate. There are hereby authorized to be expended from the contingent fund of the Senate such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

**AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS**

Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3163) to provide an improved farm program, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

**FEDERAL EQUAL PAY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL**

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 5, 1956.

The name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. PAYNE) was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3352) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination, introduced by Mr. Ivies (for himself and other Senators) on March 5, 1956.

**UTILIZATION OF COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT FUND IN STATES OF LOWER DIVISION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL**

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 8, 1956.

The name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. MALONE) was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3393) to provide for the utilization of the Colorado River development fund in the States of the lower division, introduced by Mr. Goldwater on March 8, 1956.

**ADDRESSSES, 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. WILEY. Radio address delivered by him discussing various important issues pending before Congress.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania: Address delivered by Senator SPARKMAN at meeting of the Amer Corner, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on March 3, 1956.

By Mr. BEALL.

Statement prepared by him with reference to the problems surrounding airports at Detroit, Mich.

**MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED**

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bell, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President of the United States:

H. R. 2201. An act to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; and

H. R. 7201. An act relating to the taxation of income of insurance companies.

**DEPORTATION BY BRITISH OF ARCHBISHOP MAKARIOS FROM CYPRUS**

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on last Saturday I released the following statement when news was received of the deportation of Archbishop Makarios, which reads as follows:

I have been shocked by the British deportation of Archbishop Makarios. It is my belief that no advance notice of this serious and far-reaching development was available to our Government. It is, however, our desire to disturb the association of others affiliated with the North Atlantic alliance.

Inevitably, the people of Cyprus will gain the right of determining their future status. This is no longer an internal dynastic problem of either Great Britain or Greece.

That was the end of the statement.

Even under martial law or military government, the seizing of a leading citizen of a free nation in the case of the ranking church dignitary, and sending him into exile without any semblance of trial or a chance to refute charges made, is hardly in keeping with what we like to believe are Anglo-Saxon traditions of justice.

I hope the British Government will reconsider the action and will return the archbishop to Cyprus. They are on just as legal and moral grounds as were the abrupt action, and the longer they delay in rectifying the error, the more difficult the whole problem will become.

In the meantime, cool heads are needed in Greece, Turkey, and Great Britain, and on the island of Cyprus itself.

Communism's aim is to "divide and conquer." Free men everywhere are concerned by the developments and by the possibilities.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished leader of the minority for his statement, and to be associated with him and with a very proud of the fact that the Republican Party has taken this attitude in the matter. I am pleased to hear the views of the Republican leader.

**RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA IN FOREIGN NATIONS—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES**

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the New York Times of yesterday, Sunday, March 11, there appeared a very interesting editorial entitled "Russia Did Not Invent Flies." The final paragraph of this editorial reads as follows:

If we are to defeat communism we must give up some childish legends and concentrate on the easily available proof that a free society can do nothing less well and happy than anything the children of Marx and Lenin have to offer.

This editorial has a real bearing on our consideration of our foreign policy, especially in the Far East and because of its pertinency, I ask that the editorial in full be published in the body of the Record in connection with my remarks.

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

**RUSSIA DIDN'T INVENT FLIES**

The eight SEATO foreign ministers who were meeting at Karachi last week adjourned without the reluctant reminder that there was no convincing evidence that the Russians had abandoned their efforts to subvert, weaken, and overthrow other peoples' governments. We need to be reminded. The Soviet purpose has not changed. If for one reason or another—including our concentra tion of efforts to defend ourselves by defensive measures—Moscow has abandoned the use of naked force, it is employing other methods for the same objective.

But the world is not so simple that we can save it by force of arms or by making faces at Russians, but by making advantage of a period of majestic and confusing change, but in spite of the revolutionary aroma with which they have sur-
rrounded themselves, they did not cause the change. The world’s trouble spots are almost exclusively inhabited by people with certain common characteristics: they have ceased, or are endeavoring to cease, to be at war against God; made them brown or yellow or black or red rather than white; they are poor; they are sickly and dying; they are overcrowded; they do not feel well, and they live a comparatively short time.

This is true in Iraq and Iran, in Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria, in Saudi Arabia and Egypt, and along the shore westward until we come to Tunis, Algeria, and Morocco in North Africa. In Eastern countries, too, where the Colombo Plan flourishes and where liberty appears in an unaccustomed garb, there is a dangerous mixture of politics, of technological backwardness, of resources not fully used, of human labor wasted, of human vitality kept down by hunger and disease.

Wherever these conditions prevail there appears in some sort of clothes and with some form of face a little man from Moscow. We do not read about this little man as we do about Mr. Bolshagin and Mr. Khru­shahev, or Khrushchev, but he is there, lavishing sympathy, which does not cost anything in rubles, and offering steel mills or coal which have to be paid back in fixed installments. Wherever there is an unhealthy fly or a diseased bee, he flies around with a disease in its little insides, wherever there is too little to eat, wherever there are the many persons in one room, the little man from Moscow appears. He does not tell his new friends what things are really like in Moscow or in the country districts of Russia or in the Siberian camps. He tells them how things are or will be in a mystical Communist heaven. Words are not the final answer to such visitors. For people who don’t speak English or Russian our words are no better than words in any tongue.

His birthday will be followed in 10 days by the 17th anniversary of his elevation to his church’s highest office. Thus the celebration becomes a double one, and the general satisfaction will extend to his conduct of affairs through some of the stormier phases so far met with in the Vatican’s long history. This is true of matters both great and small—of the pay day the pope gets upon Vatican employees. On the serious side there is the courage of the church in its firm stand against communism behind the Iron Curtain and in all countries, including the United States.

The statistically minded will report that Pius XII’s peace proposals in the recent communist phase of the world’s history since the papacy’s victory over Pius IX, Pope of the 19th century, and Pius XI, Pope of the 20th century, may have many more happy birthdays.

EVENING Sun and in the Baltimore News­Post, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of March 2, 1956]

THE POPE AT 80

Today is the 80th birthday of Pius XII, an occasion that will have brought to the Vatican and to the world from points around the world. These could be expected in any case; but, apart from his rank, the Pope is a man with such warmth of nature, with such command of human beings, such a spirit that he enjoys the personal liking and respect of people in every land, both inside and outside his church. His birthday will be followed in 10 days by the 17th anniversary of his elevation to his church’s highest office. Thus the celebration becomes a double one, and the general satisfaction will extend to his conduct of affairs through some of the stormier phases so far met with in the Vatican’s long history.

This is true of matters both great and small—of the pay day the pope gets upon Vatican employees. On the serious side there is the courage of the church in its firm stand against communism behind the Iron Curtain and in all countries, including the United States.

The statistically minded will report that Pius XII’s peace proposals in the recent communist phase of the world’s history since the papacy’s victory over Pius IX, Pope of the 19th century, and Pius XI, Pope of the 20th century, may have many more happy birthdays.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of March 2, 1956]

THE POPE AT 80

The hearts of untold millions throughout the world, including the 90 million persons in the undeveloped part of the world, will probably be necessary for us to work miracles in the undeveloped parts of the world. To do this we may have to forget about Russia for an hour or so at a time and put our minds on the constructive work of the church. The church may help and make friends of people who need friends and whom we need for friends.

This task is clear-eyed. Russia does not devise the evils we are trying to cure. Russia is not responsible for the races of which, the high birth rates, the unfathomable and curable misery from which more than half the human race suffers, and the invasion of insects in conditions of poverty and filth. Russia did not invent typhoid, or a free society can do more to make mankind endure poverty and filth.

Senator, this flag which you have just presented to me flew over the Capitol of the United States on March 4, the feast day of St. Casimir, the patron saint of Lithuania, which has been overrun by men whose creed, principles, and flag stand for totalitarianism and for the cause of hope that Pius XII, a true world figure, may have many more happy birthdays.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of March 2, 1956]
true in our struggle to free Lithuania from the Communist yoke." You saluted the people of Lithuania on that occasion. You now salute them again today by this ceremony. Lithuanians everywhere will feel for a moment that the presentation of this flag has been made by you, a Senator from Maryland, in which State for about two decades now, Lithuanians were permitted to meet in their own country and their patron saint are being honored by this extraordinary ceremony.

Senator, once more, I sincerely thank you.

PREVENTION OF AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS COERCING AUTOMOBILE DEALERS TO PURCHASE UNWANTED MERCHANDISE—LETTER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on February 1 I introduced S. 3110, a bill which would make it unlawful for automobile manufacturers to threaten to terminate or terminate the franchise of financial manipulation of selfish interests to threaten automobile dealers if the basic reason or the Chicago grain market; if economically sound the dealer is approaching the economic point of ultimate collapse.

Thereafter I sent a copy of my introduction of my introductory remarks, a copy of the bill, and a questionnaire concerning it, to 472 franchised new-car dealers in the State of Maryland. I requested the questionnaire and return it to me, assuring the dealers that if they signed it I would keep their identity in confidence. Ninety-three dealers replied, 84 favoring my bill, 5 opposing, and 4 uncertain about it. Of the 93 dealers who returned the questionnaire, 16 did not sign it.

Many of the Maryland dealers, after reading my bill and my introductory remarks, commented to me that many problems which arise out of their relations with the automobile manufacturers. Although I received many out- standing letters of the basic letter, dated February 8, 1956, was so well written, and came from such a prominent and highly regarded Maryland dealer, that on February 15 I wrote to him and requested his permission to insert in the Congressional Record various portions of his letter, removing therefrom all remarks which might tend to identify him.

On February 22 he replied, and stated: I have absolutely no objection to the verbatim use of my previous letter for any purpose you deem worthy. In fact, I am inclined to be less than sympathetic for those who cry to be covered with the cloak of anonymity. If one sincerely voices a conviction honestly derived, it follows that there should also be present sufficient moral courage to accept any of the consequences. That is the essence of our form of government.

In view of this fine sentiment on the part of the Maryland dealer with a reporting of public service and pride in the new-car dealers of my State that I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the entire letter to me, dated February 26, 1956, from Mr. Robert B. Livie, Jr.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DULANY MOTOR CO., INC.,
Towson, Md., February 8, 1956.

The Honorable JOSEPH L. BUTLER,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Butler: S. 3110 hits closer to the mark than any of the actions of Congress to date as regards correcting the unsound condition of automobile retailing today. As you implied, this bill is not completely defensible but it does represent a positive and concrete step toward a solution of the problems of the automobile manufacturer and the franchised dealer. New car dealers desire legislation designed to subside or guarantee a profit for his business. Just as the Securities and Exchange Commission was created to enforce the social responsibility to the entire Nation of the executives of the largest financial institutions of the country of substantial business investments, so should the new-car manufacturer's franchise as it currently stands be subjected to the due process of law.

This situation can change in only one way. If the car manufacturer can and will cause a progressive economic disintegration in every part of this country, whether it be the dealers and the manufacturers, or the franchised dealers and their customers, the company will be forced to work even harder to make a profit. That is the situation that faced the corporation to giving in to the efficient to the interests of the inefficient. As the automobile manufacturer is not in keeping with Federal legislation, as the automobile manufacturer is not in the right direction. Actual price changes from week to week in our business—for example, 1 week we negotiate for a new car profit and the next week $50, and so forth.

My point, though somewhat long-winded, is this: The new-car business has been dealt a series of blows which manufacturer as one greater risk of smaller returns and from the manufacturers. The manufacturer himself consists of three groups, and he is proving to be incapable of enlightened self-interest. If we are ever again to have a manufacturer, it will be based on such selfish actions. When GM piles up over $1 billion in earnings after taxes, then sheer size becomes an evil. Had GM decided to reduce the wholesale price of their cars by 10% across the board, their earnings would have been pared to a mere one-half billion and probably put Ford and Chrysler completely out of business. When the manufacturer has so reduced the retailing of his products that the basic reason was the dealer's refusal or unwillingness to pay 100 gross profits per car, it should be recognized that typically speaking the new-car dealer is approaching the economic point of economic disintegration.

That is why the basic reason for the economic disintegration, as he is economically forced out of this field, the economic disintegration will be the basic reason for the economic disintegration.

As although I received many out- standing letters of the basic letter, dated February 8, 1956, was so well written, and came from such a prominent and highly regarded Maryland dealer, that on February 15 I wrote to him and requested his permission to insert in the Record various portions of his letter, removing therefrom all remarks which might tend to identify him.

On February 22 he replied, and stated: I have absolutely no objection to the verbatim use of my previous letter for any purpose you deem worthy. In fact, I am inclined to be less than sympathetic for those who cry to be covered with the cloak of anonymity. If one sincerely voices a conviction honestly derived, it follows that there should also be present sufficient moral courage to accept any of the consequences. That is the essence of our form of government.
DOUGLAS MORE THAN CORONETS—ARTICLE BY THE SENATE CHAPLAIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday the middle-aged Washington Sunday Star printed a very informative article written by our distinguished Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, entitled "More Than Coronets." Let us take a look at the fact that in the coming months we shall indulge in a political campaign, for better or worse, it might be well for all of us to read this wonderful article:

I recall hearing that on one occasion when Lincoln was trying a lawsuit he said, "My opponent has been speaking in personalities, and damning me. I have noticed that when a man indulges in those tactics he has a damned poor case of his own." Personalities make for confused thinking not clarity.

I wish now to read from the wonderful article written by Dr. Harris; because the people of America are confused about many issues. They are confused because many people in position of leadership are confused, intentionally or otherwise.

"Drawing never makes for vision or judgment."

The article reads in part:

"Coronation," from its very derivation, is a royal word with the kingly grace of a coronet. Coronation, as the dictionary is defined as "having such manners as befit the court of a prince—graciously polite and respectful in dealing with others." This might well be written at the top of the first page of the primer in any school of methods for the coming campaign.

In the article Dr. Harris quotes Thomas Kempis:

"Let us be ever courteous and kind. Never let the daily environment in which we live make our days dull and drab and monotonous. Being cultured and noble in ourselves is the secret of having dignity and grace. In this convulsive day when thrones are being divided, let us be ever courteous and kind."

"Of course it is much less easy to be kind when heart and brain are worked up. Let the House be filled with the light of the divine within and without."
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Of course, now, the necessary funds for the channel deepening must be appropriated.

As you are of course aware, there is included in the 1957 fiscal year budget request the sum of $6 million, as recorded on page 651.

I would very much appreciate, General, if you would point out to me the budget figures for actual work. The latter figure can now be considered, of course, because of the serious lag which will have the channel construction work can be commenced.

As you know, the seaway will be finished by the end of March. The reason is, of course, that we had hoped that the $5 million request had of course been broken down more accurately, and as you know, it had been contemplated that the $5 million would be broken down over and above the $5 million.

To minimize this lag, we of the House Appropriations Committee, to bring to his attention this matter, have expressed that we found we were making progress, we might wish to continue in session until 8 p.m. or so and the other hour, and we already have had the bill under consideration for several weeks and if it is to be enacted in time to be of benefit to the farmers, I believe we must conclude our action this week.

We may complete our action on it by Wednesday, although in view of the number of amendments which are still at the desk, it is obvious that if we take as much time upon them as we have taken on the amendments already acted on, we may be at work on the bill all of this week and into next week, as well.

However, we do not have nor seek permission to make more progress.

Of course, every Member has other bills which he wishes to have brought up and passed. Of course, each Senator is aware of the amendments to the pending bill which remain to be acted upon. If we continue in session beyond the hour of the evening meal, then, after Senators have arranged to have their evening meal at the Capitol, they generally are willing to have the Senate remain in session until 10 or 11 in the evening, if that is required. On the other hand, if we can say to them that the Senate will not remain in session later than 7 p.m., I believe it will be possible for us to make more progress.

We also hope that, aside from minor Insertions during the morning hour and real debate today be confined to the pending bill. Of course, that is only a hope, and can be no more than that.

However, several Senators have asked me about the plan of the leadership. I have not had a chance to discuss the matter with my colleague, the distinguished minority leader; but I should like to say that if it is agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, after consultation, we plan to have the Senate convene at 11 o'clock a.m., and we hope it will be possible to complete our action on the pending bill, either tomorrow or the next day. We believe that should be possible by having the Senate convene at 11 a.m., and continue in session, until approximately 7 p.m. It is also our plan, insofar as we can control the situation, not to have ye-and-nay votes taken after 7 p.m.

I shall be glad to have the minority leader state his views regarding the matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I certainly do not want to have the Senate continue in session too late each evening, after convening at 10 or 11 a.m. When the Senate convenes at 10 or 11 in the morning, it has a rather slender time to make progress for Senators and other official staff, but also for the Official Reporters and other members of the staff. However, I hope the Members will hold themselves available.

Insofar as the exact time is concerned, it seems to me that if we found we were making progress, we might wish to continue in session until 8 p.m. or some similar time. If we are able to make progress, I do not think we can control the situation, not to have ye-and-nay votes taken after 7 p.m. However, as you know, it had been contemplated that the $5 million would be broken down over and above the $5 million.

To minimize this lag, we of the House Appropriations Committee, to bring to his attention this matter, have expressed that we found we were making progress, we might wish to continue in session until 8 p.m. or some similar time. If we are able to make progress, I do not think we can control the situation, not to have ye-and-nay votes taken after 7 p.m.

We may complete our action on it by Wednesday, although in view of the number of amendments which are still at the desk, it is obvious that if we take as much time upon them as we have taken on the amendments already acted on, we may be at work on the bill all of this week and into next week, as well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader yield to me?

Mr. Johnson of Texas. The majority leader shares my hope the minority leader has expressed that we conclude our action on the bill this week; inasmuch as both Senators are very anxious to have the bill finally acted upon, so that the bill will be enacted and will soon be available to the American farmers, all Senators will cooperate in confining the debate to the pending bill, itself. Both Senators are very anxious to have that done. I believe we can approach the Senator from Louisiana, takes that view.

Mr. Ellender. Yes; I do. Last week the Senate debated extraneous matters almost one-third of the time. If, from now on, we can devote our attention to the bill itself, and do not permit extraneous matters to be brought up, we should be able to take final action on the bill, which will be enacted and will soon be available to the American farmers. Senators are very anxious to have that done. I believe we can approach the Senator from Louisiana, takes that view.

Mr. Johnson of Texas. Of course, that is a matter which must be decided by each Senator. If the Senator from California and the Senator from Texas could refuse to permit extraneous matters to be brought up, we would find ourselves refusing several times a day. However, we do not have nor seek that privilege. Once a Senator is recognized, he can discuss any matter he wishes to discuss. It is not later than Wednesday. If all of us work on the bill, and give it our utmost attention, and are available when the time comes to take votes, we believe it will be possible to do so.

Mr. Johnson of Texas. Of course, that is a matter which must be decided by each Senator. If the Senator from California and the Senator from Texas could refuse to permit extraneous matters to be brought up, we would find ourselves refusing several times a day. However, we do not have nor seek that privilege. Once a Senator is recognized, he can discuss any matter he wishes to discuss. It is not later than Wednesday. If all of us work on the bill, and give it our utmost attention, and are available when the time comes to take votes, we believe it will be possible to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Of course, that is a matter which must be decided by each Senator. If the Senator from California and the Senator from Texas could refuse to permit extraneous matters to be brought up, we would find ourselves refusing several times a day. However, we do not have nor seek that privilege. Once a Senator is recognized, he can discuss any matter he wishes to discuss. It is not later than Wednesday. If all of us work on the bill, and give it our utmost attention, and are available when the time comes to take votes, we believe it will be possible to do so.

Mr. Johnson of Texas. Of course, that is a matter which must be decided by each Senator. If the Senator from California and the Senator from Texas could refuse to permit extraneous matters to be brought up, we would find ourselves refusing several times a day. However, we do not have nor seek that privilege. Once a Senator is recognized, he can discuss any matter he wishes to discuss. It is not later than Wednesday. If all of us work on the bill, and give it our utmost attention, and are available when the time comes to take votes, we believe it will be possible to do so.

AlloCATION TO STATES OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. Neuberger. Mr. President, a letter which I have recently received from one of the school leaders in Oregon makes some interesting suggestions concerning the distribution of Federal aid to education, now under consideration in both houses of Congress. I would like to take just a few moments to describe these suggestions, so as to bring them to
the attention of Senators on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare who are working on Federal school-aid legislation.

Mr. Marion B. Winslow, superintendent of schools of District 9 C, Coos Bay, Ore., writes me that on the whole he prefers the Kelley-Winslow school construction bill—reported by the House Committee on Labor and Education—to that proposed by the administration. He points out, however, that there are other factors he must consider in number of school-age children, will improve the educational services offered in the State, rather than only the number of school-age children, will furnish an incentive to States to institute school years of adequate length to enforce truancy laws, and to encourage more children to stay in school until the completion of high school—in short, to improve the national services offered to the children.

Such a formula might also be fair to children in States, such as Oregon, which already provide far more than average educational services. In terms of fiscal school attendance, and which as a result carry a disproportionate financial burden.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Winslow’s letter printed in the body of the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. I am sure that Mr. Winslow’s letter will be of interest to members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that that committee will want to give consideration to the point he makes in developing a formula for the allocation of Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COOS BAY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, Coos Bay, Coos County, Oregon.

Mr. WINSLOW, Superintendent, Coos Bay Public Schools, Coos Bay, Oreg.

Mr. President: The question of the allocation of Federal assistance to schools, which reflects actual total days of school attendance in a State, rather than only the number of school-age children, will furnish an incentive to States to institute school years of adequate length to enforce truancy laws, and to encourage more children to stay in school until the completion of high school—in short, to improve the national services offered to the children.

Such a formula might also be fair to children in States, such as Oregon, which already provide far more than average educational services. In terms of fiscal school attendance, and which as a result carry a disproportionate financial burden.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Winslow’s letter printed in the body of the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. I am sure that Mr. Winslow’s letter will be of interest to members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that that committee will want to give consideration to the point he makes in developing a formula for the allocation of Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COOS BAY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, Coos Bay, Coos County, Oregon.

Mr. WINSLOW, Superintendent, Coos Bay Public Schools, Coos Bay, Oreg.

Mr. President: The question of the allocation of Federal assistance to schools, which reflects actual total days of school attendance in a State, rather than only the number of school-age children, will furnish an incentive to States to institute school years of adequate length to enforce truancy laws, and to encourage more children to stay in school until the completion of high school—in short, to improve the national services offered to the children.

Such a formula might also be fair to children in States, such as Oregon, which already provide far more than average educational services. In terms of fiscal school attendance, and which as a result carry a disproportionate financial burden.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Winslow’s letter printed in the body of the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. I am sure that Mr. Winslow’s letter will be of interest to members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that that committee will want to give consideration to the point he makes in developing a formula for the allocation of Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COOS BAY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, Coos Bay, Coos County, Oregon.

Mr. WINSLOW, October 29, 1956.

Dear Senator Richard L. Neuberger,

It was a real pleasure for our group of school superintendents to have breakfast at the House restaurant and to have an opportunity to get your point of view regarding the possibility of the citizens of the United States as a whole sharing in the cost of public education. We, as school superintendents, who are close to the school situation, facing critical housing problems and recognizing the mobility of people are almost unanimous in our belief that we as citizens of our state are entitled to educational service to pupils. I know of no reason for distributing educational funds purely on the basis of the number of educable pupils in a State. I believe that money on a national level should be distributed to the several States in proportions that the total days attendance in schools of a State bear to the total days attendance in the public schools of the United States. This will encourage:

1. A school year of adequate length.
2. Increase the number of years of educational service to high-school completion.
4. A higher percentage of pupils to attend school.
5. A better attendance record. Distribution on attendance is based on the actual educational service given to pupils. I notice in the report of Atlantic City schools that with a population of approximately 10,000 the school year is approximately 8,000, or 1 in 12 in school. Here in the Coos Bay school district we have a population of approximately 22,000, with a school attendance of 4,200, or 1 in 5 in school. It makes a big difference whether a district is providing for educational services for one-twelfth of its population or for one-sixth of its population.

Those States that have the greatest portion of their population in school face the greatest financial need. Those of us who have dedicated our lives to the teaching profession have an interest in seeing that our States are given a high quality of adequate education.

On the basis of census Oregon may rank reasonably high in wealth per census child. However, because of the educational service given we may fall in an entirely different class.

If Federal funds were distributed to the States on the basis of actual days attendance at a public school, I believe this would encourage those States that have lax attendance laws with large numbers of the school population attending private schools for most of the time. Every public-school education program, would get Federal funds only on the basis of the actual public school attendance.

I believe in universal education for all and am much opposed to the segregation practice in the South. If funds are distributed on the basis of school attendance, and the actual days of attendance at a public school those States would receive funds only for the service given. I believe we should have a stand on the amount of public education actually given. For example, the number of school-age child in Oregon would be approximately 9½ cents per pupil-days attendance.

I wish to have the benefit of the Nation rather than the bill proposed by the administration. I wish to request that you do what you can to put the Kelley bill into operation.

I wish to again thank you for the privilege of having breakfast with you on Friday morning, February 24.

Sincerely yours,

Coos Bay Public Schools,

Mr. WINSLOW, Superintendent, Coos Bay, Oregon.

DEATH OF CARL BROGGI, OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, this past Friday tragedy struck in Maine. One of Maine’s outstanding citizens, Carl Broggi, died of a sudden heart attack.

I shall always remember the occasion of the last time that I saw and talked with Carl Broggi. It was in early January of this year. I introduced him to the Labor Subcommittee considering legislation to help distressed areas such as those in Maine. In my introduction of him I paid tribute to what he had done and was doing.

After he made his impressive statement to the Senate committee, he went to the Senate gallery to watch a part of the session that day prior to having lunch with me in the Senate restaurant. I made a short statement to the Senator from Maine and Carl Broggi thanking him for the courtesy that had been given me—and sending him as a token of such appreciation a chest of Maine sea foods.

Senator HOLLAND of Florida, was speaking and yielded the floor to me so that I could make my statement without further delay.

After making my statement, I went to the Senate gallery to meet Carl Broggi and from there to the Senate restaurant. During luncheon I remarked about the courtesy of Senator HOLLAND. Several days later Senator HOLLAND came to me and told me that he had received a message from Senator Carl Broggi thanking him for the courtesy that had been given me—and sending him as a token of such appreciation a chest of Maine sea foods.

Senator HOLLAND said to me that Maine must have wonderful people if they were like Carl Broggi. Here was a personal example of how Carl Broggi made friends for Maine—of how he was a wonderful ambassador for Maine outside of Maine as well as being a man dedicated to his goal inside Maine.

We are all saddened when death takes a man dedicated to his family, to his community. But there is something different in this instance.

That difference is in what Carl Broggi was doing for his State and for the people of Maine—not merely what he had done. He had done much. He had led the way in his own community—Sanford, Maine—the “Town That Refused To Die” after it had lost the textile mills. Sanford is refusing to give in because Carl Broggi and his fellow townsmen had the courage to fight back.
Carl Broggi and Sanford set the example and the pace for the rest of Maine. It was in the late 1950s that Carl Broggi became the first commissioner of industry and commerce for Maine.

What he was accomplishing—what he was doing for his State and the people of Maine—as commissioner of industry and commerce—is the difference in the normal sadness and shock we have when a leading citizen passes on. His was not only a past accomplishment for his State and people. His was a record of present accomplishment for his State and people. His was a future of great hope and confidence for his State and people.

He was a tremendous success because he put his whole heart into his work and people. He gave so much of his heart to his work for the State and the people of Maine that he died in the midst of that work.

Yes, Carl Broggi gave his heart and his life for Maine and her people. What greater devotion to a cause is there than a fallen friend to speak this truth?

I ask unanimous consent that I have printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks, editorials which reflect the true feeling of Maine people for Carl Broggi.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of March 10-11, 1956]

A LASTING MEMORIAL

The death of Carl J. Broggi is a stunning loss to his family and friends. It is also a stunning loss to the State of Maine.

The former legislator assumed the commissionership of the new Department of Development of Industry and Commerce only 6 months ago, yet his work was already winning national attention at the time of his death.

He recognized that a successful industrial development program must have its base at the community level; that is, towns must be prepared to sell themselves to visiting industrial promoters.

The developer was a cross section of community-people looking to private and public sources for assistance. The stress proved too great. He gave his life for the State.

The Broggi plan must be carried on, vigorously and successfully. This would be the finest memorial the people of Maine could give to the devoted creator.

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express of March 9, 1956]

He Felt for Maine

We happened to be chatting with Carl Broggi in the statehouse Wednesday evening, less than 24 hours before his death. Complete with his running one of his schools for amateur industrial promoters, he was smiling as usual, enthusiastic, confident. He was also happy.

When told that in his 6 months of organizing the new Department of Industry and Commerce for Maine he had impressed everyone, including Lucius B. Child, Senate leader, he quietly replied, "Well, we're trying, anyway."

That was Carl Broggi, the man who kept trying, anyway, even when he had made the impossible job like resurrecting Sanford's economy from the grave. When he took over the State job everyone expected him to be adequate. After all, he had proved his ability and there wasn't much doubt that he could handle the bigger job satisfactorily. But few expected him to move as fast and as effectively as he did.

He hired top staff men. He acquainted Maine with what he was doing. He was, when death called yesterday afternoon, in the midst of an intensive effort to make the State a more attractive place for business.

In 6 months Carl Broggi had done more than any commissioner could expect to do in that time, and did it 10 times better than we had any reason to expect. That's only one of the reasons Maine misses him because he was a fine man, because he was decent and humble. The life he gave to Maine was an unusual example of devoted citizenship.

SECRETARY MCKAY'S DEFENSE OF NATURAL RESOURCE POLICIES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is gratifying to me that the Washington Post and Times Herald provided space in its March 12, 1956, editorial page for Douglas W. L. McKay to reply at length to one of the many unsubstantiated charges directed against his administration of the Nation's public resources.

I believe that once this election year has passed and people take the opportunity to look at the whole record, that the conclusion will be reached by most fair and right-minded people that Douglas W. L. McKay has built a record as one of our great Secretaries of the Interior, and that many far-reaching contributions have been made during his administration to the preservation and supervision of our valuable natural resources.

At the least, I am sure that the American people believe in fair play and that they should have an opportunity to hear both sides of the question. Secretary McKay was an outstanding governor of Oregon, he has been an outstanding Secretary of the Interior, and I am confident prediction that he will make a decided contribution to any line of endeavor to which he applies himself after he leaves his present Cabinet post.

Inasmuch as the Secretary has been so misrepresented on the subject of natural resources in many sections of the country, in my opinion, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 10, 1956, be printed in the Record at this point, as follows:

POLICIES PRESERVE NATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES

(By Secretary of Interior Douglas W. McKay)

My attention has been called to a letter published February 23 in the Washington Post and Times Herald from Dr. Seymour E. Harris, professor of economics at Harvard University.

In his letter, touching on a broad range of economic subjects against the background of the policies of the Eisenhower administration, Dr. Harris makes the unsupported statement that: "...on one major issue they (the Republican leaders) break with the New Deal completely; instead of preserving natural resources for all the people, they seem determined to give them away."

My awareness of your frequent and consideratecourtesy to other members of your calling that freedom of the press poses a grave responsibility on the press not to mislead its readers prompts me to offer you this opportunity to discover the resplendent chairman of the department of economics of Harvard University apparently willing to accept uncritically and without careful examination an irresponsible political slogan which has repeatedly been shown to be without substance.

I suggest to Dr. Harris and a great many others that they are being misled by a "big dog" campaign developed by the enemies of the Eisenhower administration. They are convinced that the Republicans are not preserving natural resources for all the people. It is disappointing, therefore, to discover the resplendent chairman of the department of economics of Harvard University apparently willing to accept uncritically and without careful examination an irresponsible political slogan which has repeatedly been shown to be without substance.

I suggest to Dr. Harris and a great many others that they are being misled by a "big dog" campaign developed by the enemies of the Eisenhower administration. They are convinced that the Republicans are not preserving natural resources for all the people. It is disappointing, therefore, to discover the resplendent chairman of the department of economics of Harvard University apparently willing to accept uncritically and without careful examination an irresponsible political slogan which has repeatedly been shown to be without substance.

I suggest to Dr. Harris and a great many others that they are being misled by a "big dog" campaign developed by the enemies of the Eisenhower administration. They are convinced that the Republicans are not preserving natural resources for all the people. It is disappointing, therefore, to discover the resplendent chairman of the department of economics of Harvard University apparently willing to accept uncritically and without careful examination an irresponsible political slogan which has repeatedly been shown to be without substance.

I suggest to Dr. Harris and a great many others that they are being misled by a "big dog" campaign developed by the enemies of the Eisenhower administration. They are convinced that the Republicans are not preserving natural resources for all the people. It is disappointing, therefore, to discover the resplendent chairman of the department of economics of Harvard University apparently willing to accept uncritically and without careful examination an irresponsible political slogan which has repeatedly been shown to be without substance.

I suggest to Dr. Harris and a great many others that they are being misled by a "big dog" campaign developed by the enemies of the Eisenhower administration. They are convinced that the Republicans are not preserving natural resources for all the people. It is disappointing, therefore, to discover the resplendent chairman of the department of economics of Harvard University apparently willing to accept uncritically and without careful examination an irresponsible political slogan which has repeatedly been shown to be without substance.
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In the summer of 1953, the number of national parks has also now been doubled, and in consequence more efficiently administered than it ever has been.

Since January 1953 more than 400,000 acres have been acquired by the National Park System, and more than a million acres has been made available for the use of the American people. This is a rich legacy for the nation. The fact is that the National Park System today is larger, more accommodating, and more efficiently administered than it ever has been.

I have said on many occasions that I am as firmly convinced that the parks are an irreplaceable national asset, to be enjoyed by all of our people. Accordingly I have consistently sought to protect the integrity of the National Park System. During the past 3 years I have rejected a number of proposals which would have unjustifiably intruded on the integrity of the parks.

These proposals have ranged from requests to build tramways in five national parks to efforts to lease lands of the National Park System to open Joshua Tree National Monument to mineral prospecting and mining.

However, in the strange logic of those who are attempting to plaster the giveaway label on the administration, I find that the firm rejection of the proposals is recognized, but the fact that the proposals have been made to the Department becomes in itself a matter of great concern.

When I became Secretary I quickly concluded that protection of the parks was only part of the action that was necessary. I determined that the 15-year trend of neglect of which the American people want and have a right to expect. The very gratifying supply of the long period of progress in park development.

Mission 66, a comprehensive 10-year program for protection, improvement, and development of the Park System, faces this problem squarely. Designed to equip the parks to accommodate adequately the visitors expected by 1966, Mission 66 will build the Park System up to the standards which the American people want and have a right to expect. The very gratifying supply of the long period of progress in park development.

The early months of the administration were marked by a series of bitter attacks on the partnership program as a "giveaway." It is interesting now to compare the reaction of the American people with the sound and fury which were generated in the early stages by the political slogans.

The record shows that the partnership program is moving steadily to put kilowatts on the line through the cooperative efforts of the Federal Government and local groups. The very vital and comprehensive Upper Colorado project has been approved by both Houses of Congress and now awaits the final evidence report before going to the White House for the President's signature.

The development of the power resources of the Snake River in the Hells Canyon reach is going forward under private auspices.

Before concluding, I should like to mention the Al Sarena case, although charges surrounding this matter have also been the subject of a good deal of discussion. Under Secretary Clarene Davis made it indisputably clear, I think, that the Department's position in the Al Sarena case is identical in full accord with the law, and that the objections which have been made against the Al Sarena decision could be valid only as they were disregarded against the law, rather than at the Department.

The fact that the Al Sarena case came into public discussion is a reflection of the fact that the Congressional committee permitted the responsible official involved to set forth all of the details so that a disposal of the case could be made in the context of the public.

Certainly, the honest reporting by the responsible press of Mr. Davis' testimony, with or without a side trip to the Al Sarena case, could be emulated in the handling of the many other important issues which may expect to arise in the hectic emotionalism of this election year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further business?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT IN THE SCHOOL CASES

DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the increasing gravity of the situation following the decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called segregation cases, and the peculiar stress in sections of the country where this decision has created many difficulties, unknown and unappreciated, perhaps, by many people residing in other parts of the country, have led some Senators and some Members of the House of Representatives to prepare a statement of the position which they hold and to ask for the affirmative.

I now wish to present to the Senate a statement on behalf of 19 Senators, representing 11 States, and 77 House Members, representing a considerable number of States likewise, to the effect that the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to have unanimous consent to proceed for more than 2 minutes?

Mr. GEORGE. Perhaps I shall have to ask for a slight extension. For the present I shall proceed for 2 minutes only. I merely wish to add that I shall not speak to this declaration at this time.
This declaration has not been hastily made. Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not attempt to determine the priority, because that is a matter for the Chair to determine in his best judgment; but we are still in the morning hour. However, I raise the point of order. I sit on the New York question before the expiration of the morning hour.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if there is to be much speaking after my statement, I myself may have to ask for an extension of time.

But, Mr. President, completing the statement which I asked the privilege of placing in the Record this morning, and under the 14th Amendment of the Constitution which considered the 14th amendment.

As admitted by the Supreme Court in the public school case (Brown v. Board of Education), the doctrine of separate but equal schools "apparently originated in Roberts v. City of Boston (1849), upholding school segregation against attack as being violative of a State constitutional guarantee of equality." This constitutional doctrine began in the North, not in the South. It was followed not only in Massachusetts, but in Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania and other northern States until they, exercising their rights as States through the constitutional processes of local self-government, changed their school systems.

In the case of Plessy v. Ferguson in 1896 the Supreme Court expressly declared that the doctrine of separate but equal public schools was not inconsistent with the 14th Amendment. This decision has never been overruled.

It is notable that the Supreme Court, speaking through Chief Justice Taft, a former President of the United States, unanimously declared in its opinion that the "separate but equal" principle is "within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools and does not conflict with the 14th Amendment."

This interpretation, repeated time and again, became a part of the life of the people and is one of those clauses of the Constitution, which has not been modified, without which it is impossible for some States to maintain their educational processes. We decry the Supreme Court's encroachments. It has not been a heretofore friendly and understanding Court.

Without regard to the consent of the governed, outside agitators are threatening immediate and revolutionary changes in our school systems. It is the duty of the Senate to destroy the system of public education in some of the States.

The Vice President is asked to consider the explosive and dangerous condition created by this decision and inflamed by outside meddlers; to reassert our reliance on the Constitution as the fundamental law of the land.

We decry the Supreme Court's encroachments and appeal to the States and people who are not directly affected by these decisions to consider the constitutional principles involved against the time when they too, in issues vital to them, may be the victims of judicial encroachment.

Even though we constitute a majority in the present Congress, we have full faith that the people of the United States, whether in the dual system of government which has enabled us to achieve our greatness and will enable us to maintain the prestige of the States and of the people be made secure against judicial usurpation.

We appeal to the people, all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision which is contrary to the Constitution and to prevent the use of force in its implementation.

In this trying period, as we all seek to right this wrong, we appeal to our people to be patient with the agitators and troublemakers invading our States and to scrupulously refrain from disorder and lawless acts.

Signed by:

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE


MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ALABAMA: FRANK W. BOYKIN, GEORGE M. GEORGE, ROBERT W. ANDERSON, GEORGE A. ROBERTS, ALBERT RAINS, ARMISTEAD I. SLEDEN, JR., CARL ELLIOTT, ROBERT E. JONES, GEORGE HURST, JR.

ARKANSAS: E. C. GATHINGS, WILBUR D. MILLS, JAMES W. Trimble, Cren Harris, Brooks Hate, W. F. Norell.


GEORGIA: FREDERICK H. PRESTON, JOHN L. FULCHER, E. L. FORRESTER, JOHN JAMES FLYNT, JR., JAMES C. DAVIS, CARL VINSON, HENDERSON LANDHAM, IRIS F. BLITCH, PHIL M. LANDESMAN, FLEWELL.

LOUISIANA: F. EDWARD HERSEY, HALE BOGGS, EDWIN W. WELLER, OWEN BROCK, OTTO F. PASSMAN, GEORGE F. HAYDON, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, GEORGE S. LONG.

MISSISSIPPI: THOMAS G. ABNEYTHY, JIMMY L. WHITMAN, FRANK E. SMITH, JOHN BELL SMITH, ARTHUR D. CONOVER, WILLIAM M. COMER.


TENNESSEE: JAMES B. FRASER, JR., TOM MURRAY, JAY COOPER, CLIFFORD EDWIN.
Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for approximately 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. THURMOND. But, Mr. President, I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Lehman].

Mr. LEHMAN. I, of course, recognize and respect the right of any Member of Congress, as any other citizen of our country, to hold and express such views as he may approve. However, the distinguished Senator from Georgia has read a proclamation on the floor of the Senate. I wish no one to think that failure to make immediate reply to the proclamation issued by certain Senators and Representatives, assailing the decision of the Supreme Court outlawing segregation in public schools, and the views expressed therein, I therefore want it known that I am wholly in disagreement with the position against the Supreme Court decision taken in the proclamation by those Members of the Congress who are signatories to it. I expect to have more to say on this subject at an early date.

I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am constrained to make a few remarks at this time because I believe a historic event has taken place today in the Senate. The action of this group of Senators in signing and issuing a Declaration of Constitutional Principles with regard to the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, is of great significance. The signers of this declaration represent a large area of this Nation and a great segment of its population. Solemnly and simply we have stated our position on a grave matter so as to make clear there are facts that opposing propagandists and agitators have neglected in their zeal to persuade the world there is but one side to this matter.

In suggesting that a meeting of like-minded Senators be held, it was my thought that we should formulate a statement of unity to present our views and those of our constituents on this subject. My hope also was that the statement issued should be of such nature as to gain the support of all people who love the Constitution; that it would be accepted as an instance the dawning of other future encroachments by the Federal Government into fields reserved to the States and the people.

Mr. President, the people in South Carolina sought to avoid any disruption of the harmony which has existed for generations between the white and the Negro races. The effort by outside agitators to end segregation in public schools has made it difficult to sustain the long-time harmony.

These agitators employed professional rackets to raise funds contributed by persons who were permitted to deduct the contributions from their taxes. The organization established to receive the funds in question pays the status of freedom from taxation.

Except for these troublemakers, I believe our people of both races in South Carolina have continued to proceed harmoniously together. Educational progress in South Carolina has been marked by $200 million worth of school buildings in the past 4 years, providing true equality, not only for white and Negro pupils, but also for urban and rural communities.

In the South Carolina school districts where segregation cases were instigated, the Negro schools are better than the schools for white children. Yet the Negroes continue to seek admission to schools for the white race.

This is sufficient proof that, while South Carolinians of both races are interested in the education of their children, the agitators who traveled a thousand miles to foment trouble are interested in something else. The "something else" they are interested in is the mixing of the races.

They may also recognize that they cannot establish by judicial legislation what they could never succeed in doing by constitutional amendment.

Historical evidence positively refutes the decision of the Supreme Court in the school-segregation cases.

The 39th Congress, which in 1866 framed the 14th amendment to the Constitution—the amendment which contains the equal protection clause provided for the operation of segregated schools in the District of Columbia. This is positive evidence that the Congress did not intend to prohibit segregation by the 14th amendment.

The Supreme Court admitted in its opinion in the school cases that "education is perhaps the most important function of State and local governments." But the Court failed to observe the constitutional guaranties, including the 10th amendment, which reserve control of such matters to the States.

If the Supreme Court could disregard the provisions of the Constitution which were specifically designed to safeguard the rights of the States, we might as well not have a written Constitution. But only did the Court disregard the Constitution and the historical evidence supporting that revered document; it also disregarded previous decisions of the Court itself.

Between the decision in Plessy against Ferguson in 1896 and the reversal of that opinion on May 17, 1954, 157 cases were decided by the Supreme Court in support of the separate-but-equal doctrine. The United States Supreme Court rendered 11 opinions on that basis; the United States court of appeals 15, United States district courts 27; and State supreme courts, including the District of Columbia, 106.

Such disregard for established doctrine could be justified only if additional evidence were presented which was not available when the earlier decisions were rendered.

No additional evidence was presented to the Court to show the earlier decisions were unjustified. It is the decisions rendered on May 17, 1954, which are contrary to the Constitution and to legal precedent.

If the Court can say that certain children shall go to certain schools, the Court might also soon attempt to direct the courses to be taught in those schools. It might be soon decided to establish qualifications for teachers.

I reject the philosophy of the sociologists that the Supreme Court has any authority over local public schools, supported in part by State judicial reversal of the Supreme Court. The Court's segregation decision has set a dangerous precedent. If, in the school cases, the Court can by decree create a new constitutional provision, not in the written document, it might also disregard the Constitution in other matters. Other constitutional guaranties could be destroyed by new decrees.

I respect the Court as an institution and an instrument of Government created by the Constitution. I do not and cannot have regard for the nine Justices who rendered a decision so clearly contrary to the Constitution.

Propagandists and the agitators applied every pressure of which they were capable to bring about a reversal of the separate-but-equal doctrine. They were successful, but they now contend that the very methods they used are unfair. In the Court the States may proceed.

The people are free, morally and legally, to fight the decision. We must oppose to the end every attempt to encroach on the rights of the people.

Legislation by judicial decree, if permitted to go unchallenged, could destroy the rights of the Congress, the rights of the States, and the rights of the people themselves.

When the Court handed down its decision in the school-segregation cases, it attempted to wipe out constitutional or statutory provisons in 17 States and the District of Columbia. Thus, the Court attempted to bring about which even the Congress had no right to invade. A majority of the States affected would never enact such legislation through their legislatures. A vast majority of the people in those States would staunchly oppose such legislation.

The people and the States must find ways and means of preserving segregation in the schools. Each attempt to break down segregation must be fought with every legal weapon at our disposal.

At the same time, equal school facilities for the races must be maintained. The States are not required to avoid responsibility. They want to meet all due
responsibility, but not under Court decrees which are not based on law.

I think, Mr. President, that some of the problems of the South really want to take such action, that because some of us may live in the North, we have no appreciation of the problems of the South. That is contrary to the fact. But we have reached a point in history when the Supreme Court of the South, once again will have to determine whether we are to be governed by law or whether we are to be governed or subverted by the interposition doctrine, which is the doctrine of nullification.

Mr. President, on the basis of the arguments of the proponents of the declaration of principles just submitted by a group of southern Senators, I think today Calhoun was walking and speaking on the floor of the Senate.

I think, that, as patriots all, those of us representing areas outside the South, need to sit down with our brethren representing the South, and see what we can do to solve, by reasoned discussion, the great problem which the Supreme Court decision has created. But I first want to say, respectfully, that I leave this question on this sound decision, and a decision that was long overdue.

I say, respectfully, the South has had all the time since the War Between the States made the statement. That is why I am not greatly moved by these last-hour pleas of the South, “We need more time, more time, more time.” How much more time is needed in order that equality of justice may be applied to the blacks as well as to the whites in America?

Mr. President, I regret that this declaration has been filed, because I respectfully say such a declaration will not bring about the unanimity of action we will need in order to help solve the school problem in the South.

I close by saying a unanimous Supreme Court, which includes in its membership men in the tradition of the South in their veins, has at long last declared that all Americans are equal, and that the flame of justice in America must burn as brightly in the homes of the blacks as in the homes of the whites.

A historic debate must take place on the floor of the Senate in the not too distant future, because in the weeks immediately ahead the Congress will have to determine whether or not we and the people of the United States shall follow the Supreme Court decision, and recognize, as was laid down in Marbury against Madison, the supremacy of the Court in protecting the American people in their constitutional rights.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is a truly sad, bewildering, and difficult day in the Senate of the United States. This great body is sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States. To be sure, on every piece of legislation we make changes in the lives of our constituents, as to whether or not we believe it is within the spirit and the letter of our great document, the Constitution.

I do feel, Mr. President, once the Supreme Court of the United States has spoken, not merely upon statutory law, but upon constitutional law, that the presumption is, and should be, that the order of the Court and the rule of the Court is the law of the land—to be obeyed and upheld.

I do not confess to be an expert in constitutional law, I am familiar with the development of the doctrine of the power and the right of the Supreme Court, which has been enacted within its jurisdiction the responsibility for ruling upon the constitutionality of State statutes which may or may not be in conflict with the Constitution, the power to declare the responsibility and the right to rule upon Federal statutes which may or may not be in conflict with the Constitution, and finally the power of the Supreme Court to interpret and to apply the language of the Constitution itself.

Mr. President, the 14th amendment is a part of the Constitution of the United States. The fact that the 14th amendment has not been applied to specific instances throughout the past decades does not in any way weaken or vitiate this power of law. That amendment is quite explicit in section 1. It reads:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 2 minutes of the Senator have expired.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator request 5 additional minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I continue to read from section 1 of the 14th amendment:

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Mr. President, this amendment is all important in our constitutional structure. For years it has been interpreted and actually applied to the economic interests of our country, under the doctrine of what we call reasonableness, “due process of law” being interpreted as a reasonable rule of law. It was applied that way to economic matters and to large corporate interests.

The Supreme Court, in the case involving school segregation, applied the principle to citizens of the United States, to holdings rather than the State ownerships, to people rather than property.

So, Mr. President, I must say with all due respect—and I certainly respect the knowledge and experience of my colleagues—that the Supreme Court did not write the law; it merely applied existing constitutional law. It applied the principle of human equality—equal treatment under the law, which, since July 4, 1776, has been declared as the fundamental tenet of our Republic.

And, furthermore, Mr. President, in its ruling the Supreme Court took jurisdiction over one of the most complex, difficult, and trying questions of our time, namely,
segregation in our public schools. I re-
emphasize to my colleagues that the issue of segregation is a matter of great 
importance in the jurisdiction and the responsibil-
ity of the Supreme Court of the United 
States and the judicial process. I am 
pleased that it has been handled by the 
courts. I am displeased that it has be-
come the subject of passion, emotion, 
bitterness, and antagonism.

Frankly, Mr. President, the principle 
of federalism leaves no room for nulli-
fications. Senator Ferguson has 
said, it leaves no room for inter-
position. Interposition fully developed 
becomes nullification, as the courts of 
our country have stated again and again, 
and as the great, historic leaders of the 
Nation have stated. Nullification is a 
violation of the Constitution. It cannot be 
condoned.

Mr. President, there are many of us 
in the Senate who have been deeply dis-
turbed for a long time over the difficult, 
heart-rending issues of discrimination 
and inequality so evident in the fields of 
education, economic, and social rights 
for many of our people. I had hoped the 
Members of the Congress might restrain 
themselves on this issue of segregation. 
I had hoped that we would leave this to 
the courts. It is that I continue to reason 
with one another, rather than be the 
victims of passion or emotion.

I was pleased that in the document 
I heard read this morning that the 
position of the Senate, the decisions 
of the Court, and the national policy 
are, and shall be, upon lawful 
means; and of course I was pleased 
that there was an appeal to the people 
not to be provoked to irrational action.

Mr. President, it is of the utmost impor-
tance that there be law and order. It 
is of the utmost importance to the 
safety of our Republic that there not be vio-
lence; and it is of the utmost importance 
that the people, the Senate, the Courts, and 
the people as a whole, have regard for the 
rule of law. It is an order based upon understanding 
that will yield the results of law and order, 
that will bring people together, rather than 
the victims of passion or emotion.

Not only did the Supreme Court rule 
that segregation is unconstitutional, Mr. 
President; it also handed down an im-
plementation order. That implementa-
tion order is based upon understanding 
of the various problems in the areas of 
our country. It is based upon proceed-
ing as quickly as possible, however, with 
due consideration to the difficulties of the 
people. Agreement is not easy to reach 
 anymore. It is a reasonable doctrine. It is an order 
based upon reason, knowledge, and un-
derstanding. Mr. President, if ever there 
was a time when every citizen of the 
United States needed to be guided by 
compassion, kindness, understanding, 
tolerance—yes—with love, it is now.

Nothing could be worse for our Repub-
lic than to have a conflict between the 
races. Nothing could be worse than for 
North and South to become divided.

Let me say to our friends in the South, 
who have problems that are 
difficult ones, too; and some of those 
problems relate, indeed, to discrimina-
tion. It is our duty—as has been said 
by others—to set those problems aright, 
to cure them, to correct them.

Mr. President, our people need to be 
reminded, perhaps, that we are 
people, that we are citizens, and that 
we are not colored. We are 
people, not colored. We are 
American citizens.

Mr. President, if ever there was a 
time when Senators and Members of 
the House of Representatives should 
be calling upon the people of their States 
to work together, to build together, to 
reason together, it is now. Once the 
Supreme Court has ruled, arguments 
over law will yield little or no results, 
and as the great leaders have said, 
helpfulness: I only hope that the civic 
and political leaders throughout America 
will rally together to try to bring order, 
to reason, and to look toward 
a future that is better for all of us.

Mr. President, I know the thought has 
been expressed many times that some of 
us simply do not understand these prob-
lems. Perhaps we do not understand 
the full meaning of the problem. But none 
of us is unmindful of their difficulty.

I have been pleased to see the great 
progress that was being made in the 
South toward equality amongst the peo-
ple: in schools and in the Courts. This 
decision should be a stimulant for fur-
ther orderly progress. It requires that 
people of good will continue working to-
gether day after day. Mr. President, if 
Congress, Senators, and Members of the 
House of Representatives will take a 
stand for the fulfillment of equal rights 
under the law, progress will become or-
dery; and by holding back, we merely impede the fulfillment 
of what is inevitable, namely, the rule of 
law under the Constitution of the United 
States. The Constitution prescribes 
that there be no Second-class citizens 
and no Second-class citizenship; there 
be First-class citizenship. There can 
be no Second-class citizenship. There 
can be no Second-class citizenship.

Therefore, let us hope and pray that 
out of this body will come voices and 
out of the statehouses will come 
voices that will call upon the people as 
in this country to put away the dif-
ficulties, the problems, that we have. 
Mr. President, I add: Come, let us plan 
for forward progress together; come 
and let us build together and live together. 
That is the only choice we have, Mr. 
President.

I plead with my colleagues that if we 
persist in antagonism and bitterness, 
or if we persist in trying to hold back 
the rule of law, we shall only persist in 
leading this nation toward a probable 
catastrophe and conflict, not only in 
America, but throughout the world. Mr. 
President, this issue is far beyond 
the confines of our Republic.
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out of the statehouses will come 
voices that will call upon the people as 
in this country to put away the dif-
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for forward progress together; come 
and let us build together and live together. 
That is the only choice we have, Mr. 
President.
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or if we persist in trying to hold back 
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leading this nation toward a probable 
catastrophe and conflict, not only in 
America, but throughout the world. Mr. 
President, this issue is far beyond 
the confines of our Republic.
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out of the statehouses will come 
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in this country to put away the dif-
ficulties, the problems, that we have. 
Mr. President, I add: Come, let us plan 
for forward progress together; come 
and let us build together and live together. 
That is the only choice we have, Mr. 
President.

I plead with my colleagues that if we 
persist in antagonism and bitterness, 
or if we persist in trying to hold back 
the rule of law, we shall only persist in 
leading this nation toward a probable 
catastrophe and conflict, not only in 
America, but throughout the world. Mr. 
President, this issue is far beyond 
the confines of our Republic.

Therefore, let us hope and pray that 
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White House conferences have been called on matters of far less importance than this in the history of our nation. It is a good, commonsense way to utilize our surplus milk—as well as other foods. As indicated by Senate votes on the farm bill, we have been attempting to resolve the problem of avoiding further surpluses and depleting our existing surplus stockpiles; for these are costly, and have adverse effects on farm prices.

There is another type of legislation—which serves a two-fold purpose of getting rid of surpluses and improving the health of our children—should not be immediately expedited to fulfill an urgent need.

This legislation dovetails completely with the administration's current farm parity bill, on which we will complete action this week.

**BRUCELLOSIS-ERADICATION PROGRAM VITAL TO FARMERS AND HEALTH OF NATION**

The brucellosis-eradication program, too, is vital to the farmer, and to the welfare of the country. The completion of this fine effort to eradicate a dread disease from the dairy cattle of our Nation will not only eliminate a health hazard from all of us, but will free the farmers from this great economic loss resulting from the rumbling of infected cattle in their herds.

**ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUDGET BEFORE THE ST. DAVID SOCIETY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK**

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the Record an address by Mr. Rowland R. Hughes, Director of the Bureau of the Budget after 3 years, and the St. David's Society of the State of New York, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. There being no objection, the address ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**THE CITIZEN AND HIS GOVERNMENT**

**INTRODUCTION**

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege and a pleasure to be with you tonight, and I am deeply appreciative of the action of the society in awarding the Hopkins medal to me. It is a most distinguished company of which I am proud to be a part. Today's address is one in which I would like to discuss in relation to our economy, to local government, and to our natural resources.

The first of the two challenges is a domestic one: Determination of the appropriate role of the Federal Government in our society. I am certain there is no disagreement with the fundamental American conviction that man was created to be free, that he can be made free with freedom, and that governments have as a primary function the protection of that freedom and the defense of the nation. The challenge, however, has long been differing points of view as to the proper role of the Government in relation to this freedom. On the one hand we have the popular philosophy which calls for a system of universal and equal leadership in every area of our society. The contrary view holds that more limited government is the essence of our constitutional system.

Throughout our lifetimes, and of course, the lifetimes of our children, I venture to say, Americans have continually forced to choose between principal reliance on Government or principal reliance on individual initiative. The choices will arise in varied forms—perhaps with respect to tax rates or public works, perhaps with respect to Federal participation in education, labor relations, or medical affairs. In nearly all instances, however, we have a choice that a leader and one of my life to economic matters, I must say I have them constantly in mind.

However, considering the two existing philosophies as to the proper role of Government in relation to our economy, I am certain there is little question in anyone's mind as to the desirability of a strong and growing American economy, designed both to provide for our increasing population and to assure a higher standard of living for all. How this goal is to be achieved, however, has been the subject of virulent debate—which has become particularly apparent during our own lifetime.

We have had, on the one hand, the philosophy which favors direct Government intervention and, if necessary, inflation constantly to spur increasing economic activity; which accepts increases in the price level as necessary consequences of economic growth; and which is not adverse to paying for all this through popular and appealing processes of adding to the national debt rather than collecting taxes. On the other hand, we have the school of thought which believes in private initiative, rather than Government intervention, should provide the basic stimulus for economic growth; which encourages stability in prices; and which rejects the opiate of today's bills and tomorrow's payments to pay.

For 20 years beginning with 1933, in peace as well as war, it was always the policy of the Federal Government vigorously to project itself on the economic scene and to apply a forced direction on the economy, as it has been said, to encourage the country to run a little fever as a means of staying well. During those two decades both our gross national product and our wages and salaries were substantially increased. In the same period, however, the national debt was increased almost tenfold and the value of the dollar was cut in half.

During the last 3 years we have seen the economic philosophy of the Administration, the Government seeking to reduce its predecessor's emphasis on paternalism and pump-priming...
and, instead, to lay stress on the resourcefulness of individual initiative and on fiscal stability. While emphasizing the steady growth of the economy, the Government has sought, by indirect rather than direct means, to check the upward spiralling of prices, the swelling of the national debt, and the steady degradation of our currency. The result has been a stabilization of the cost of living and of the value of the dollar, and a balancing of the Federal budget. The experience of the past 15 years, from 1944 to 1959, has amply demonstrated the wisdom of this policy of reducing the Federal budget deficit, if only to the extent of providing a reserve against inflation. Inflation, even if not the legal fiction, will have been lost. We must also realize that it can be lost only to the degree, by necessities, of a Federal and State and local initiative as well as by overuse of national authority. We have therefore a further obligation to see to it that those legitimate needs of society that could be met by timely State and local action do not by default have to be met by the National Government.

A further point of integral importance is the fact there are certain responsibilities, such as national security, which can be met only by the Federal Government. The larger the number of additional and subsidiary and transitory burdens we endeavor to shift from our States and cities onto Washington, the more difficult it becomes for the Federal Government to concentrate resources and effort on those essential programs which only it can and must carry out.

My own conviction is that the interests of our national life must be encouraged by encouraging State and local governments to strengthen themselves and thus keep as much as possible of such governmental activity in the States and communities, and that any national administration must have, as does my own, the cautionary recognition against unnecessary and unfair interference in the private affairs of our people, of their communities, and of the several States.

Resource development is a third area in which, during our lifetime, we will continue to witness sharp divergences of opinion as to the proper role of the Federal Government. In the field of power, for example, the effect of the administration's current policies has been to reverse the Government's tendency during the past two decades to preempt strategic and important areas of opportunity for the eventual exclusive Federal development of power and other resources. Instead, we have sought to create a situation designed to encourage early action by the several governmental agencies.

The administration's position is based on the conclusion that resource development is the responsibility of everyone. In many instances, it is the people most directly involved who have the greatest interest in the outcome of the projects that are to be built. In other cases, Federal participation is the necessary condition for the development of the national aims, where projects are beyond the means or needs of local groups.

In the field of public works, this philosophy has come to be known as the partnership principle. The policy does not rule out Federal assistance, but it is grounded in the premise that to the greatest possible extent the responsibility for developmental projects should be born by those responsible for their approach. It serves to multiply the effect of Federal expenditures in the stimulation of conservation and development of the natural resources of the country, in all cases where the partnership principle applies there is automatically acquired a concomitant Federal responsibility for such areas lacking where no local contribution is required.

I could multiply these illustrations manyfold, but I am certain that my point is quite clear: That almost anywhere we turn in respect to our Government's domestic policies we find the basic effort toward the ultimate decisions will be made by reference to one or the other of these two philosophies: the traditional concern with the awesome power of nuclear weapons, power that today we are told that a single weapon can carry as much destructive energy as all the aircraft of all the nations of the world combined.

How the relationship between the two great power systems will develop—the Iron Curtain countries on the one hand and the United States on the other—will undoubtedly be the central issue of our times. The problem has been infinitely complicated in the past decade by the discovery of the awesome power of nuclear weapons, power that today we are told that a single weapon can carry as much destructive energy as all the aircraft of all the nations of the world combined.

Today, no nation or individual can have assurance of absolute security, when for the first time in history weapons exist which are capable of destroying all mankind. As the fearful realities of modern warfare are recognized, we have become grimly aware that in a wide-scale war of the future the victor and the vanquished would be scarcely distinguishable victims of devastation on a scale never before witnessed or suffered by man.

Such, then, is the awful arithmetic of the atomic bomb that we know mankind must deal with in our era. That the cold and forbidding, is an ideological front which marshals every weapon in the armament which is to be the downfall of all mankind—this is the only assurance we have left.

One country, one hand, all the lessons of history teach us that if one nation lets down its guard, the other will find a way to move or stop it. If the West possesses a great reservoir of energy, the peoples of the Western world must be ever on the watch, always ready to lift from the world its sword of fear, and eventually to maximize availability for peaceful purposes of the infinite promise of our age.

Our country's purpose, he has said, is to "move out of the dark chamber of horrors into the light, to find a way by which the hands of men of good will in all the souls of men everywhere, can move forward toward peace and happiness and well-being." After reviewing the vast scope of all wars in history and all the attempts to limit wars and what happened under them, we must recognize that there is no indication from any of the studies which have been made that any single mechanical formula has yet been found that technically can guarantee a permanent peace.

On the one hand, all the lessons of history tell us that a long-sustained competitive arms race, as has been the case with arms race, carry within themselves the dangers of war. On the other hand, we are equally aware that if one nation should ever invade another, it invites aggression from a powerfully armed adversary. Unilateral disarmament on our side."

"And the wisest method of conducting our domestic affairs is concerned. I have been convinced that the sheet anchor of the Republic should and must be the policy so well explained by President Eisenhower that the legitimate object of Government is to do for a community of people what they cannot do so well; that in all a people can individually do so well for themselves, Government cannot do so well for them.

"Safeguarded disarmament"

The second of the 2 challenges of which I wish to speak tonight is an international one. It is not quite a decade since the first hint that the associates plunged us into a world war of unprecedented scope and violence. In that war, extending over 2 great oceans and their shallowest shores, we and our allies achieved a tremendous victory. But the peace we sought has continued eludes us. The forces of communism, no less totalitarian than those of Hitler, ranged themselves against the free nations of the world.

One country after another was swept into the Communist orbit, and today we face the continued threat of the Soviet conspiracy to dominate the nations of the world—dictatorship by force, or by discovery of the awesome power of nuclear weapons, power that today we are told that a single weapon can carry as much destructive energy as all the aircraft of all the nations of the world combined.

Today, no nation or individual can have assurance of absolute security, when for the first time in history weapons exist which are capable of destroying all mankind. As the fearful realities of modern warfare are recognized, we have become grimly aware that in a wide-scale war of the future the victor and the vanquished would be scarcely distinguishable victims of devastation on a scale never before witnessed or suffered by man.

Such, then, is the awful arithmetic of the atomic bomb that we know mankind must deal with in our era. That the cold and forbidding, is an ideological front which marshals every weapon in the armament which is to be the downfall of all mankind—this is the only assurance we have left.

One country, one hand, all the lessons of history teach us that if one nation lets down its guard, the other will find a way to move or stop it. If the West possesses a great reservoir of energy, the peoples of the Western world must be ever on the watch, always ready to lift from the world its sword of fear, and eventually to maximize availability for peaceful purposes of the infinite promise of our age.

Our country's purpose, he has said, is to "move out of the dark chamber of horrors into the light, to find a way by which the hands of men of good will in all the souls of men everywhere, can move forward toward peace and happiness and well-being." After reviewing the vast scope of all wars in history and all the attempts to limit wars and what happened under them, we must recognize that there is no indication from any of the studies which have been made that any single mechanical formula has yet been found that technically can guarantee a permanent peace.

On the one hand, all the lessons of history tell us that a long-sustained competitive arms race, as has been the case with arms race, carry within themselves the dangers of war. On the other hand, we are equally aware that if one nation should ever invade another, it invites aggression from a powerfully armed adversary. Unilateral disarmament on our
waging of peace with as much resourcefulness, vigor, and urgency as we have ever mustered in defense of our country in time of war.

We have to find somehow the inspiration of the world's great national strength, and in return for a substantially dependable system for reduced armaments on the part of all nations, which would lighten the burdens on their backs.

The importance of a sound agreement cannot be exaggerated. It is possible at all, must be a joint matter. It is possible to make a dedicated attempt in the coming months to evolve a sound and safeguarded agreement for the future limitation of armaments in the interest of a just, durable, and secure peace for America and for the world.

The Bagot agreement between Great Britain and the United States after the War of 1812 was designed, in 1817, Great Britain and the United States agreed that they would be foolhardy. Disarmament, had a meager amount of working capital which could be utilized for a manufacturing plant, and this hitherto unused source of manpower composed of physically disabled individuals exemplified by the program suggested by the President at Geneva. We must not forget the Federaion of the federation, but we must continue to maintain at this stage of world affairs a suitably powerful posture of defense, but remember that it needs to be based on the spiritual and moral strength of a nation of free people. With it we shall need the proper role of government in our society—another lesson of our peaceful unarmed border with Canada. It is one of the paradoxes of our atomic era that mankind's greatest scientific achievement, of what appears to me to be our atomic era that mankind's greatest scientific achievement, to achieve safeguarded peace and to maintain our security. Thus, we must be concerned with unproven or untried to the case of disinterestedness, with the assurance that the support of a higher power which has been a source of strength to our Nation in difficult times in the past and which can be a source of peace and safety for the present and the future.

The importance of a sound agreement cannot be overestimated. Without thorough inspection and reporting, a sound agreement is necessary to safeguard peace and to maintain our security. Indeed, decisions reached with respect to the proper role of government in our society will determine how each of us will live; decisions reached with respect to disarmament and the extent and the method and the extent and the method in which a proper role is determined whether each of us will live or die.

I have directed my remarks to these two great problems—domestic and international—because of what appears to me to be a danger of disinterestedness, to each one of us. The actions of the American Government reflect the mood of the American people, the extent to which the Government will continue to maintain a suitable posture of defense and the direction which we are going in, will have the most profound effect on each of our lives.

Mr. SMATHERS: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a statement I prepared, a transcendence of anxieties, to each one of us.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:
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men and women have received the benefits of medical treatment, psycho- 
ological therapy and professional counsel-
ing.

A tribute to both the Bendix Aviation 
Corp. and the Federation electronics plant 
which it developed, that the latter is now 
capable of completely financing and man-
aging its own operation and can successfully 
compete against other Bendix subcontractors 
for Bendix subcontract work. Outstanding 
among these, I believe, was the part Bendix 
played in the development of local industry. I trust 
that many of us will follow this example thus 
making a great contribution to the wel-
fare of our country.

THE REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have just had transmitted to Congress 
the semiannual report on the refugee 
relief program. On page 13 of that re-
port is found the following sentence:

At the same time, the present imbalance of 
visas in certain categories and for certain areas of 
operation may cause 40,000 to 50,000 visas to go unused 
under the Refugee Relief Act.

We are aware. We have known for some 
time that the way in which the program was being administered 
would mean that it would fall far short of its 
goal. The first official admission of this 
came from the Director of the refugee 
relief program, Pierce J. Gerety, who said 
at the beginning of the year that about 
44,000 refugees will be denied admission 
as a result of the administration’s failure 
to carry out the program properly.

Many of us have been warning for 
some time that this would happen. Ac-
tually, the Refugee Relief Act never was 
a workable instrument for achieving the humanitar-
ian purposes intended by this program. But, in addition, there has 
been indication in the way this program has been administered of a reluctance on 
the part of Congress to facilitate administration of the 
program.

At this point in the Record, Mr. Presi-
dent, I would like to have appear an 
article from the New York Times of March 8, 
1956, titled “Refugee Program.”

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

[From the New York Times of March 8, 1956]

REFUGEE PROGRAM

The latest official report on the operations of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 confirms 
what has been evident for many months, namely, that there is almost no possibility 
that the law will achieve its alleged goal of admit-
ting 209,000 nonquota immigrants to the United States by the end of this year.

Indeed, months ago we noted on this page that the question was no longer whether 
the act would be fully effective, but rather whether the 209,000 nonquota immigrants 
authorizations were to be filled.

Mr. Gerety said that sponsors were needed for 
refugees in Germany, Austria, and the Neth-
erlands, non-Asians stranded in the Far East and 
orphans. Assurances to cover as many 
as 39,500 applicants may be needed if the 
50,000 German-Austrian allocations is to be 
filed, he reported.

On the other hand, he said, all the 60,000 
visas authorized for refugees in the Soviet 
area of the United States citizens in Italy and Greece 
will have been issued well before the pro-
gram’s termination. No new Italian and 
Greek applications of refugees and relatives 
are being accepted.

Despite a pressing over-population prob-
lem, “hundreds of thousands of applicants in 
Italy will be disappointed because the de-
mand for visas has greatly exceeded the 
supply,” Mr. Gerety said.

Mr. Gerety said Communist propagandists 
since last spring had “kept up a constant 
barrage” to entice refugees and those who 
had escaped to return to their former homelands. 

“Thus far the campaign has not been par-
ticularly successful,” he commented. “A cer-
tain amount of defection has taken place 
among the thousands of refugees from East-
ern Europe but not in alarming numbers 
despite glowing promises.”

Some of these, he added, have applied for 
admission to the United States under the 
program, but Mr. Gerety said the campaign 
was not the reason why those who had 
arrived in this and other countries of the free 
world under emergency migration programs. 

“Most of them have fled from their countries of origin are bitter anti-
Communists,” he asserted, “and fully aware of 
their own conditions.”

“However, many are discouraged and dis-
satisfied because of long delays in resettle-
ment and may be unable to continue to 
resist pressures applied by the Communists.”

The President of the United States 
and the Secretary of State have it within 
their power to act now to prevent the re-

The program has been speeded up, but 
spontaneously. It has been functioning 
during the first year or so of the law’s operation it was 
bogged down so badly that it had been 
helped by the election of thousands of 
guished refugees, many of them victims of Communist perse-
cution, and by overwhelming public 
and administration to the United States.

Such of the faults still 
lies in the law itself. Congressional 
juries in the field of real relief were written into 
the act such difficult and complex require-
ments as to make it almost the despair of 
those who wanted to continue the American 
tradition of extending a helping hand to our 
friends abroad.

But full of road blocks as the law may be, 
its early failure is better than a cruel 
worse, whether because of lack of sympathy with the professed purposes of the law, fear 
short of its purpose that more than one-

REFUGEE PROGRAM

[From the New York Times of March 8, 1956]

The status of the program was reviewed by 
President Eisenhower. In his semiannual report to Congress.

Mr. President, time is running out. We cannot allow this 
program to carry out the program properly.

But something more immediate can 
be done and needs to be done. The Pres-
ident of the United States has it within 
their power to act now to prevent the re-

...
They have worked patiently in close cooperation with the refugee relief administrators in an attempt to help as many people as possible to come to the United States under this program. They have spent large amounts of their own funds and labored long and hard in an effort to make this program work. They have been told time and again only the many unworkable provisions of the act itself but also up against the apparent lack of will on the part of the administration to make this program work.

Let me cite to the Senate two of the administrative changes that are immediately needed if the issuance of visas is to be expedited. These administrative changes are recommended in a letter to the President from members of the committee on the refugee relief program of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service. The letter was sent to President Eisenhower on February 16. I would just like to list here the groups signing this letter and make it clear that recommendations come from organizations with close experience in the way the refugee relief program has been functioning. Signers include the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, the American Foundation for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc., Catholic Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference, Inc., Church World Service, Inc., International Rescue Committee, Inc., International Social Service, Inc., Lutheran Refugee Service, Tolstoy Foundation, Inc., United Friends of Needy and Persecuted People of Yugoslavia, Inc., United Hias Service, Inc., and United Ukrainian American Relief Committee, Inc.

In their letter to President Eisenhower those groups said:

May we respectfully call to your attention the present situation with reference to the refugee relief program? The present rate of security clearances in the Agency which the Department of State has designated as the agency, to which has been made available the larger amount of funds necessary to make the program work, is discouraging and indicates that the number of persons who may need such relief is being met or exceeded.

As national voluntary agencies to the President, we believe it is to the best interest of our country and of our humanitarian desire and of our humanitarian interest that applicants seeking admission under the Refugee Relief Act be processed in a manner and in such time as the investigative agencies or agencies shall determine to be necessary.

Mr. President, there are a number of proposals for legislative changes urgently needed contained in the letter to the President from the committee on refugee-relief program of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service. I believe that some of these proposals will be called to the attention of the appropriate committees of both Houses. However, as they are worthy of the consideration of all of us, I would like to have you appear at this point in the remarks both the letter to President Eisenhower and the accompanying statement entitled "Some Proposals by American Voluntary Agencies to the President of the United States for Facilitating the Refugee Relief Program." The letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

Mr. President:

I write to you this letter of March 12, 1956. The President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

Mr. President:

I write to you this letter of March 12, 1956. The President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

Mr. President:

I write to you this letter of March 12, 1956. The President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

Mr. President:

I write to you this letter of March 12, 1956. The President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

Mr. President:

I write to you this letter of March 12, 1956. The President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

Mr. President:

I write to you this letter of March 12, 1956. The President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

Mr. President:

I write to you this letter of March 12, 1956. The President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.
May we respectfully call to your attention the present situation with reference to the refugee relief program. For example, the visa rate of 265 visas per week for the last 10 weeks needs to be increased immediately to more than 375, from January 15 to March 31, 1956, to cover all refugees now in process. Also actual experience over the past 2½ years now clearly indicates that changes in some of the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act would be beneficial in carrying out the true intent of this legislation.

Therefore we are submitting in the attached statement some proposals which, in our judgment, merit your consideration. We hope that through administrative clarification and acceleration of the refugee relief program where it now lags and through your recommissionary to the leaders of both branches of Congress in certain reasonable amendments, that the Refugee Relief Act can be fully implemented and its important objectives achieved.

To support you in this humanitarian task we are sending copies of this letter and statement to many of the leaders in both Houses of Congress.

Respectfully yours,
Robert McGowan E. Svanstrom
Chairman, Committee on Refugee Relief Program.


Some Proposals by American Voluntary Agencies to the President of the United States for Facilitating the Refugee Relief Program.

1. Legislative Changes Urgently Needed

1. Redefinition of the terms "refugee," "escapee," and "expellee".

The present definitions require that an escapee or German expellee in order to qualify must not be "firmly resettled," must be "out of his usual place of abode," and must be "in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life and transportation." These phrases have been difficult to interpret. Even with administrative clarification and relaxation of the meanings of the term, they have resulted in the exclusion of large numbers of deserving refugees, particularly those who have had enough courage and hard work to have made themselves economically independent in their present places of asylum even though they have never intended to remain permanently in such places. To overcome these difficulties, we recommend that the term "refugee" should apply to the Italian, Greek, and Dutch groups, and the term "escapee" and "expellee" should be redefined to mean "any person" instead of "any refugee".

2. Provision for escapees in additional areas

We recommend that the areas to which special nonquota visa numbers for refugees are available be increased to include persons fleeing from North Africa, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, and Jordan. Under the present provisions of the act, only those persons leaving the NATO countries, Turkey, Sweden, Iran, or Trieste are presently eligible. The additional numbers which may be eligible under the proposed amendment is small, but they are in great need and are as deserving as those presently covered.

3. Security and investigations

Section 4 of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, reads as follows: "Except as otherwise expressly provided by this act, all of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163) shall be applicable under this act." In other words, each applicant for a special nonquota visa under the Refugee Relief Act is subject to the same security and other investigations as applicants for regular quota visas under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

We believe that in view of the above, sections 11 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of the Refugee Relief Act should be supplemented and made time-consuming and costly blocks to the expeditious processing of applicants and should, therefore, be eliminated.

4. Certificate of readmission

Although those applicants for special nonquota visas under the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, are able to obtain certificates under section 7 (d) (2) of the act, nevertheless a small number of otherwise qualified applicants for purely technical reasons are not able to obtain these certificates. Therefore, we recommend that the Secretary of State be authorized to waive this requirement in cases where it is to the interest of persons otherwise eligible under the Refugee Relief Act.

5. Utilization of unused visas

Developments since the enactment of Public Law 384 have prevented the allotments for expellees and escapees in Germany and Austria are greater than will be required by the number of probably eligible applicants. Also the allocations for the probably eligible applicants in Greece, Italy, the Far East, and NATO countries are considerably less than the number of applicants. Therefore, it is recommended that the Administrator be authorized to reallocate surplus quotas to other categories where they are needed, after making proper provisions to safeguard the visas actually needed for those applicants from Germany, Austria, Greece, Italy, and the Netherlands. For practical purposes it is recommended that a partial reallocation of 30,000 be made immediately and that the reallocations be made if the program warrants in the interest of the effectiveness of the act.

To insure the fullest utilization of visas unused by applicants in process as of December 31, 1956, and by beneficiaries of assurances received by the Department of State on or before December 31, 1956, and also for the benefit of orphan applicants, we recommend that the expiration date of the Refugee Relief Act be extended by 6 months or as much as a year if, in the judgment of the Secretary of State, this extension is required.

In relation to the availability of quota numbers, we also wish to call attention to the fact that there is no provision in the law as written or in the proposed amendments, for taking care of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain who will have fled after December 31, 1956. We would suggest that provision be made in the basic immigration law to take care of these people.

6. Orphans

The 10-year age restriction on orphans should be increased to 14 for a principal applicant coming to the United States for adoption by a United States citizen and spouse, and special provisions should be made for the adoption of siblings of such principal applicant up to the age of 16. The number of admissions for this special section should be increased by 1,000.

7. Admission of persons having tuberculosis

The words "lawfully entered" should be deleted under section 6 of Public Law 303, as amended. The requirement that the quota to which the alien is charged be oversubscribed should also be eliminated. The Secretary of State should be authorized to increase the number of aliens whose status can be readjusted under the provisions of this act if additional numbers are needed.

8. United States and the hard core

As an additional factor in resolving the refugee problems, we wish to bring to your attention the urgent need for provision for those among the refugees who are the so-called hard core—those thousands for whom no employers orRunLooped resettlement is possible. These are the aged, the infirm, the amputees, the blind, and others for whom no employer can take responsibility. Through the United Nations Office of High Commissioner for Refugees and the United States escapee program, our Government is helping to provide for some of them and for their families. It is our hope that Congress will make provision whereby a Government sponsored plan can be provided to bring 13,000 such persons to this country for permanent care in their declining years. In such a plan provision should be made whereby the families of these hard-core groups, voluntary agencies, and State or private institutions can work together with the Government in assisting these people. Refugees may make good labor, good citizens, good Americans. Also, they may be hard core. We are asking you to provide for the United States to help on this problem not by money only, but by offering homes in our owncountry to a fair share of the victims of oppression.

10. Mortgage of quotas

Because of its value in the future, particularly for persons fleeing from Iron Curtain countries, we favor the cancellation of mortgages on quotas which became effective as a result of sections 3 (c) and 4 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, and the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 201 (e) (2).

II. Administrative Changes Immediately Required

It is believed that the following administrative changes in implementation of the Refugee Relief Act would greatly expedite the operation of the program:

1. Transportation: A refugee relief program responsibility

The same provisions for ocean transportation which have been given to refugees from Europe should also be made available to refugees, including orphans, from the Near and Far East. In the absence of such provision, there is the problem of confusion against such persons, causing difficult problems for agencies and sponsors of persons already vised but for whom no transportation means are available. Fortunately, the law authorized...
the Secretary of State to make such arrange­ments (see sec. 8). The estimated number of orphans that need such transportation have been in the Department of State since August. The number of visa-ready refugees of European origin who need transportation have been in the Department of State since August. The number of visa-ready refugees of European origin who need transportation have been in the Department of State since August. The number of visa-ready refugees of European origin who need transportation have been in the Department of State since August.

2. Section 11 (a)

This section requires that for all appli­cants there be thorough investigations and written reports prepared by such investiga­tive agency or agencies of the United States as the President designates, regarding such persons' character, reputation, mental, and physical health, history and eligibility under this act. The investigations in each case shall be conducted in a manner and in such time as the investigative agency or agencies may determine to be necessary. The President has designated the Department of State as the agency of the Government to conduct the investigations and written reports in cooperation with the Department of the Army and any other agency of the Government to which the Department of State may request.

We believe that the Administrator of the program has it within his authority, accord­ing to Section 11, to conduct these operations in a less cumbersome manner and in a much shorter time. As a result of my having been in close and constant touch with the Department of State, I understand that the more than 30 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox churches which make up this organization are spending over a half-million dollars per year on these operations. Mr. Eli­ott, as director of immigration ser­vices for the National Council of Churches has staff members throughout the world in close and constant touch with the way in which the program is being ad­ministered, not only here in Washington, but in those countries in which refugees are being processed. Mr. Elliott also wrote to Mr. Gerety as a member of the advisory group to the refugee relief pro­gram, he said that his recommendations on the changes that are needed in the pro­gram deserve our closest attention. Mr. President, I ask that you have the Recom to print the Recom at this point in the letter from Mr. Elliott to Mr. Gerety of January 30, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Recom, as follows:

**January 30, 1956.**

The Honorable Fierce J. Gerety,
Deputy Administrator, Refugee Relief Program, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Dear Fierce: I am glad to act on your sug­gestions! I have just met with your group met­ting on Monday, that I put in writing my sug­gestions for improving the refugee relief pro­gram, both administratively and by legisla­tion.

I do this at once because of your an­nouncement of your plan to leave shortly for the Far East and since, before you leave, you naturally will want to initiate some of the crucial steps necessary; also, quite frankly, because my own executive director and some of the key leaders of our churches have made it clear to me that I would be re­mis if I were to fail to put our position be­fore you while there is time for you to act decisively on remedial matters which involve the Secretary of State, the President, and the Congress.

As you well know, I am writing critically and constructively as your friend, as a member of your advisory group, and as the director of Church World Service, which represents the refugee service of over 30 Protestant and Eastern Catholic Churches. These Churches, which currently are investing over a half-million dollars a year in the refugee-relief program and have in their pipeline assurances for some 30,000 refugees, wish to be assured that the refugee-relief program is being administered in a way—and in time—to justify their continued participation. In their clear view both administrative changes fully authorized under the present law, and in the spirit of such changes, in line with experience in the program to date, are equally essential—and possible.

No one knows better than you that your present problem as administrator of this refugee-relief program has been occa­sioned by the following factors:
1. Certain drastic changes made in the original legislation.
2. Serious delays in beginning the program in certain countries, particularly in the Near East and in the Far East.
3. Delay in providing an assurance form (DSR-8) to facilitate the cooperation of volun­tary agencies.
4. Lack of adequate coordination overseas to prevent duplication of efforts, including investigations, visa issuance, transportation, work of voluntary agencies, etc.
5. Disappointment and discouragement of applicants overseas and in the United States of America by the uncertainties and delays.
6. Consequent slowness of assurance pro­cess, in some cases, to voluntary agencies.
7. Economic and political developments in Germany and Austria.
8. The earlier lack of clarity regarding the administrative intent for this program and its status as compulsory legislation or only as a permissive act.

Since your own appointment as deputy ad­ministrator, there has been substantial progress in this important work in terms of the result of your administrative and procedural improvements. Some further administra­tive changes can be and urgently need to be done if visa issuance is to cover all eligible cases. The most crucial of these do not require new legislation. The present rate of security screening and visa issuance in all countries except Greece and Italy is substantially below the rate required to act in accordance with the intentions of this act. In the Netherlands, the pro­gram is just now beginning so there, as elsewhere, the processing is about to receive an early acceleration by your office. Otherwise assurances produced at great cost by agencies like our own will never produce visas for people who are not finally eligible under the Refugee Relief Act.

While in some countries, as in Germany and Austria, the refugee problem has dimmed since 1953, in some other areas (Greece, NATO countries, Hong Kong) it has become even more crucial. And the aggressive “come home” campaign of the Communist countries adds a new dimension to the im­portant value of making the Refugee Relief Acts a compulsory and Act constitutes an im­portant improvement. The answer to redefinition is not necessarily multiple and discouraging screening but more simple American efficiency in coordinating and expediting our refugee relief program (includ­ing security screening) on behalf of those who have risked everything because of their love of freedom. At such a moment as this, it is our conviction that our United States of America program for the world’s refugees—our allies in the struggle for a free world—should be given new momentum. To fail to do so, when we are strong enough now, and when the conditions for effective action are present, will be against our own self-interest and our democratic and humanitarian principles. In the Far East, the importance of closer coordination of the United States escapee program which is our welcome service to those who defect to the West with the procedures of RCP. In this same connection you will want to note that with the suspension of the adjustment of status provision, there is no way to give status to any of those escapees for whom the United States of America is the first country of asylum. This situation needs correction soon.

In our judgment the changes needed im­mediately as of this moment have should be considered apart from the basic immigration law. While it is our view that, in light of the current program, Ger­ency immigration might well be made an integral part of our Immigration and Na­tionality law, it seems to us to be imperative that these present and immediate consider­ations be given by the Congress to the relatively few changes in Public Law 203 which experi­enced no comprehanded, and which are desirable in achieving the objectives of the special emergency legislation (Public Law 203).

Our plea, therefore, is not for a general expansion or extension of the Refugee Re­lief Act, but specifically for the changes which are needed in the current program. Some of these can and should be made by
utilizing authorizations already in Public Law 203. Some may require legislative changes: 

1. The Attorney General in consultation with the help of voluntary agencies if re-
quested, could quickly suggest changes in current authorizations to help persons, clearly belonging within this pro-
gram are excluded from it because of a 

(3) Two Poles are refugees to France; one 
still in France is eligible, the other now in North Africa is not because he represents a French 

While, in the light of experience to date, certain amendments to eligibility criteria 
can be made, it is our experience that no precise definition of eligibility can be 
extended to cover all cases of merit which 

In our experience they add no safeguard to 
United States law. They also may be hard core. We 

6. Discretion regarding readmission: In 

The present RRA regulations for 

Our hope is that the Immigration Subcommittees, together 

Any administration 

under the RRA program the urgent need of some 

(3) Two Poles are refugees to France; one 

5. Make security procedures efficient: It now 
security screening that is already required under the Public Law 203. The administra-
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a Government implemented 

We believe 
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in the governments concerned will greatly 

in the governments concerned will greatly 

in the governments concerned will greatly 

in the governments concerned will greatly 

in the governments concerned will greatly 

in the governments concerned will greatly 

in the governments concerned will greatly 

in the governments concerned will greatly 

in the governments concerned will greatly
Church World Service is urgently concerned for the safety and assurance of those who are being processed under the RRA: our churches are securing more assurances daily; we pledge our continued cooperation with you in working for this. In the face of the under existing law and in bringing to the attention of the Congress the few, reasonable and positive recommendations that I think it essential to be made.

I am now sending this letter to you and to the officers of the general board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America which next meets on February 1, 1966. I believe you will take my suggestions as the friendly evidence of my regard for you which you are intended to be.

Ever cordially yours,

R. BELL ELLIOTT
Director, Immigration Services.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is one point that Mr. Elliott makes that I believe requires special emphasis at this time. It bears upon the significant humanitarian role that the program has for United States foreign policy. Mr. Elliott wrote to Mr. Gerety:

While in some countries, as in Germany and Austria, the defector problem has diminished since 1953, in some other areas (Greece, NATO countries, Hong Kong) it has become even more crucial. And the aggregate current and projected exodus of the Communist countries adds a new dimension to the imperative value of making the Refugee Relief Act the positive and quickly effective instrument it was designed to be. The answer to defection is not protracted, multiple, as in the past, humanitarian role in the world. Let me stress this, it is our conviction that our United States officers of the Church and our churches as this, it is our conviction that our United States

Mr. ELLIOTT,

in recent months, to woo and win back their campaign,...

Mr. Elliott warns. In recent months some 220,000...of January 25, 1966. * * * Well over half of the visas issued have come in Italy where, due to the Graham amendment, thousands of relatives had been waiting for regular quota visa numbers. Of the 45,000 visas originally targeted by Congress for Italian refugees only a little more than 3,000 have been issued to that category and perhaps the total number will not exceed 8,000 by the end of the act. In Greece the picture is pretty much the same except that a large number of refugees also qualified as refugees due to the guerrilla war and earthquakes. Yet less than half of the 11,000 visas issued have been to Greek refugees, thanks again to the Graham amendment.
BEFORE

Senators LEHMAN, · DOUGLAS, KEFAUVER, ·
Mr. President, I wish to express my concern at the recent announcement by the Director of the refugee relief program, Mr. Pierce J. Gerety, that he will not be able to issue the 209,000 entry permits authorized under the present law by the cut-off date of December 31 this year. Mr. Gerety estimates that on the scheduled basis the administration will not be able to issue these entry permits because of the failure of the administration to administer the program properly.

As I stated in testifying before your committee last June on amendments to the Refugee Relief Act, the attitude of some of those administering the law seems to have been that the number of admissions authorized under the act is merely a permissive figure—that they can issue visas up to that number but it is not necessary to make an effort to attain the goal of the maximum number of entries under the refugee relief program. I wish to make it clear that the intention of those of us who voted to support this program. When we consider how many refugees have been living for long, weary years in some of these countries, we are concerned that we ought to complete the issuance of visas as quickly as possible.

As you know, one of the amendments contained in S. 1794, introduced by Senators Lehman, Douglas, and myself, was to extend the expiration date of the refugee relief program to December 31, 1960. Under this amendment and various others, the law would be reinterpreted among those categories under section 4 of the act that have been filled but still have relatives to be resettled. This relaxation and extension of the time would permit the refugee relief program to achieve its goal in permitting the maximum number of persons authorized under the act to enter the country.

I, of course, desire most of all that your committee recommend the adoption of those amendments which I have already supported before your committee. But, in view of the facts that the administration will not be able to meet its obligation of issuing all visas authorized under the Refugees Act, I believe that at least the committee will recommend an extension of the termination date of the act beyond December 31, 1966. I cannot know in advance the possible steps of the administration at this time that the Refugee Relief Administration may need to complete the issuance of all 209,000 authorized visas, but I am sure that the committee could ascertain this and make a recommendation for the necessary extension.

It appears to me that the failure of the administration in many of these refugee cases has been due to a lack of personnel. We have been gravely concerned by the situation and are concerned that these serious problems encountered in the implementation of the act are such that it is necessary to extend the act.

I am now in receipt of a letter from Mr. Gerety, the administrator of the Refugee Relief Administration, which I have cosponsored, as follows:

Mr. President, I wish to express my concern at the recent announcement by the Director of the refugee relief program, Mr. Pierce J. Gerety, that he will not be able to issue the 209,000 entry permits authorized under the present law by the cut-off date of December 31 this year. Mr. Gerety estimates that on the scheduled basis the administration will not be able to issue these entry permits because of the failure of the administration to administer the program properly.

As I stated in testifying before your committee last June on amendments to the Refugee Relief Act, the attitude of some of those administering the law seems to have been that the number of admissions authorized under the act is merely a permissive figure—that they can issue visas up to that number but it is not necessary to make an effort to attain the goal of the maximum number of entries under the refugee relief program. I wish to make it clear that the intention of those of us who voted to support this program. When we consider how many refugees have been living for long, weary years in some of these countries, we are concerned that we ought to complete the issuance of visas as quickly as possible.

As you know, one of the amendments contained in S. 1794, introduced by Senators Lehman, Douglas, and myself, was to extend the expiration date of the refugee relief program to December 31, 1960. Under this amendment and various others, the law would be reinterpreted among those categories under section 4 of the act that have been filled but still have relatives to be resettled. This relaxation and extension of the time would permit the refugee relief program to achieve its goal in permitting the maximum number of persons authorized under the act to enter the country.

I, of course, desire most of all that your committee recommend the adoption of those amendments which I have already supported before your committee. But, in view of the facts that the administration will not be able to meet its obligation of issuing all visas authorized under the Refugees Act, I believe that at least the committee will recommend an extension of the termination date of the act beyond December 31, 1966. I cannot know in advance the possible steps of the administration at this time that the Refugee Relief Administration may need to complete the issuance of all 209,000 authorized visas, but I am sure that the committee could ascertain this and make a recommendation for the necessary extension.

It appears to me that the failure of the administration in many of these refugee cases has been due to a lack of personnel. We have been gravely concerned by the situation and are concerned that these serious problems encountered in the implementation of the act are such that it is necessary to extend the act.
to give new life to those people—displaced by war and in flight from oppression—who had not only made material contributions to our way of life, but who had spent years in refugee camps. Others had fled from behind the Iron Curtain in search of freedom and for the sake of their lives. America stood as a symbol of hope to them, for they knew that we had always welcomed refugees.

It was this humanitarian spirit that the refugee relief program was proposed to the Congress. We wished to give a new life to some of these uprooted people. But the bill as finally passed had written into it many provisions which pleased only those who do not welcome new Americans to our shores. Many of us warned at the time that the restrictions might make the refugee relief program nearly unworkable. In considering the historians of this act, we cannot help but wonder whether a certain reluctance to make the work has not compounded the difficulties.

The unfortunate failure of the refugee program and the dismissal of the full-time Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 by the Department of Justice has vitiated the entire purpose of the act. The appointment of Mr. Gerety as Deputy Administrator of the refugee-relief program does not correct this basic defect. I urge most strongly that the subcommittee support amendment of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 along the lines stated in section 10 of S. 794.

The attitude of some of those who have been administering the Refugee Relief Act is that the number of admission authorized under this act is merely a permissive figure—that they can issue visas up to that number but the maximum number of entries under the refugee relief program. That was surely not the intent of those of us who voted to support this program. When we consider how many refugees there are—numbers far beyond the hundred thousand—such a provision means that at present the number of maximum number of entries under the refugee relief program. That was surely not the intent of those of us who voted to support this program. When we consider how many refugees there are—numbers far beyond the hundred thousand—such a provision means that at present the number of entries authorized under the act is merely a permissive figure—that they can issue visas up to that number but the maximum number of entries under the act is merely a permissive figure—that they can issue visas up to that number but that the maximum number of entries is not necessarily the maximum number of entries.

The attitude of some of those who have been administering the Refugee Relief Act is that the number of admission authorized under this act is merely a permissive figure—that they can issue visas up to that number but the maximum number of entries is not necessarily the maximum number of entries. It does not only mean heartbreak and inconvenience for the position and prestige of the United States, but when the restrictions are put into practice it is very likely that the act and its administrators will be branded as a failure. It is not surprising that this discouraging aspect of the act has had a bad effect on public opinion. I feel that it is asking entirely too much of our citizens to expect them to support a program that has been administered in such an unsatisfactory way.

Under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, the maximum number of refugees that can be admitted to this country during any year is 15,000. It is not surprising that this discouraging aspect of the act has had a bad effect on public opinion. I feel that it is asking entirely too much of our citizens to expect them to support a program that has been administered in such an unsatisfactory way.

But, with only a year and a half left before the termination date of the Refugee Relief Act, the goal is far off. At the present rate it is doubtful that it will be reached. December 31, 1960, is fixed as the present Administrator's analogy to an "assembly line"—and I do not care for the comparison in this connection. But the act does not appear that the assembly line is going to pick up sufficient speed, now that the number of admissions has been completed, to reach the full humanitarian goal within the time limit set by the law. For this reason, a way of extending the time for the effectiveness of this act should be sought. No one should be denied entry under the Refugee Relief Act simply because of an arbitrary cutoff date. An attempt is made to utilize all of the authorizations for visas by an amendment proposed in our bill. This amendment would provide that the number not issued by December 31, 1956, shall be redistributed among those categories under section 212 and subsections (a), (d), and (f) of section 213. But it is my understanding that there is a possibility that time will not be extended. I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

I believe that there should be a time limit for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time should be made in such a way that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be able to admit to the United States sufficiently many persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge that the subcommittee consider this provision as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.
them as new citizens. The stipulation that a refugee must be under 21 years of age at 2 years of the refugee's life must be supplied before issuance of a visa has proved to be a particularly onerous one, and will not succeed in keeping many refugees from being able to provide themselves with a 2-year history.

Such a procedure defeats the purpose of the first part of the bill. The refugee's relatives should be removed from the law.

Committee of the United States, both bills would amend the act to relax the present requirement that a person be entitled to enter the United States in order to avoid a distinction not properly rendered the trials of being broken apart from relatives and friends. This is a proposal in the Watkins bill, which simply adds the

Another amendment of the Watkins bill that I wish to support is the change in wording recommended in section 2 of S. 2113. This relatively minor change would make a great deal of difference to refugee families. It now would permit the entry of a refugee relief visa. Under the statute as it now reads, wives, children, and others eligible to enter the United States accompanying someone entering on a refugee relief visa, must all come together, accompanying the senior member of the family. The present amendment, as already added to the Watkins bill, would simply add the words "or following to join them," would allow members of the family to follow later when for some reason an individual could not accompany the head of the family being admitted under this program. I urge that this amendment be included in the Watkins bill. It is most worthy modification.

There is one final proposal in the Watkins bill that I think would be worthy of inclusion. That is the addition made in subsection (c) of section 11, which provides that "* * * eligible to enter the United States shall be under the exclusive responsibility of the consular officer." Presently this eligibility is subject to the review of the immigration officer whose responsibility is to decide the proper appli­cation of the Immigration Act to the applicant. This authority of review by the immigration officer has caused much confusion and delay in dealing with the separate officers charged with this responsibility and has been one of the sources of the confusion and delay in administering the Refugee Relief Act. By so clarifying the act that the respon­sibility for administering the Refugee Relief Act would reside solely in the consular officer, much of this confusion and delay could be eliminated. This will certainly improve the ad­ministration of the program. I strongly sup­port this delimitation of authority and hope that it will be made part of any recom­ mendations for amending the Refugee Relief Act of 1933.

May I come back again to a proposal which I just mentioned in passing, but which I think is worthy of special support—the humani­tarian spirit of the Refugee Relief Act. I refer to the amendments of the chairman, contained in S. 2149, that would extend eligi­bility to refugees accompanying the head of a family with a refugee relief visa. Here again, like the amendments we have discussed, these recommendations would in many cases mean the difference between a family being able to take advantage of the program and come to the United States or having to stay on in a foreign refugee camp or makeshift home in order to avoid parting from a loved mem­ber of the family. In some cases, of course, matters when we are drawing up a bill affecting hundreds of thou­sands, but we must never forget how much just such modifications as these can mean to the individuals whose whole lives turn upon them. I wish to support the amendments of the chairman, as they extend the benefits of this program in a way that should not have been overlooked.

In conclusion, I would just like to say that the consideration of this committee, and by this subcommittee give new hope for the Refugee Relief Act of 1933, and those who should be particularly helped by it to come to the United States and become useful citizens. I shall not refer again to the way in which this program has been imperfectly constructed. I hope that those who do not wish to see it work. I would like to reiterate, however, that the success of this program is improbable so long as it means to the lives of those many thousand we hope to assist by it, that its success is important in the world for the good name of the United States itself.

In part, we are already known to the rest of the world for the quota system upon which the Immigration and Naturalization Act is built. While we have yet to correct the inequ­ities that are written into that law, here, in the Refugee Relief Act, we can present a better face to the world, our true face. Let us show the world the spirit of truly moves our people. Let us extend the same spirit of welcome to the refugees who have been disrupted and whose homes have been lost. I trust that the subcommittee will give due consideration to the amendments be­fore it. I hope you will agree with me that they are worthy of our support.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to stress that the recommendation that I have made of a humanitarian purpose—to hold out hope to those unfortunate people who have been driven from their homes by war or uprooted by fear of political reprisal.
Further, however, it is an essential part of our foreign policy in attempting to meet and counter the redenomination campaign of the Commies. Our failure to our responsibility under the Refugee Relief Act could have unfortunate consequence for us in providing a Communist victory in this redenomination campaign.

The Congress has legislation pending that would make those legislative changes necessary if we are to fulfill the goals of the refugee-relief program. But, as I stated at the outset and have repeated the recommendations of those groups best qualified to criticize administration of the program, the President and the Secretary of State have wide administrative authority to make such administrative changes as need to be made to expedite this program.

I would not want to close without paying tribute to the voluntary agencies that have done so much in an effort to assist refugees in coming to this country under the Refugee Relief Act. They have given of their efforts selflessly and tirelessly in an attempt to help those who seek a haven for their lives and have new home after years of being uprooted. They deserve the thanks not only of those they have helped but the thanks and commendation of us all for the fine, dedicated work they are doing.

We owe it to them as well as to the refugees who look to us for assistance to improve the refugee-relief program. I join with the voluntary agencies in urging President Roosevelt to take action now. The President should instruct the Secretary of State and the administrator of the refugee-relief program to make such adminstrative changes as are so urgently needed.

The refugee-relief program must not fall in its mission of bringing to their new home all of the refugees we intended to welcome when we passed the Refugee Relief Act.

THIRTY-SEVENTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. KNOWLAND of South Carolina. Mr. President, yesterday was the birthday of the American Legion, organized March 11, 1919, and later chartered by Congress. I want to congratulate this patriotic organization on its 37th birthday. As a charter member of my local post, I have always considered it a great honor and a high privilege to be a member of this the largest organization of wartime veterans in the history of mankind.

"For God and country" are we comrades associated. May the eternal principles enumerated in the preamble to our Constitution ever serve as guideposts in our lives so that in truth "right shall become the master of might" and "peace and good will" on earth shall ever be our goal.

To recount here the accomplishments of this great organization is a task beyond the time permitted me.

In support of the widow and orphan of our deceased comrades and the disabled, the Legion has established establishments that will ever be a tribute to a zealous devotion to worthy causes.

In the defense of our national institutions—our Americanism—unadulterated—few can equal its constancy and unswerving guardianship.

It was quite a disappointment to some and a pleasure to me that here in Washington, during a recent National Convention of the American Legion, the bands and drum corps who led the parade concentrated on Onward Christian Soldiers and The Battle Hymn of the Republic. Soberness and maturity characterized its deliberations with a patriotism born in the crucible of service to God and country.

In its child welfare activities, junior baseball activities, its oratorical and other school contests, the American Legion is rendering services in the field of Americanism to the young men and women of our country which will ever redound to its credit. Think of it—over 50 percent of the baseball players in the big leagues today received their initial training under the auspices of the great organization—the American Legion.

The work of our Subcommittee on Internal Security has its counterpart in the Americanism commission of the American Legion.

Some detractors would have us think that the Legion is solely a pressure group. I will have none of that propaganda. If it is pressure, it is pressure for a greater, stronger and better America, so that we may transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy. May the judge of all us give more of such pressure organizations like the American Legion the legislative support it needs.

Someday, when more time is at our disposal, I shall recount for you the many blessings America has received from the American Legion. It is an amendment similar to my amendment, except that it deals with a different commodity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the previous request, I now suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time consumed being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum be extended.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I submit a modification of my amendment, which consolidates 3 other amendments. Noticed this when the Senate began the consideration of the farm bill last Thursday, 83 amendments to the bill were prepared. This morning there are 84 amendments. Unless greater progress than that already evidenced is made we shall not get anywhere.

All three amendments I have deal with one subject, namely, limitations on the vote. Therefore, I submit the modification and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the modification as proposed by the Senator from Delaware.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 5, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "The com-
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chairs hears objection to the consideration of the amendments offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on retaining the floor, the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, does that mean that I will have to offer the amendment as amendments to my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because of the objection, the amendments will have to be considered separately.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Which amendment does the Chair hold should be considered first?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment on the list which the Senator submitted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The first amendment submitted was on page 11, line 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will call attention to the fact that there is one amendment before that, in the order in which the Senate has submitted them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment pending on Friday is the one which will be before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand correctly that the Senate will vote on each one in its order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Am I to understand that, under the pending situation, after the Senate has voted on the amendment which proposes to add section 225, the next amendment would be the one offered as a modification, as it comes in consequence?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot guarantee that the Senator from Delaware will be recognized to offer his next amendment in order. The Chair cannot guarantee that the Senator has an advantage to present whichever amendment he chooses as his first one.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Delaware has several amendments he intends to offer. Is it the amendment designated "2-22-56-B?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the amendment which was called up last Friday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we not considering the amendment designated "5-56-B?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; unless the Chair hears objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the amendment which was called up on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, it seems unusual that I cannot consolidate the amendments. That practice has been followed before in the Senate.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, not before the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the amendment designated “A–5–6–B” is not now before the Senate? The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not before the Senate; it was modified by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the Senate is not considering the amendment designated “A–5–6–B”.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, may we have order? Senators cannot hear the rulings of the Chair or the remarks of the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my reason for offering this amendment as a substitute for the other amendment at this time is that the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, who is now over there, raised a question that the first amendment offered may contain language which, as at present written, may cause undue hardship to those who depend solely on a small piece of land, leased from the Government, for his operations.

That was not the purpose of the original amendment and I want that point clarified before proceeding. If new language is needed we can modify the amendment accordingly.

I have asked the Solicitor to try to prepare suitable language by which the amendment could be modified to take care of hardship cases, and that is now being done. It was hoped the revision would be ready before the Senate resumed consideration of the bill. But it has not come in yet, so I thought it was useless to take of the time of the Senate to debate that particular phase until the proper language had been prepared.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from Delaware now proposes to withdraw the amendment which was offered by him last week?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Only temporarily. That is why I have substituted the amendment now being considered.

I may say to the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) that it is true he has offered an amendment, and I think it is almost identical with mine. But the Senator from Utah also has a comparable amendment, as has the Senator from Indiana. As I understand, there are 12 or 14 amendments which have been submitted, all dealing with the same general subject.

The proposal here is a consolidation of all these limitation features into one amendment for the purpose of conserving time.

A point out before we started out last Friday with 83 amendments and after 2 days work we now have 84.

Unless we consolidate some of these proposals, we will never get the bill passed.

I think we are all trying to attain the same objective, namely, to keep the benefits for the smaller farmer. I am not trying to take anything away from the Senator from Minnesota, who, as I have said, has likewise drawn a comparable amendment. I think the Senate would have voted on the amendment last Friday evening, had it not gotten into a parliamentary dispute lasting for nearly 2 hours on another question. That forced the amendment to be carried over until today.

This morning I was requested to hold up the original amendment until the version I offered could be prepared. The change have not as yet been made available. I thought the Senate could vote at one time on all the amendments. They are comparable amendments. The first phase would limit payments under the acreage reserve to $25,000. The second phase would limit payments under the conservation reserve to $5,000.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not a matter of pride of authorship. It is a question of orderly procedure. The items involved are separate items. For instance, there is an amendment relating to acreage reserve, one relating to the conservation reserve, and one relating to production on Government-owned land. They should be considered separately.

It is my intention to offer an amendment on limitation of price supports. That amendment has been printed. I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture to accommodate a colleague. When the Senator offers the amendment on limitation of price supports, I shall offer an amendment to that, because I should like to be at his point.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection to that, and to accommodate the Senator will offer that portion first. I might support the language which the Senator from Minnesota will offer. As previously stated, the purpose of offering the amendment is to restrict to $25,000 the amount of price supports which any individual or corporation may obtain under the program.

Last year more than 1 million farmers participated in the support program, and more than $25,000 were obtained by 2,000 farmers. There will be less than 2,000 farmers affected by this amendment if it should be adopted.

I would be the first to protest on the floor of the Senate any legislation which would be against the right of any individual or corporation to do business in this country, whether he be a farmer or in business, to grow and make progress; but we certainly should not use a subsidy system supported by the United States Government to help him to make progress.

The benefits of this farm program were intended by the administration and the Congress to go primarily to the family-sized farms, the bona fide farmers who are not able to assist themselves, and not to go to large corporations. To cite an example, I know of one unit which has over 340,000 acres of wheat under the price support program. It was not intended to use the taxpayers' money to assist such large farm operations.

Mr. Aiken. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. Aiken. Will the Senator tell us how he arrived at the selection of the $25,000? In some types of farming the family is all or more than a family can produce. In other types of farming a single family can produce forty, fifty, or sixty thousand dollars worth of commodities on the farm. In certain types of farming if $50,000 worth of commodities were not produced, the farmers would not be able to engage in that type of farming.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Delaware thinks that a limitation of $25,000 would be enough to cover family farms, I point out that family farms are producing more each year. They have to get more than that amount to maintain their farms. As a consequence, the farmers must produce more to maintain an adequate return on their investment.

I think the Senator from Delaware has a good idea. A few years ago I think $25,000 would have been a good limitation. Former Secretary Brannan, I think, proposed that the limitation be $2,500. But times have changed somewhat.

Frankly, I should think that if the figure were doubled, it would be more nearly applicable to farmers generally. It would stand at that point the effect of cutting out some of the million-dollar loans. While we do not have too many of those, they are an irritation to the public generally.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I might say to the Senator from Vermont that I am not wedded to the figure $25,000. The reason that figure was used was that in obtaining figures from the Department of Agriculture, the $25,000 figure was used in considering the effect it would have. I have not studied what the effect would be if the figure were increased to $50,000 or $75,000. I would not affect farmers in my area, but if it could be shown that in other areas $25,000 would cause undue hardship, and $50,000 would be more realistic, I would not have any objection to modifying that amendment. The principle involved is that the amount of the payments should stop at a point where corporate-type farming cannot be carried on at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. Aiken. If the figure of $25,000 were applicable to the net income of the family, it would be adequate. How-
ever, I can conceive of a single farm family producing $25,000 worth of commodities, and at the same time not netting more than $5,000.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The amendment could not be applicable to great family wheat operations, where one family may have several thousands acres in dry farming in our wheat region. A limitation of $50,000 would obviously rule out such operations from consideration, because the cost of the combines and other machinery is so high that the operations of farmers in that category necessarily must involve commodities worth at least $25,000 a year.

I suggest that the figure in the amendment be enlarged to at least $50,000, and I think it is safe to say that it would apply to the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of those families producing $50,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I certainly would not object to that, because I think that it would not function in cases of family farming in Oregon or elsewhere. As I said before, since offering the amendment and having had it printed, I have felt that perhaps the amount was not sufficient. I said at that time that if Senators in areas which were affected felt that the amount was not high enough, I would not oppose such a change in the amendment. I think we all want the program to protect bona fide family-type farms. I certainly am not trying to restrict the amount in such a way as to hamper them.

I understand the Senator from Utah has suggested that the amount be $50,000. I shall be very frank and say that since the amendment was printed further study has shown that the figure $25,000 might be a little low and unrealistic and I will not oppose any effort to increase it. I wish to have such a change in the amendment.

My only interest is to preserve the principle of keeping our farm program benefits for the farmers.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator realize that on February 22, 1956, I offered an amendment to make the restriction $50,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I so understand.

Mr. WATKINS. I have been waiting for a time to call up the amendment. I have had some study made of what that restriction would do to the family-size farm. As has been pointed out, $25,000 would be too restrictive for family-sized operations in the West. I think $50,000 would be more realistic. I wonder if the Senator from Delaware would accept, as an amendment to his amendment, the figure of $50,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Utah that if Senators from the areas affected believe that $50,000 would be more realistic, I would have no objection. But I think what we are trying to do is stop the payment of several hundred thousand dollars to a few absentee farmers or to a few groups that are operating large, corporate-type farms.

If the larger figure be necessary in order to provide protection for the areas in the West where there are large farming operations I certainly shall not object to revising the figure as the Senator has suggested.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator from Delaware be willing to have his amendment amended so as to provide for $50,000, instead of $25,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; or perhaps we could modify my amendment in that way.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I understand the Senator from Delaware for the principle of his amendment, which I believe needs careful attention and study. In connection with the amendment, I wish to raise a practical point. If a man feeds 100 head of steers at 1,000 pounds each, at $20 a hundred that would be $20,000. That is not a large operation, but there are many of that sort; and in connection with such operations, this proposal should have some study and some thought.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, that particular type of operation would not be affected by the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. But that involves farm income. How would the amendment be limited?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment applies only to loans to farmers, for support of the agricultural crops produced on the farm.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUMERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have several questions to ask. Under the bill, farmers are to be paid in connection with the soil bank and in connection with the acreage controls and in connection with the conservation control, and then the farmer is going to be able to borrow money on his crops, under the price-support program. My first question is this: Does the limitation of the amendment apply to all 3, or to only 1, or to several?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The limitation before us applies only to loans made on supported crops. It was my intention, when I offered the amendment, to deal only with this question now.

Mr. CAPEHART. The amendment applies only to the loans made on the products themselves, does it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right. Immediately after disposing of this amendment, I shall offer an amendment which will be applicable to the other two phases of the operations, namely, the acreage reserve and conservation reserve.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then let me ask this question: What are we talking about now is, is it not, a limitation on the amount of the loan from the bank—borrow—as the support price—on the agricultural commodities he raises?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.
Mr. CAPEHART. I am in accord with the purpose of the Senator's amendment, but the trouble between us is just what we are dealing with. Let us say that the amendment is limited to $50,000, and that a farmer has 1,000 acres of corn, and grows 56 bushels to the acre, and the support price at the moment is $1.41—as I think it will be this year. That would amount to approximately $75,000 worth of corn. The amendment would permit him to obtain loans up to $50,000. My point is that, under the law, he would have to reduce his acreage or else he could not obtain the $50,000, or whatever may be the total amount. Under those circumstances, can the farmer plant all 800 of his acres, or must he limit his planting to 500 acres?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He must limit his planting to his allotted acres if he gets price support on any crop.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then we would be very unfair to the wheat farmer and to the corn farmer. Then when we extend the acreage controls, we went the accomplishment of the very thing we are trying to do, namely, to get the farmers to take some of their acreage out of production. I say that because the Senator from Delaware has just explained—all I do not think it should operate that way; I think we should change the amendment—any farmer who is in a position to grow anything more than $50,000 would not participate in the acreage reduction. If that happens there would be an increased production of corn and wheat, because the large farmers with the greatest amounts, will not participate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If they are going to produce to that extent, let them do so without having the benefit of the Government's support price.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I agree. I have no objection to the proposed $50,000 limitation, but my question is whether he would have to plant a certain number of acres to verify the acreage controls, even in order to get the $50,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then it simply will not work.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps it will not; but the Department thinks it will, and the President has recommended it. If a farmer has an acreage allotment for 1,000 acres of corn, either he will comply with the law to the extent of the 1,000 acres, or he will not comply.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let us say that a farmer is allotted 1,000 acres as his percentage of the total of 51 million acres of corn; and let us assume that normally he produces 60 bushels to the acre. That would amount to 60,000 bushels, from which he would be permitted $3,400 support price, that would amount to $44,000, would it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under the amendment, he would be permitted to obtain loans up to $50,000, would he?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Or whatever we agree upon here.

Mr. CAPEHART. What will happen to the remainder?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The remainder would be on the free market, just as if the farmer were not in compliance at all. I do not see how anything else can be done.

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that then we would penalize him by making him reduce all his acreage in the same proportion as everyone else did if he wished to obtain the support price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If he wishes to obtain the support price, he will have to be in compliance.

It would always be possible that he might completely disregard all compliance, plant all his acreage outside the program, and sell any amount of his crop he wished on the free market. I do not see how it could be otherwise. But the Government would not be underwriting the operation.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator proposes to compel him to reduce his acreage by about 25 percent on 1,000 acres in order to get the support price on 750,000 bushels, which would represent about 400 acres.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We do not propose to compel him, but we propose to tell him that if he wishes to get the benefit of the support price to the extent we agree upon, he will have to comply.

Mr. CAPEHART. In my opinion, he will not do it. He will continue to grow all the corn he can grow, even though he takes a lesser amount for it, and we shall defeat the very purpose we are trying to accomplish, and that is to control production.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think so; but experience will tell.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us how it will work?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is difficult for me to see that this proposal would compel many farmers to reduce their acreage. I have before me a table showing the number of loans, the total loan value, and the average loan value, with respect to seven major 1953 grain crops. The table is dated February 24, 1956. It was supplied by the United States Department of Agriculture.

The table shows that in 1953, of practically 300,000 corn loans, there were only 1,191 over $25,000. Of approximately 44,000 oat loans, there were only 1,468 that were over $25,000. Of approximately 44,000 oats loans, there were only 10 that went over $25,000. Of approximately 35,000 barley loans, only 66 went over $25,000. Of approximately 34,000 sorghum loans, only 26 were over $25,000. Of approximately 60,000 soybean loans, only 5 were over $25,000. Of approximately 58,000 flaxseed loans, only 15 were over $25,000. Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator is correct. The situation he has outlined is the reason why we have surpluses today. That is the reason we have low farm prices, as everyone did not comply. They grew as much as they wanted to grow, and we have surpluses which push prices down. Had everyone complied with acreage control on wheat, corn, and other crops, we would have no surplus today. The Secretary of Agriculture says that his acreage of farm products will go up to where they belong in the market place. Let us make sure that we are not doing something which will increase production rather than decrease it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out to the Senator from Indiana that the President made this suggestion as a part of his recommendations.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The larger growers can still do what the Senator suggests. They can plant without regard to the support program. All we are doing is saying that if they want the benefit of support prices, they must be in compliance.

Mr. CAPEHART. If they plant as much as they desire to plant, can they still borrow up to $50,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not unless they are in compliance on acreage allotments.

Mr. CAPEHART. If they cannot, and a farmer wishes to borrow $25,000, can he do it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out to the Senator the impossibility of doing as he proposes, that is, allowing them to plant anything they want, and then not to make a loan,

Mr. CAPEHART. I point out to the Senator the impossibility of doing as he proposes, that is, allowing them to plant anything they want, and then not to make a loan.

Mr. WILLIAMS. More than one million farmers participated in the program last year. Less than 2,000 would be affected by this amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. More than one million compelled?

Mr. WILLIAMS. More than one million farmers had loans.

Mr. CAPEHART. On corn, soybeans, and wheat?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. One farmer might have had several loans.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That I am pointing out is that if we were to say that there shall be no rule for compliance with respect to the acreage planted in order to make a farmer eligible to borrow $50,000, we would be turning loose 900,000 farmers who could grow all they wished, up to $50,000 worth. That would be impossible.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am trying to do is to make certain that we do not get more production rather than less, thereby further reducing the prices in the market place.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Department agreed that if the plan would work, perhaps this would be the best method. As to the exact figure, whether it should be $25,000, $50,000, or some other figure, the Secretary would have the discretion of Congress. I think we are all in agreement as to what we are trying to achieve, namely, to preserve the benefits of this program for the family-sized farm.

I think this is the method to achieve that goal.
Mr. CAPEHART. What we are trying to do is to reduce the surpluses, so that farmers might have the marketplace place to be 100 percent of parity or more. We should not become confused as between the little farmer and the big farmer, and therefore I am single object of the program. Whether the big farmer grows X number of bushels of corn, or whether the little farmer grows it, it is still X number of bushels, which creates a surplus. That is why I am going in the marketplace, and must sell his own way, as he can, with price or the space, and therefore become confused over any factor except bushels. That is what will govern the price. If the big farmers withheld corn from the market, there would be a high price in the marketplace, and the little farmer would be helped. It is the little farmer who does not have storage space, and must sell his corn.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is with mine of opinion, I am merely presenting my own opinion.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am in favor of the principle; but we must not lose sight of the practical.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] wishes to say anything on this amendment at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment which I am presenting, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I submitted an amendment to strike from the amendment that the farmer, the Farm Credit Administration, figure of $25,000, and substitute $50,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that I will go along with his amendment. However, from the point of view that he presented, his amendment would not be in order until all time on my amendment had been exhausted or yielded back. So if the Senator will temporarily withhold his amendment until the appropriate time, I assure him that it will be acted upon before a vote is taken on my amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the light of the figures in the table which I read, I was about to suggest that if a change is made from $25,000 to $50,000, that we are applicable to multiple loans. A producer may be getting loans from $25,000 to $50,000 amount which might be borrowed by a farmer, his friends from Delaware has overlooked the whole purpose of the price support program. It is not to be considered a subsidy. The purpose of the price support program is to give a security to any producer of a supported commodity to withhold his commodity from the market when it would otherwise depress the market. This has worked well with the basic commodities and with these non-basics. Thus the price support program, from its inception, has benefited farmers greatly by making it possible for a farmer to hold his production during times of harvest, or otherwise when prices are seasonally low. This is done by lending a farmer money, with his crop as collateral. If the market rises, the farmer can pay back his loan from his crop and sell it on the higher market. In no manner, Mr. President, is the price support program of loans and purchases a subsidy program. Now, as to those benefiting most from this program, I think the record will show that as to the larger producers—particularly those growing cotton, rice, and also wheat—the Commodity Credit Corporation is able to take over only a relatively small amount of those commodities placed under loan. Most of them, I understand, repay their loans as they are able to market their commodities at the support price. I repeat, this amendment would tend to draw all production of small producers into Government stocks, leaving the market to the larger producers. If sufficient commodities were put under loan, the withdrawal of such stocks from the market would tend to support the market price for all producers, both large and small, and this amendment would be ineffective. On the other hand, if this amendment so curtailed price support operations that they were not effective to support the market price to producers, then the price support program would be rendered ineffective.

I wish to emphasize again that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry gave considerable thought to the possibility of limiting price support payments. Our committee received various methods and proposals for doing so. One method was to begin with a 90-percent support price to a producer up to the amount only of a specific amount of basic commodities. For example, it, in effect, was proposed to support only the first 1,000 bushels of corn, or perhaps 25 bales of cotton, or 2,000 bushels of wheat, produced by a farmer. As the farmer produced more, it would cost the Government less than a quarter of the amount as the production per farm increased.

After studying that proposal, the committee decided that it would be impracticable to have the Government end up by taking into its own hands all of the production from the smaller farms. We felt that, in practice, as the support price lowered, market prices would tend to be maintained at or around the lower support levels. This, of course, would certainly do violence to the market, and would result in the small farmers producing almost entirely for Government stock, and would place their crops, as to their crops, would be higher than the market price.

This effect, Mr. President, would be demoralizing and it would result in the Government holding more high-priced wheat or high-priced cotton that it should.

Members of the Senate must remember that the price-support program is not a subsidy. The Government lends money to a producer and takes his crop as security in order to help the farmer protect his market. That is how and why it operates, and not for any other purpose.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Government does even lend the money. The Government guarantees the money at the farmer's local bank. It never puts up any money itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. It works that way, but the program's financing is actually handled through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. CAPEHART. The farmers borrow money from their local bank, and the Commodity Credit Corporation guarantees the repayment of the loans.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right. We are concerned here with respect to the program of crop loans.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; and the loan is paid back to the bank, or the Government receives the money, whatever it is. That is how the Government has acquired its present surpluses.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to take the Senate's time by dwelling on the operation of the program. It has been discussed many times on the floor of the Senate.

I do, however, want the record to be perfectly clear on the point of how much the price-support program in the basics has cost the Government. As of November 1955, the Government has not lost a dime on its cotton loans. As to price support for all basics, from 1933 to November of last year the entire loss to the Government during that entire 23-year period was less than a half billion dollars—less than $22 million per year. It would be folly to defeat the operation of this program by limiting the amount that a farmer can borrow on the commodity he produces by, in effect, treating this program as a subsidy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the Senate from Louisiana has put the
matter in a logical light so far as the purpose of the provision is concerned. However, he does overlook the other side of the question which is being overlooked, and that is this: The purpose or the intent of the amendment is to encourage the family-sized farm, rather than the large corporate operation. That is another element of which I am sure the Senator is aware.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would the amendment do that?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let us take wheat, for example. It would tend to encourage operations within the size of the limit, rather than to encourage someone either to buy or to rent a much bigger amount of land, and then request a large loan. In that respect, many of the people of my State feel that some limitation would tend to encourage the family-sized farm, rather than the corporate operation.

Mr. ELLENDER. The mere fact that a small farmer knows he can borrow up to $26,000, or to $100,000, should not discourage him from continuing his farming operations. In fact, it should encourage him by offering an incentive to increase his efficiency and scope of operation, and the loans provided should be limited only in the sense that the small operator should not be doomed to remain a small operator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The amendment would not discourage the small farmer, but it might tend to discourage the large corporate operation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot see that at all, if I may say so to the Senator.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator from Louisiana admit that the provision would encourage a farmer to rent thousands and thousands of acres, perhaps Indian land, and raise enormous quantities of wheat, if he could secure a loan of $100,000 or $200,000 or $300,000?

Mr. ELLENDER. The total lands he can raise wheat on have not been limited under the phase of allotted acres. If he had no acreage-allocation program, the argument of the Senator from North Dakota might apply. But I do not forget that, whether a farm is large or small, whether it is a corporate farm or individually owned, the acreage that can be planted to the basic commodities is limited to the farm's acreage allotment.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator, I am sure, knows that some farms are as large as 60,000 acres.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The primary reason that the smaller farmers are going out of the picture is due to the inability to finance the purchase and operation of the modern-day farm machinery required to maintain an efficient output. The small farmer does not have the capital to protect the investment in expensive labor-saving machines. That factor more than anything else has caused many of the smaller farmers to fall by the wayside.

I can speak from personal experience. I used to farm before I came to the Senate. After I sold my farm, I came to the Senate. Among other crops I planted sugarcane. My sugarcane operation was not large enough to justify my purchasing a mechanical caneforner, and mechanical cane cutter, which, with two men, would enable me to make the factory at about 95 cents a ton. Compared to my cost of $2.20 a ton, I realized that I could not remain in business unless I were prepared to substantially increase my farming operations. I chose to get out of farming.

To my way of thinking, that is one of the main reasons why many of the smaller farmers operating with a couple of mules or a few horses, as we have seen on the prairies in the Senator’s State, have not a farm that cannot afford to mechanize; I do not have enough funds for that purpose, and my operations are not large enough.” Such farmers have to lease their farms or sell them, and I believe in the supports that have anything to do with it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think the Senator should make the record unequivocally clear at this point, so that no one could misunderstand it. I think the Senator's statement is not a complete understanding at the present time. No farmer can borrow at the support prices unless he has reduced his production. He must make a sacrifice in order to borrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. This year the corn acreage is going to be cut. Every farmer must grow 21 percent less acreage to qualify for the support price. He does not receive a sacrifice. He has to cultivate a smaller number of acres. That applies on corn, oats, soybeans, and so forth. The farmer has to reduce the acreage he has been cultivating but not his production. Every farmer who has complied with the acreage control there would be no surpluses today. There would be no low prices in the market place. Prices would be 100 percent or more of parity. The farmer who is entitled to borrow—and that is what he does; and he has to pay the loan back—is the one who reduces his acreage and grows less production.

Mr. ELLENDER. My friend has anticipated my next point.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sorry.

Mr. ELLENDER. From the Senator brought it out. But that is exactly the point I was in process of explaining when my good friend from North Dakota asked a question.

"Take the corn grower, for instance. What happens? The Secretary of Agriculture, under rules and regulations he proposes, states to the farmers who grow corn in the commercial area that if the acreage is limited to 55 million acres, plus the Government will see to it that they may borrow at a certain percent of parity. It does not apply to all the corn that can be grown; it applies only to the corn produced by a farmer who stays with one kind of crop. That is growing in a nutshell. If that provision is stricken from the Recom I think we shall do violence to the whole farm program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from South Dakota is very eloquent and very persuasive, but, unfortunately, he does not get the idea of either the Senator from North Dakota or the Senator from South Dakota.

Here is a farmer who has 50,000 acres. Certainly, under this amendment, he would not take advantage of it if the amount of the loan should be limited to $26,000.

I do not understand the argument of the Senator from South Dakota, the purpose is to serve the small farmer, instead of the one farming 50,000 acres, of which we have illustrations in the West. If I am incorrect, I hope the Senator from South Dakota will correct me. I think that is the purpose of his question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will not work the way you do, Mr. President, as suggested to my good friend from South Dakota. The wheat grower for example, cannot buy land tomorrow and plant it to wheat the next day and obtain price support on his wheat crop. The Secretary of Agriculture submits to the wheat growers, as he has done this year, a national acreage allotment permitting the planting of 55 million acres of wheat, there are certain conditions that the larger farmers must meet in order to make themselves eligible to obtain price-support loans on their wheat crop. They must comply with acreage allotments, for one thing. Also, because he overplants his land to wheat, beyond the acreage he is authorized, he is subject to marketing penalties.

The same thing applies to peanuts, cotton and the other basic commodities except for corn, which has no marketing penalty in its program.

The committee has from time to time given study to the subject of price-support limitations, but they have come to naught. They are incompatible with the very nature of the price-support program. I can well understand that if this were a direct subsidy, it would be much easier to place and justify a limitation on it.

Mr. CAPEHART. And we should.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator should, by all means. It has been done in the past for example, with respect to payments for soil-conservation practices under the ACP program from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator will recognize that it took 2 years to get that limitation under soil conservation.

Mr. ELLENDER. But we got it.

Mr. LANGER. And we are trying to get this limitation.
Mr. ELLENBERG. I know but as I said to my good friend, there is a basic difference between the programs involved. The price-support operation is not a subsidy, it is not in the same category as the ACP program.

Mr. ELLENBERG. President, it is useless to make further use of programs involved. The price-support operation has not done much good, so far as my friend from North Dakota is concerned, but I must bring up another point. Quite conceivably a corporation or a farmer who could incorporate would break his farming operations into separate farms to the point where the entire production would qualify for price support under the limitation now proposed.

The committee realized the limitation would be very difficult to carry out.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLLIAMS] will yield me 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENBERG. Mr. President, I had agreed to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I understand he desires to speak, but that can be done a little later.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the point which the able chairman of the committee has made with reference to the penalty brings up exactly the point I wish to make clear. The penalty for the large operators does not fall upon the big operators with its most penalizing effect, but upon the small operators.

There is a county in my State known as Perkins County. When there were no restrictions during the war, wheat production bloomed out in that county as it did through a great part of the northern Great Plains area. It went to a national total of between 70 million and 80 million acres. When we returned to acreage allotments again a few years ago, a large percentage of acreage allotments went to big farms. The little farmers who had not been able to expand as much as the big farmer, and the little farmer was the one who was penalized. The ability of the small farmers of Louisiana has spoken about the necessity of doing something for the small operator so he can pay for his machinery and equipment.

That is exactly the problem about which I am concerned, because the small farmers were not able to expand their operations. They did not have the necessary capital. Many of them were GI's who came back after the war to try to take up farming again. They did not have the money, as some of the big operators had. They had to rent land; they had to rent land in Nebraska; they had to rent it in South Dakota and North Dakota.

It was the big operators who were the ones who plowed up land which ought not to have been plowed up again, except for a war emergency. But when we established crop limits again, we did not go back to the historical base of what was being plowed acreage when wheat had been planted in the war years. So when we applied a 15-percent reduction, we applied it to the 15-percent expanded operations of large operators and also to the stabilized operations of the small operators also.

Some of the small farmers in Perkins County have had a reduction of 30 percent in their wheat acreage on a farm which was a small farm to begin with. Today they are at a point where they cannot, even if they grow a crop on every acre which is allotted to them, cut enough of the acreage they have in their machinery and equipment. They are the ones who are having difficulties as the result of the expansion of the big operator.

That is why I have some sympathy with the amendment. I should like to see the small farmers protected in some way. I should hate to see them pay for the expansion of the large operators, who come in and operate corporation type of farms. That is what I mean when I speak of the value of this operation.

If we should cut off 1,400 of the large operators from a total of 600,000, those operators could still plant within their allotments. I want to save the little farmer from having to take a penalty as the result of the expansion on the part of the large farmers.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Some of the small farmers are the ones who have been practicing good soil conservation by planting legume crops. I know a farmer who has 160 acres of land. He used to grow 80 or 90 acres of wheat. His wheat allotment now is 31 acres. He has told me this will be the last year he will be able to farm.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With 30 acres, he does not have enough yield to take care of his investment in his combine and other equipment which are necessary to plant and harvest wheat. So he is being penalized, and the big operator comes along with a full fleet of combines. He can perhaps rent his equipment to other farmers and make a margin in the Wheat Belt, according to the seasons.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. ELLENBERG. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The difficulty is that we are considering an amendment but are talking about an entirely different subject. I am in hearty accord with the difficulty in which the small farmers find themselves. But that is not covered by the amendment under discussion. The amendment we are now considering would not help the little farmer at all. It would not do anything to aid him. In my opinion, it would hurt him, because it would enable the big farmer to grow an unlimited amount of crops, thereby building up his surpluses and further depressing prices.

We are trying to do in the bill—if we are not, then certainly we ought not to be looking for an answer, to try to reduce production, and thereby to raise prices in the market place.

If it is proposed to take away from the big farmer and give to the little farmer, that is something else again. But the amendment does not do that at all. The amendment that is desired will hurt the little farmer, rather than help him.

As I said in the Senate the other day, what we ought to do is pass a law having a complete, 100-percent reallocation of acres in the United States, in order to take care of the very situation about which the able Senator from South Dakota has spoken. There has been no reallocation of acreage. There has been a lot of shifting. Some farmers have increased their acres; others have decreased them. There ought to be a fairer, more equitable allocation of acres. But that is not the purpose of the amendment at all. It has no relationship to the amendment.

What we are talking about is limiting the larger farmer in the amount of supports he may receive, thereby forcing him to harvest all his acres, and denying him the right to participate in the program at all, and in the meantime the grower will grow more corn, instead of less, and more wheat instead of less, thereby further depressing the little farmer's economy, because under the amendment, the little farmer will continue to get the same price, and at the same time will have the same number of acres which he has been allocated. Those acres may not be enough, and the allocation may not be equitable to the little farmer. But that is not what the amendment proposes at all. The amendment does not even touch the subject that relates to an entirely different subject.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the able Senator from Indiana has put his finger upon what ought to be done, namely, to go back to the historical base which existed prior to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. We ought to return to a true base, rather than to use a base which developed as a result of the spurred production incident to the war.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question about that. I am in sympathy with the Senator's views, but I do not feel the amendment we are now considering relates to that subject.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the amendment yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I am preparing an amendment to apply the flexible concept, about which we hear so much, to the problem of price supports for the small farmer. There should be price supports on a stipulated number of bushels at a relatively high support price, and then we should graduate the support price downward as production increases. We should move in the direction in which the Senator from Indiana has spoken.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, if it is the desire to help the small farmer.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. It is desired to help the small farmer.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not see how the amendment can possibly help the small farmer. It may penalize the big farmers; but I am afraid that so, the small farmer will be hurt, because as production is increased, the market price will be depressed.
Mr. MUNDT. If it is desired to penalize the big farmer, what should be done to justify the cost and the additional acreage unprofitable.

Mr. CAPEHART. If it is desired to limit the acreage of the big operator, we could provide that he shall be allotted 70 percent as many acres; if it is desired to aid the small farmer, we can say that he shall be allotted 90 percent. If it is desired to adopt an amendment which would discriminate between the small farmer and the big farmer on the number of acres, then the small farmer can be helped. That is what we ought to do, if we want to help the small farmer, but not do it on the basis of yield.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The big producer, if he gets soil-bank income for retiring his acreage, will have to comply with the law, and he cannot increase his acreage. We are not limiting him in the amount of corn he can receive. But if he intends to get any soil-bank aid, he must comply with the law. He cannot go on expanding and increasing, as the Senator from Indiana has indicated.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am fearful that he will not do it. I think he will grow all his acres, if he is not permitted to participate. If it is desired to offer an amendment whereby he is allowed to plant a smaller percentage of his total acreage, and give to the little fellow a larger percentage of acres, that might help the little fellow.

For example, this year the acreage of all farmers is being cut about 20 percent. If we want to cut the farmer who plants 100 acres, 25 percent, and the farmer who has less than 100 acres, 15 percent, that will help the little farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield 18 minutes to the Senator from Utah. I believe I have 23 minutes left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield 18 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the chief beneficiaries of the farm price support program have been, and are, the upper one-third of our farmers who produce 85 percent of the annual marketable crop value and who likewise receive 80 percent of farm income.

The family and per capita income picture for these farmers and their families compares very well with those of non-farm workers. The 1950 Census of Agriculture, published, for the first time, complete information on farm income receipts by an economic class of farm. The commercial farms are classified as follows:

Class I: Those farms which produce over $25,000 worth of crops.

Class II: Those farms which produce more than $10,000 but less than $25,000 worth.

Class III: Those farms which produce more than $5,000 but less than $10,000 worth.

Class IV: Those farms which produce more than $2,500, but less than $5,000 worth.

Class V: Those farms which produce more than $1,200 worth, but less than $2,500 worth.

Class VI: Those farms which produce over $250 worth, but less than $1,200 worth.

Analysis of these data reveals that—

First. Nine percent, or 484,000 of the farms produced 51 percent of the total value of all farm products sold.

Second. The average family income provided by these farms was $5,365, nearly 2½ times the average of all farm families.

Third. The average per capita income of people living on these farms was $1,984; also about 2½ times the average of all people living on farms.

The owners or operators of these 484,000 farms are, and have been, receiving the largest subsidies under the price-support programs. One private research organization recently reported that 1.9 percent of our farmers received 25 percent of the price support subsidy in 1953.

The largest loans made under the price-support program are those made to corporations, not family, type farms. For example, in 1953 the largest loans were made to—

First. The Harrigan farms of Prosser, Wash., which placed 152,840 bushels under loan in the amount of $354,339.

Second. The United States Wheat Corp., of Hardin, Mont., which placed 184,516 bushels under loan in the amount of $349,046.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the lack of a limit upon the amount of price-support assistance a farmer can receive, in my opinion, unnecessary financial subsidy to a great many of the 103,321 farms in the first economic class of farms, which, as defined by the Census Bureau, produces products valued at more than $25,000.

While it is clear that during certain periods even these farms may need some price-support assistance, it is equally clear that many of them simply do not need unlimited price-support assistance. Many of these farms will year in and year out return to their owners net incomes much higher than 90 percent of what our people ever hope to receive. This they would do even if they never received a dime in price-support subsidy.

This can be done by those who operate the more profitable farms by applying to their lands just the right amount of labor and machinery which will produce the largest possible volume at the lowest possible cost per unit of output.
This, of course, results in the highest gross income possible of achievement while that farmer makes one crop but farmers of multiple-unit or many corporate units, by reason of the price supports they received peak prices, which were above 90 or 100 percent. The farmer has to have such an opportunity. But if we say to the man who has large crops and large resources and is able to have more price supports, he will proceed to move his products just under the prices at which another farmer may move his. Therefore, the farmer who become the highest price at all times. I think that would be bad for all farmers, large and small.

In my opinion, the amendment would further the general wisdom of the farmers. The amendment provides that a farmer cannot get more than $25,000. If the farmers live in a community property State, he will decide at once to have his wife own half of the farm, he will transfer half ownership to her in one way or another, so that the two of them will be able to divide the income. Furthermore, they might like to take his inheritance earlier than he ordinarily would get it, so he will proceed to divide the farm with his son.

Corporation farms will find it easy to have the amendment. We have seen that happen in the subdivision business, where companies have 20 corporations handling their matters, because they have found circumstances under which that might be favorable if they keep the income at $25,000. The same thing can be done with farms.

Not too long ago I visited a farm in the state represented by the able minority leader. That farm had been a long time in the process of being brought into productive cultivation. It was a very fine farm, containing more than 40,000 acres of irrigated land. When it was sold, it brought $75,000. It was a cash transaction. Does anybody believe that the corporation which bought it for $75,000, even though money it wants without coming to the Commodity Credit Corporation?

But if we say, "You cannot have any price support; all you can do is stay happy as you can in trying to earn or have any price support," the company could very easily apply the extra amount of fertilizer which results in the production of very large crops, and could drop those crops into the market at a price just below what the support price would be, and that price would tend to fix the price for the remainder.

After all, when we are considering this amendment, we must realize that some farmers have very large operations and are able to obtain large amounts of credit. One farmer just a few months ago in the Delta & Pine Land Co., we realize that that company will not be blocked from obtaining capital, by a $25,000 limit. It will not be blocked by it at all. The only result of such a limit would be that that company would put all its product into the market at just below the loan price.

It is true that if the little farmers were squeezed out, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case] has pointed out, that happened before there were allotments. I think there is something to the argument the Senator from South Dakota has made; but that condition occurred when there were no allotments; and during that period, the big farmers "got the cream of it".

If we wish to deal with that problem, we must proceed in an entirely different way, and not in the way proposed by this amendment. I agree with the Senator from Delaware, insofar as the purpose of the amendment is concerned. He is correct in trying to make sure that these programs will not be improperly used.

However, we are not dealing with a subsidy paid to a farmer. The purpose of this fund is to provide orderly marketing. The farmer gets a loan. I think it is the general feeling that the farmer gets a subsidy. When the farmer puts his product on the market, we should have an agricultural program which will make the commodity sell at a sufficiently high price.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think it would be a mistake for the Senate to adopt this amendment. I find myself in complete sympathy with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case], in connection with the problem he has outlined. But I say this amendment will not cure that situation.

Mr. President, the amendment was carried by a coalition of 50 Senators on Agriculture and Forestry, and was voted down by the committee. I hope the Senate as a whole will reject the amendment.

Mr. ELLENBERG, Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. President, there are personal reasons why I dislike to oppose the amendment. I vote with the Senator from Delaware a great deal, and I appreciate the attitude he has taken in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on questions coming before that committee, and on many other matters. I should like to be able to favor his amendment, but I cannot do so.

I think in this instance while the intention is good, the amendment would work very badly. I believe it would tend to bring down the very prices which it is intended should be held up.

Under the amendment, what will the farmer who has more than $25,000 or $50,000 worth of commodities do? He will proceed to market his products, outside the price supports, and that will result in the prices never getting above the price support levels.

Farmers have to have peaks as well as valleys. We discovered during the war that farm prices were held down by the Office of Price Administration, but once the war was over farmers found that they could control when they received peak prices, which were above 90 or 100 percent. The farmer has to have such an opportunity. But if we say to the man who has large crops and large resources and is able to have more price supports, he will proceed to move his products just under the prices at which another farmer may move his. Therefore, the farmer who becomes the highest price at all times. I think that would be bad for all farmers, large and small.

In my opinion, the amendment would further the general wisdom of the farmers. The amendment provides that a farmer cannot get more than $25,000. If the farmers live in a community property State, he will decide at once to have his wife own half of the farm, he will transfer half ownership to her in one way or another, so that the two of them will be able to divide the income. Furthermore, they might like to take his inheritance earlier than he ordinarily would get it, so he will proceed to divide the farm with his son.

Corporation farms will find it easy to have the amendment. We have seen that happen in the subdivision business, where companies have 20 corporations handling their matters, because they have found circumstances under which that might be favorable if they keep the income at $25,000. The same thing can be done with farms.

Not too long ago I visited a farm in the state represented by the able minority leader. That farm had been a long time in the process of being brought into productive cultivation. It was a very fine farm, containing more than 40,000 acres of irrigated land. When it was sold, it brought $75,000. It was a cash transaction. Does anybody believe that the corporation which bought it for $75,000, even though money it wants without coming to the Commodity Credit Corporation?

But if we say, "You cannot have any price support; all you can do is stay happy as you can in trying to earn or have any price support," the company could very easily apply the extra amount of fertilizer which results in the production of very large crops, and could drop those crops into the market at a price just below what the support price would be, and that price would tend to fix the price for the remainder.

After all, when we are considering this amendment, we must realize that some farmers have very large operations and are able to obtain large amounts of credit. One farmer just a few months ago, a man who owned a billion dollars in real estate, established a corporation with a capitalization of $3 million. It lasted only a few months. He moved all the cotton into the market, and disposed of every bit of it. He did not need to have all of it handled in at a time, but there was a bank that was happy to make him a loan of $3 million; in fact, it gave him an open line of credit amounting to $5 million. Are we to think that by writing a limit of $50,000 or $50,000, we would make it impossible for that man to market his cotton?

If we go to Mississippi, and consider the Delta & Pine Land Co., we realize that that company will not be blocked from obtaining capital, by a $25,000 limit. It will not be blocked by it at all. The only result of such a limit would be that that company would put all its product into the market at just below the loan price.

It is true that if the little farmers were squeezed out, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case] has pointed out, that happened before there were allotments. I think there is something to the argument the Senator from South Dakota has made; but that condition occurred when there were no allotments; and during that period, the big farmers "got the cream of it".

If we wish to deal with that problem, we must proceed in an entirely different way, and not in the way proposed by this amendment. I agree with the Senator from Delaware, insofar as the purpose of the amendment is concerned. He is correct in trying to make sure that these programs will not be improperly used.

However, we are not dealing with a subsidy paid to a farmer. The purpose of this fund is to provide orderly marketing. The farmer gets a loan. I think it is the general feeling that the farmer gets a subsidy. When the farmer puts his product on the market, we should have an agricultural program which will make the commodity sell at a sufficiently high price.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think it would be a mistake for the Senate to adopt this amendment. I find myself in complete sympathy with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case], in connection with the problem he has outlined. But I say this amendment will not cure that situation.

Mr. President, the amendment was carried by a coalition of 50 Senators on Agriculture and Forestry, and was voted down by the committee. I hope the Senate as a whole will reject the amendment.

Mr. ELLENBERG, Mr. President, I understand from the distinguished Senator from Delaware that no other Senator on his side desires to be heard. Unless some Senator on this side wishes to speak against the amendment, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time, because I understand that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has an amendment which he wishes to offer at this time.

In reply to the Senator from New Mexico, there is no Member of the Senate for whom I have greater respect; and his knowledge of the agricultural problem is such that none of us ever expected to equal him. But I think that perhaps the amendment would work. I point out that there have been precedents for such action. It is true that a farmer could divide his farm into multiple units or many corporate units, and that was pointed out in the committee. In the case of the Small Business Administration, we imposed a limitation on the amount in the case of any one
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loan. At that time we recognized that theoretically it would be possible for a corporation to divide itself into multiple units or into several parts. If that happens, either by administrative action or by a correction of the law we can take care of that problem. Our limitations worked in that instance.

I think we are agreed that we wish to have the benefits of this program go to the family-type farm. I think the amendment will accomplish that objective.

There is no justification for asking the American taxpayers to extend this help to $7,500,000 to $10 million corporate-type of farming operations.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. WATKINS. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah desire to have time yielded to him?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Delaware wishes to cooperate in connection with this matter. Will the Senator from Delaware state the section to which the amendment is offered?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I offer it as an amendment in the nature of a substitute, if that is the correct way to offer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota desire to add his amendment at the end of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. HUMPHREY. All I desire to do is to offer the amendment and have a substitute. If I can, however, I offer it as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then will it come at the end of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware?

Without objection, the amendment will be considered as being offered to be inserted at the end of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota. If he later desires to have the amendment rewritten or to have it apply to another section, he will later be recognized for that purpose. Meanwhile, while the Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because of the peculiar parliamentary situation, in that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) has in order to modify his original amendment, offered as a substitute an amendment which was pending up to the time of the offering of my amendment, it is my understanding that I cannot offer my amendment as a substitute. If I can, however, I offer it as a substitute. It was my previous understanding that since the word "substitute" had been used in the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, it was not possible for my amendment to be offered as a substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. Should the amendment not be read?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, Mr. President; I wish to have my amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota has, in order of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE Clerk. In lieu of Mr. Williams' amendment, on page 4, between lines 22 and 28, it is proposed to insert the following:

LIMIT ON PRICE SUPPORT

Sec. 107. The Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

(a) Notwithstanding section 101 of this act, price supports made available under this act to any person for any year for basic agricultural commodities shall be made at 90 percent of parity; if the loans to such person, or the purchases made by the Commodity Credit Corporation from such person do not exceed $50,000.

(b) The total amount of price support made available under this act to any person for any year through loans to such person, or through purchases made by the Commodity Credit Corporation from such person, shall not exceed $50,000.

(c) The term 'person' shall mean any individual, partnership, firm, joint stock company, corporation, association, trust, support agency, or agency of a State, or of any loan to, or purchase from, a cooperative marketing association, such limitation shall apply to the amount of price support made available through such cooperative association to each person. The limitation herein referred to the amount made available to any person shall not apply if price support is extended by purchase of a non-agricultural commodity from processors and the Secretary of Agriculture on the determination that it is impracticable to apply such limitations.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my amendment has two objectives. First, it has the objective of providing, in addition, 90 percent of parity price support loans on basic agricultural commodities, up to a maximum loan or purchase amount of $5,000 per farm. This is designed to give economic assistance and support to the small family sized farm.

The second purpose of the amendment is to limit the total amount of price support loans or purchases. In the event one person, as defined in the amendment, the term "person" meaning any individual, partnership, firm, joint stock company, corporation, association, State, or agency of a State.

I would have my colleagues note that the 90 percent section of the bill is limited to the smaller farm production units. The $5,000 limitation is designed to get away from the large corporation type of farm. The government price support program encourages large corporation farm developments.

I think there has been far too little consideration in this body as to what is happening to one of the basic social and economic institutions of the country. The truth is that the family farm unit is being slowly but surely driven out of existence. There is an increasing and more consolidation of large land holdings. There is more and more absentee land ownership. More and more rural communities are being literally dried up because of the economic pressures upon the family farm unit.

I recognize that on the basis of so-called production efficiency and sheer dollars and cents, it can be said that many of the so-called family units cannot meet the high standards of efficiency and double-entry bookkeeping stand-
ard of big business. I think the time has arrived to make a great decision, a decision as to whether we are interested only in production efficiency, or whether we are interested in a certain basic pattern of social organization.

If we want more nor less than production efficiency, the thing to do is to group the large farms into huge corporate structures. Turn loose the big equipment, put the land under a general supervision, and then let the straw bosses, and Russianize American agriculture.

Lest anyone have any doubts on the question, I am again for collectivism, and I am equally against private collectivism. I do not see much difference, except that possibly one might be a little worse than the other, in that, in private collectivism, one individual is exploiting his fellow men, and in State collectivism, the State exploits its citizens.

I am opposed to the socialization of American agriculture. I charge that this administration's policies tend to accelerate such a policy. I am opposed to the collectivization of American agriculture; and that this administration's price support policies and other policies are leading in that direction. The fact that collectivization comes under some huge corporation does not make it much different than if it came under some larger State agency. In fact, in America, we might have a vote in the State agency, but in a large corporation we would have no vote.

A number of reports have come to Members of Congress lately, from some of our fine organizations. For example, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference has sent a communication to me. They are deeply concerned over what is happening in American agriculture. They are deeply concerned that the provisions in the bill before us, now that the proposals are out, would encourage further large land holdings, and further dilution of the American family farm.

Mr. President, the purpose of the first section of any amendment is to give to the family farm operator the opportunity to get 90 percent of parity price support loans on his production, up to $5,000.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator would like to have the yeas and nays requested now on his amendment, in order that Senators may be on notice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be very happy to have that done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Humphrey substitute.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

We want nothing that this administration's policies are out, would encourage further large land holdings, and further dilution of the family farm unit. In particular, it made a study in the Central Valley of California on the effects of scale of farm operations. The report is dated December 23, 1948, and is known as Senate Document No. 13.

In the introduction to the report, I find some very moving language:

"The family farm is the classic example of the American rural community, the American small-business enterprise. For generations this institution and the community it supports have held the esteem of all who have known and understood the American heritage. Statesmen, historians, economists, and sociologists have generally agreed that the spread of the family farm over the land has laid the economic base for the liberties and the democratic institutions which this Nation counts as its greatest asset."

The great declaration by Daniel Webster still stands as perhaps the clearest and most authentic expression of America's deep-rooted belief in the intimate and causal relations between the family farm and the distinctively popular character of our Government.

"Our New England ancestors," he said, "brought thither no great capitals from Europe; and if they had, there was nothing more productive in which they could have been invested. They left behind them the whole feudal policy of the other continent. They came to a new country. There were as yet no lands yielding rent, and no tenants rending service. The whole soil was unclaimed from barbarism. They were themselves either from their original condition, or from the necessity of their common interest, nearly on a level in respect to property. Their situation demanded a parceling out and division of the land, and it may fairly be said that this necessary act fixed the future frame and form of their government. The character of their political institutions was determined by fundamental laws respecting property. The consequence of all these causes has been a great subdivision of the soil and a great equality of condition; the true, best, most certain, of popular government."

The study goes on to show:

"The advances in technology during the past century have greatly benefited the family farmers with their families, work the land. The industrial revolution has eased the burden of the farmer and rendered service. The whole soil was unclaimed from barbarism. They were themselves either from their original condition, or from the necessity of their common interest, nearly on a level in respect to property. Their situation demanded a parceling out and division of the land, and it may fairly be said that this necessary act fixed the future frame and form of their government. The character of their political institutions was determined by fundamental laws respecting property. The consequence of all these causes has been a great subdivision of the soil and a great equality of condition; the true, best, most certain, of popular government."

The threat is this: That with increased mechanization will come increased industrialization of the farm enterprise; that with industrialization will come an increasing concentration of economic power in the hands of fewer and fewer men at the head of great organizations, and an end to that broad diffusion of social and economic benefits that has long been characteristic of American rural communities.

There is foundation for the belief that industrialization is on the increase. The United States Census of Agriculture has been recording the gradual increase in average farm size in America. This is not a result of the disappearance of undersized farms; family farmers on the better lands appear to be particularly vulnerable. Census statistics are supported by other information. In those areas particularly suitable to high-value specialty crops, the concentration of land and production into large units has been reported by various agencies and studies. In 1948, the American States Committee of the United States Senate has pointed out that within the decade of the thirties the percentage of all farms in California had increased 18 percent, and total agricultural production of that State fell from 10 to 6.8 percent, marking a growth in concentration and a decline in commodity production. This is not without significance as evidence of this trend that at least one group of specialty crop producers has so far changed its character away from the family farm unit in that direction of becoming industrialists that it has found itself indicted for violation of the antitrust laws of the Nation. For generations this institution and the community it supports have held the esteem of all who have known and understood the American heritage, statesmen, historians, economists, and sociologists have generally agreed that the spread of the family farm over the land has laid the economic base for the liberties and the democratic institutions which this Nation counts as its greatest asset.
The development of large-scale farming has been foremost in California. The influence of Spanish and Mexican inheritance, development of large areas by early comers after American statehood, the soil and climate favorable to the production of crops, and the development of electric and other forms of transportation, have made California particularly adaptable to industrialized agriculture. The large-scale farming industry in California has been developed, and crops are grown in areas where goods or climate are not favorable to the production of specialty crops, circumstances have made California particularly amendable to industrialized agriculture. The development of large-scale farming in California has been reported in some degree from urban centers and worked by wage labor, is not peculiar to any one part of the Nation. It has been reported in some degree from all sections. Whether industrialization of farming is a threat only to the family farm, but also to the rural society founded upon the family farm, is a question to which every part of the Nation. The present inquiry consists of a detailed analysis and comparison of two communities, one where agricultural operations are on a modest scale, the other where large factory-like techniques are practiced. Both communities lie in the fertile southern San Joaquin Valley in the Central Valley of California, where highly developed and richly productive agriculture is characteristic. Limitations of time and resources dictated that no more than two communities be studied. Numerous other pairs might have been chosen which, however, would have yielded comparable results.

The two communities studied here naturally vary in some degree with respect to proportions of surrounding lands devoted to this or that crop, with respect to age, to depth of water lift for irrigation, etc., as well as with respect to the character of the business enterprises of which the communities are formed. It must be realized that the two communities are agriculturally related, that no more than two communities be studied. Numerous other pairs might have been chosen which, however, would have yielded comparable results.

The small-farm community is more than one-third of the breadwinners in the small-farm community are agricultural wage laborers—characteristically unskilled laborers, hired by the piece, while the proportion of persons in this position reaches the astonishing figure of nearly two-thirds of all employed persons in the large-farm community. The expenditure for household expenses in the large-farm community is approximately as great as that for the small-farm community; indeed, in the industrial-farm community, the factor of greatest weight in producing differences in wealth among them are not great, and the people generally associate together in those organizations which serve the community. Where farms are large, on the other hand, the population consists of relatively few persons with economic stability, and of large numbers whose only tie to the community is their uncertain and relatively low-income job. Differences in wealth are great among members of this community, and social contacts between them are rare. Indeed, even the operators of large-scale farms for the most part live in Arvin, they as often seek their recreation in the nearby city. Their interest in the welfare of the community is hardly greater than that of the laborers whose livings are transitory. Even the businessmen of the large-farm community frequently express a feeling that they have no share and that their financial investment in the community, kept usually at a minimum, reflects the same view.

The expenditure for household expenses in the small-farm community is much greater than in the large-farm community. In the small-farm community, the proportion is less than one-fifth. The expenditure for household expenses in the large-farm community is approximately as great as that for the small-farm community; indeed, in the industrial-farm community, the factor of greatest weight in producing differences in wealth among them are not great, and the people generally associate together in those organizations which serve the community. Where farms are large, on the other hand, the population consists of relatively few persons with economic stability, and of large numbers whose only tie to the community is their uncertain and relatively low-income job. Differences in wealth are great among members of this community, and social contacts between them are rare. Indeed, even the operators of large-scale farms for the most part live in Arvin, they as often seek their recreation in the nearby city. Their interest in the welfare of the community is hardly greater than that of the laborers whose livings are transitory. Even the businessmen of the large-farm community frequently express a feeling that they have no share and that their financial investment in the community, kept usually at a minimum, reflects the same view.

The expenditure for household expenses in the small-farm community is much greater than in the large-farm community. In the small-farm community, the proportion is less than one-fifth. The expenditure for household expenses in the large-farm community is approximately as great as that for the small-farm community; indeed, in the industrial-farm community, the factor of greatest weight in producing differences in wealth among them are not great, and the people generally associate together in those organizations which serve the community. Where farms are large, on the other hand, the population consists of relatively few persons with economic stability, and of large numbers whose only tie to the community is their uncertain and relatively low-income job. Differences in wealth are great among members of this community, and social contacts between them are rare. Indeed, even the operators of large-scale farms for the most part live in Arvin, they as often seek their recreation in the nearby city. Their interest in the welfare of the community is hardly greater than that of the laborers whose livings are transitory. Even the businessmen of the large-farm community frequently express a feeling that they have no share and that their financial investment in the community, kept usually at a minimum, reflects the same view.

The expenditure for household expenses in the small-farm community is much greater than in the large-farm community. In the small-farm community, the proportion is less than one-fifth. The expenditure for household expenses in the large-farm community is approximately as great as that for the small-farm community; indeed, in the industrial-farm community, the factor of greatest weight in producing differences in wealth among them are not great, and the people generally associate together in those organizations which serve the community. Where farms are large, on the other hand, the population consists of relatively few persons with economic stability, and of large numbers whose only tie to the community is their uncertain and relatively low-income job. Differences in wealth are great among members of this community, and social contacts between them are rare. Indeed, even the operators of large-scale farms for the most part live in Arvin, they as often seek their recreation in the nearby city. Their interest in the welfare of the community is hardly greater than that of the laborers whose livings are transitory. Even the businessmen of the large-farm community frequently express a feeling that they have no share and that their financial investment in the community, kept usually at a minimum, reflects the same view.

The expenditure for household expenses in the small-farm community is much greater than in the large-farm community. In the small-farm community, the proportion is less than one-fifth. The expenditure for household expenses in the large-farm community is approximately as great as that for the small-farm community; indeed, in the industrial-farm community, the factor of greatest weight in producing differences in wealth among them are not great, and the people generally associate together in those organizations which serve the community. Where farms are large, on the other hand, the population consists of relatively few persons with economic stability, and of large numbers whose only tie to the community is their uncertain and relatively low-income job. Differences in wealth are great among members of this community, and social contacts between them are rare. Indeed, even the operators of large-scale farms for the most part live in Arvin, they as often seek their recreation in the nearby city. Their interest in the welfare of the community is hardly greater than that of the laborers whose livings are transitory. Even the businessmen of the large-farm community frequently express a feeling that they have no share and that their financial investment in the community, kept usually at a minimum, reflects the same view.

The expenditure for household expenses in the small-farm community is much greater than in the large-farm community. In the small-farm community, the proportion is less than one-fifth. The expenditure for household expenses in the large-farm community is approximately as great as that for the small-farm community; indeed, in the industrial-farm community, the factor of greatest weight in producing differences in wealth among them are not great, and the people generally associate together in those organizations which serve the community. Where farms are large, on the other hand, the population consists of relatively few persons with economic stability, and of large numbers whose only tie to the community is their uncertain and relatively low-income job. Differences in wealth are great among members of this community, and social contacts between them are rare. Indeed, even the operators of large-scale farms for the most part live in Arvin, they as often seek their recreation in the nearby city. Their interest in the welfare of the community is hardly greater than that of the laborers whose livings are transitory. Even the businessmen of the large-farm community frequently express a feeling that they have no share and that their financial investment in the community, kept usually at a minimum, reflects the same view.

The expenditure for household expenses in the small-farm community is much greater than in the large-farm community. In the small-farm community, the proportion is less than one-fifth. The expenditure for household expenses in the large-farm community is approximately as great as that for the small-farm community; indeed, in the industrial-farm community, the factor of greatest weight in producing differences in wealth among them are not great, and the people generally associate together in those organizations which serve the community. Where farms are large, on the other hand, the population consists of relatively few persons with economic stability, and of large numbers whose only tie to the community is their uncertain and relatively low-income job. Differences in wealth are great among members of this community, and social contacts between them are rare. Indeed, even the operators of large-scale farms for the most part live in Arvin, they as often seek their recreation in the nearby city. Their interest in the welfare of the community is hardly greater than that of the laborers whose livings are transitory. Even the businessmen of the large-farm community frequently express a feeling that they have no share and that their financial investment in the community, kept usually at a minimum, reflects the same view.

The expenditure for household expenses in the small-farm community is much greater than in the large-farm community. In the small-farm community, the proportion is less than one-fifth. The expenditure for household expenses in the large-farm community is approximately as great as that for the small-farm community; indeed, in the industrial-farm community, the factor of greatest weight in producing differences in wealth among them are not great, and the people generally associate together in those organizations which serve the community. Where farms are large, on the other hand, the population consists of relatively few persons with economic stability, and of large numbers whose only tie to the community is their uncertain and relatively low-income job. Differences in wealth are great among members of this community, and social contacts between them are rare. Indeed, even the operators of large-scale farms for the most part live in Arvin, they as often seek their recreation in the nearby city. Their interest in the welfare of the community is hardly greater than that of the laborers whose livings are transitory. Even the businessmen of the large-farm community frequently express a feeling that they have no share and that their financial investment in the community, kept usually at a minimum, reflects the same view.
those of the hired workers of the corporate farm.

Physical facilities for community living—paved streets, sidewalks, garbage disposal, sewage disposal, and other public services—are far greater in the small-farm community; indeed, in the individual farm the large-farm community has but a single elementary school.

I could go on and on. I commend the report to the reading of every Member of the Senate. This is a case study of a corporate land operation and of some 60-family farms. Both of them are in the same valley of the same State. Both use the same forms of transportation. Both supposedly operate under similar conditions.

The truth is that the family-farm unit was better for the business and the people in it lived under very poor economic and social conditions.

This report has been cited from time to time by leading clergymen and by persons on the farms look upon farming as a way of life. If we are going to control the big farmers, those big producers . . .

Some of the large farms do not need any price supports. All they do is to hire Mexican labor and pay it 50 cents an hour, or Jamaican labor, and pay it 50 cents an hour and take care of acreage control of the crop was adequate. However, we were going to control the big farmers, those big producers . . .

I want to live in a country in which people on the farms look upon farming not only as an occupation and an economic pursuit, but as a way of life. If we want to live in a country in which people on the farms look upon farming we need only as an occupation and an economic pursuit, we need only as an occupation and an economic pursuit.

One of the troubles with the Department of Agriculture today is that it has been General Motorized. The Department looks upon everything in terms of the big approach. The Under Secretary of Agriculture has from time to time said, as have his associates, that agriculture is big business.

Mr. President, the total of all American agriculture may be big business, but agriculture is small business. I am one of the last stands of small business. We must make up our minds whether we want to have happen to agriculture what has happened to manufacturing, or whether we wish to preserve in our society a social unit for the family on the farm, in order to preserve and maintain smaller rural communities.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator consider the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Massachusetts asks me to make a comparison between my amendment and the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. My amendment in its second part is the same as the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. My amendment is in its second part is the same as the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

In other words, the Government would not be obligated to any producer for more than a loan of $50,000 on the commodities which might be offered. That is a principle, as the Senator from Delaware and the Senate has pointed out, which is used time and time again in legislation.

We do not offer unlimited guarantees on housing, but have a cutoff point. We do not apply a loan brand under the Small Business Administration. I believe the maximum is $150,000 at the present time. We are applying the same principle here. Some of the sharpest criticism of the price support program has been directed toward the large corporate farm units which have received as much as $300,000 in loans from the Government, and even as much as a million dollars in loans. To be sure, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said, they give as their collateral the corporate farm.

In fact, we could justify a loan of any amount so long as the collateral put up in the form of the commodity or the crop was adequate. However, we are not going to control the big farmers, those big producers . . .

Some of the large farms do not need any price supports. All they do is to hire Mexican labor and pay it 50 cents an hour, or Jamaican labor, and pay it 50 cents an hour and take care of acreage control of the crop was adequate. However, we are not going to control the big farmers, those big producers . . .

I want to live in a country in which people on the farms look upon farming we need only as an occupation and an economic pursuit, we need only as an occupation and an economic pursuit.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota happened to see an article in yesterday's Washington Post by the Alsop brothers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In it they discussed the plight of the small farmers of this country and related it to a similar situation preceding the fall of the Roman Empire.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I read it with great care. In fact, I was discussing it this morning in my office with my administrative assistant. I believe he has the article in his folder. I read the report to which I alluded a moment ago, and there is no doubt that every country in the world that is in trouble today got into trouble by permitting its agriculture to deteriorate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The last time we were in trouble in this country, from an economic standpoint, it had grown from the same beginning.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It had, indeed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am very much in sympathy with what the Senator is driving at, but here is a question which has been asked in some considerable detail. Would you like to have it explained. This is not just a loan program; it is tied in with the control of acreage, is it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How would the Senator take care of acreage control of big farms raising crops which would exceed $50,000 limitation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that a $50,000 loan is no small potatoes. It is quite a concession on the part of the Government.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator knows that in this country, much as he believes and much as I believe in small farms, we have some big producers in every type of agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And a great deal of the agricultural production comes from those big producers. So long as it is tied in with production control, how are we going to control the big farmers, those whose production would exceed the limit of $50,000? If we turn them loose and let them sell in the free market, we shall be breaking down or threatening the price-support system itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The acreage control also relates to the conservation reserve and the acreage reserve, all of which provide benefits to the farmers. The acreage control applies to the right of the small family operation to own the Commodity Credit Corporation for loan purposes. But I must say there are only a very few producers in this country who would go above the $50,000 figure. I have the figures here, and I assume if the Senator will tarry with me a moment I think I can give him a little help.

The Department made a survey on the basis of the $50,000 figure; that is, a $25,000 limitation, and stated that the census data reveals that only 3.7 percent of the farms in our country have gross sales above the $25,000 figure. The larger farming operations produce out
25 percent of the production, and 85 percent of the total commodity supply falls under the $25,000 price for price-support loans. If we have a price-support limitation of $25,000, approximately 85 percent of the supply will be eligible. If we raise it to $50,000 it will go up substantially higher. Of the $2,000 each loan, each of those three-tenths of 1 percent, were larger than $25,000. If we put the figure at $50,000, the percentage will be less than as many fingers as there are in an average hand.

Of the 35,000 barley loans only 6 were above the $25,000 figure.

It is true that putting a limitation of $50,000 as a maximum amount of loan which can be received from the Government, will cause some persons to be left outside the program, but there are some who are outside of it, anyway. Some of the large producers do not need to use commodity credit loans. So the argument which has been made that by a limitation we would permit some persons to go scot-free as to acreage compliance under the farm program. The program last year had slightly more than 95 percent compliance, and it has percent, and if the Government had a subversive influence in American society. I ask my friends from the South a question: What will my friends south of the Mason-Dixon line do if more of the small tenants are driven off the land? What will they do when those tenant farmers move to Atlanta, to Birmingham, and to the other great cities of the South? Where will they find jobs? What about the social problems which will result? In the rural communities today there is a sense of stability. What will be done about the farmer and his 6 or 10 acres? How will his family be affected by such a program as the one which we are about to adopt?

Mr. President, from Southern States do not expect this administration to protect the tenant farmer, do they? This administration wants so-called efficiency; and efficiency to them is synonymous with wealth, with wealth, with big cars, with white shirts, with big clubs, with big cigars.

That is not the way to build the kind of America we would like to have. The Republican Party is sometimes the destructor of the family farm system will never work as the Russians intend it should. Their plan may produce. Oh, yes, it may produce goods, that is true. It produces good people, happy people, or a happy society. The Russian system is organized wrong.

The present policies of this administration are not the kind of fight the President? He did not win over me. He does not have UNIVAC. If they were half as much as the Russian government, we could see how that worked, but it was the UNIVAC that gave them the first prediction of their success in 1952, and they have never forgotten it. This great electronic instrument does things for them as well as things for us.

The Government of the United States is supposed to be dedicated to the people and to the general welfare of the American people. Mr. President, you can read the Constitution from beginning to end, and the word "efficiency" is not in it. I have said on the floor of the Senate, one can read the Old Testament and the New Testament in any translation, and he will find, in the Emancipation Proclamation, the Atlantic Charter, the Constitution of the United States, and the Charter of the United Nations; but not in them the word "efficiency." But "efficiency"? That has been brought in since January 1953. It has since become a national byword; it is a GOP household word. We are told by the President—it is the Republican success formula.

But the price of so-called efficiency, Mr. President, is sometimes the destruction of the people. Hitler was efficient—implacable. Stalin claimed a certain amount of efficiency. Krushchev says he can be even more efficient. Both believe their true friends are those who stand by this line. That is one part of our propaganda which has worked.

Mr. President, if we wish to preserve the family farm unit in this country, if we are to build the kind of society that we believe is a great expanse of the public domain and build a family-size farm upon it.

As I listened to those words, repeated by the Senator, it occurred to me that while this country is due to the growth of large farms, the absorption of small farms, and the mechanization of the large farms. We are reversing the condition which Daniel Webster described. We are getting a class of gentleman farmers who occupy large farms, and we are driving the small farmer into the class of the peasant who lived in the countries from which our original settlers came. The great virtue of America was that here we established opportunities for every man; but because of the concentration of economic power through industrial organization, upon the one hand, and now through the present type of operation of agriculture upon the other hand, we are making what was once a classless society a class society. When that is done the America which the Founding Fathers saw and envisioned for the future will have vanished.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. As we vote on this farm bill we shall be not only voting on dollars and cents, but on social patterns, social structures. We have been witnessing the erosion in the United States of a great social structure namely, the small family farm unit, with the family on the land taking care of it, attending school, attending church, attending their town meetings, and participating in township and local government.

I know there are a lot of experts around; they are all over the place these days. They know all about management. They know how to manage everybody's affairs but their own. They are the men that need to day is today to apply business efficiency principles to farming.

Mr. President, that is what has been tried in Russia. That does not belong in the United States. The Russian collectivized farm system will never work as the Russians intend it should. Their plan may produce. Oh, yes, it may produce goods, that is true. It produces good people, happy people, or a happy society. The Russian system is organized wrong.

The present policies of this administration are not the kind of fight the President? He did not win over me. He does not have UNIVAC. If they were half as much as the Russian government, we could see how that worked, but it was the UNIVAC that gave them the first prediction of their success in 1952, and they have never forgotten it. This great electronic instrument does things for them as well as things for us.

The Government of the United States is supposed to be dedicated to the people and to the general welfare of the American people. Mr. President, you can read the Constitution from beginning to end, and the word "efficiency" is not in it. As I have said on the floor of the Senate, one can read the Old Testament and the New Testament in any translation he wishes to read; he can read the Declaration of Independence, the Magna Charta, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Atlantic Charter, the Constitution of the United States, and the Charter of the United Nations; but not in them the word "efficiency." He will find, as I have said a number of times before, the words "justice," "equality," "liberty," "compassion," "equity," "love," and "kindness." But "efficiency"? That has been brought in since January 1953. It has since become a national byword; it is a GOP household word. We are told by the President—it is the Republican success formula.

But the price of so-called efficiency, Mr. President, is sometimes the destruction of the people. Hitler was efficient—implacable. Stalin claimed a certain amount of efficiency. Krushchev says he can be even more efficient. Both believe their true friends are those who stand by this line. That is one part of our propaganda which has worked.

Mr. President, if we wish to preserve the family farm unit in this country, if we are to build the kind of society that we believe is a great expanse of the public domain and build a family-size farm upon it.

As I listened to those words, repeated by the Senator, it occurred to me that while this country is due to the growth of large farms, the absorption of small farms, and the mechanization of the large farms. We are reversing the condition which Daniel Webster described. We are getting a class of gentleman farmers who occupy large farms, and we are driving the small farmer into the class of the peasant who lived in the countries from which our original settlers came. The great virtue of America was that here we established opportunities for every man; but because of the concentration of economic power through industrial organization, upon the one hand, and now through the present type of operation of agriculture upon the other hand, we are making what was once a classless society a class society. When that is done the America which the Founding Fathers saw and envisioned for the future will have vanished.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. As we vote on this farm bill we shall be not only voting on dollars and cents, but on social patterns, social structures. We have been witnessing the erosion in the United States of a great social structure namely, the small family farm unit, with the family on the land taking care of it, attending school, attending church, attending their town meetings, and participating in township and local government.

I know there are a lot of experts around; they are all over the place these days. They know all about management. They know how to manage everybody's affairs but their own. They are the men that need to day is today to apply business efficiency principles to farming.

Mr. President, that is what has been tried in Russia. That does not belong in the United States. The Russian collectivized farm system will never work as the Russians intend it should. Their plan may produce. Oh, yes, it may produce goods, that is true. It produces good people, happy people, or a happy society. The Russian system is organized wrong.

The present policies of this administration are not the kind of fight the President? He did not win over me. He does not have UNIVAC. If they were half as much as the Russian government, we could see how that worked, but it was the UNIVAC that gave them the first prediction of their success in 1952, and they have never forgotten it. This great electronic instrument does things for them as well as things for us.

The Government of the United States is supposed to be dedicated to the people and to the general welfare of the American people. Mr. President, you can read the Constitution from beginning to end, and the word "efficiency" is not in it. As I have said on the floor of the Senate, one can read the Old Testament and the New Testament in any translation he wishes to read; he can read the Declaration of Independence, the Magna Charta, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Atlantic Charter, the Constitution of the United States, and the Charter of the United Nations; but not in them the word "efficiency." He will find, as I have said a number of times before, the words "justice," "equality," "liberty," "compassion," "equity," "love," and "kindness." But "efficiency"? That has been brought in since January 1953. It has since become a national byword; it is a GOP household word. We are told by the President—it is the Republican success formula.

But the price of so-called efficiency, Mr. President, is sometimes the destruction of the people. Hitler was efficient—implacable. Stalin claimed a certain amount of efficiency. Krushchev says he can be even more efficient. Both believe their true friends are those who stand by this line. That is one part of our propaganda which has worked.

Mr. President, if we wish to preserve the family farm unit in this country, if we are to build the kind of society that we believe is a great expanse of the public domain and build a family-size farm upon it.
soil people who love the land they live on, it will be necessary to provide an economic program under which they can live; because the sheer law of economic attrition will drive them off the land, and everyone knows it.

Mr. President, I do not believe that if the program as presently outlined is adopted, the only farm people who will be able to live on the land will be those with large inheritances. The program will result in larger and bigger farm units. Some persons say, "It is inevitable. Why not let them have it?"

Mr. President, it need not be inevitable if we have the will to let it be so. I am arguing for the right of the individual farm family to be able to make a living. Ninety percent of parity-price supports is not high. I say: If $5,000, the farmers are entitled to 90 percent of parity on their commodities. It may cost them a little more to produce each unit of their commodity, but they are entitled to that objective loan. If $5,000, they will have to go on the Bensonized formula. They will be the victims of slide and flexibility.

The big operators say the flexible price-support program is good. Let them try it. If they want it, let them have it. Some of them say they do not even want any Government supports. Those are the ones who do not need it. Another 10 percent will not need it, because they have the family farm. Those farmers literally ought to be marching to their courthouses, demanding equity and justice.

If the farmers of America were as well organized as the unions and industry then they would have something to say about legislation affecting them. But the farmer is working 16 hours a day—trusting his elected representatives to do him justice.

I have put into the Record indisputable facts as to the hourly wage the farmers of Minnesota are receiving. What good does it do? The Senate just reduces their wages. Apparently the Senate thinks they are being paid too much. They receive something like 45 cents an hour. Apparently some feel they should get 50 cents an hour. So the Senate reduced price supports.

Has anybody thought for a minute what would happen if Mr. Farmer had an organization strong enough so he could say to the coal miners in the city, "We are getting by too easily. Let us hold up the pork supply. Let us hold back the beef supply. Let us hold back their fruits and vegetables." That is what is done in industry. That is what was done in the coal fields. That is what was done with respect to fuel oil. That is what is done in the case of every other commodity except food.

The farmer has asked only for justice. He does not want to restrict the food supply, and I pray to God he never will. But if American agriculture is "corporatized," that is exactly what he will do.

The most miserable living conditions on this continent are to be found where there are large corporate farms which exploit the small farmers, the Mexicans, the Jamaicans, and the Bahamians. I do not want that sort of condition existing in this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to point out to the Senator that he may have an ally, in the amendment which he is offering, of whom he is not yet informed. When the Secretary of Agriculture, about a week and a half ago, appeared before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I questioned him about certain provisions of amendments to the pending bill which would create the family-sized farm, guaranteeing, through the 90 percent support program, the marketability of the farmer's crop, through the local market, at the same time making it impossible for the big farmer to produce a surplus.

My suggestion was, as I expressed it afterward on the floor of the Senate, that perhaps any more than 90 percent of parity for the small farmer and flexible supports for the farmer in the larger classification.

The Secretary did not like that suggestion, but he said in his letter to me which I put in the Record on March 5, and which will be found on page 3911 of the Record, that the President had written a letter to the Secretary to be almost identical with the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota now offers.

If I am correct in the interpretation of the President's language, I transmitted to me by Secretary Benson, I think our Republican friends in the Senate ought to know that in supporting the Humphrey amendment they will be supporting the Eisenhower program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would even be willing to call it the George Humphrey amendment, naming it after the Secretary of the Treasury, if that would result in getting any more votes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now read the President's intent, according to Secretary Benson:

First of all, the President's intent was not identical with the objective you have indicated. The President said:

"The average size of farms in American agriculture, as measured by capital or by acres, has rapidly increased. To the degree that this trend is associated with the development of more economic and more efficient units it is in the interest of farm families and of the Nation."

Let me interpolate—because this efficiency seems to develop only when the farm has expanded beyond what we normally call a family-sized farm. To return to the President's language:

To the degree, however, that it has resulted in the removal of risk for large farm businesses by reasons of price supports, it is much to the wholesome and constitutes a threat to the traditional family farm.

Under the price support machinery as it has developed, functioning. Loans of tremendous size have occasionally occurred. It is not sound Government policy to undertake public expense such formidable competition with family-operated farms, which are the bulwark of our agriculture.

I urge the Congress to consider placing a dollar limit on the size of price-support loans to any one individual or farming unit.

The Senator from Minnesota has done that. His limit is $5,000 and 90 percent supports for those making less than $5,000.

The limit should be sufficiently high to give full protection to efficiently operated family farms.
Mr. HUMPHREY. There is a $50,000 limit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So I take it the President has recommended precisely the program which the Senator from Minnesota has outlined in his amendment.

If I may address the Senator personally, what he is seeking to do, as I understand, is to limit the payment from the Government and the loans from the Government to those large farms which actually do not need it, in the belief that by this limitation they will be more efficient, in the national sense, in the fact that the farmer is paying a price below which they must sell at a price which will destroy the whole basis of agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator for being most helpful. I am fully cognizant of the President's expression on limitation of the amount of price supports, or the total amount of price support, which is something which the department did not agree with a proposal to limit the amount of loans to any one farmer; in other words, whether it recommended a cutoff, or limitation. I think the Senate should know that the Department said it was opposed to it. However, that has no relationship to what the President is for. There are seven Department of Agriculture members in Washington. There is one at the White House. There is one at the Bureau of the Budget. There is one at the Department of Agriculture. So no matter what side of the fence one is on; he can always find somebody in the administration who supports or opposes his position on the farm program. But if I had a choice, I would rather have the President support me. I am sorry Mr. Benson does not support the President, and I am sorry the President does not support Mr. Benson, but perhaps we can get them together if we write this proposal into the law.

I should like to help President Eisenhower get the price-support limitation into the farm bill. I agree with that part of his amendment. He can have more credit for it if the proposal should pass, I am perfectly willing that the Washington Post and Times Herald have another headline that reads, " Ike Wins Farm Fight." I noticed another headline which it carried, " Ike's Flexible Wheat Prop Saved by Nixon." They are working together. They saved the flexible price-support bill.

I want every farmer in the Wheat Belt to know that the President and his Vice President were kind enough to lower the wheat supports to 76 percent of parity. I want that word to go abroad in the country. Ike likes to have headlines; and he can have this one, too. In fact, I shall take this paper over to the Library of Congress and have it treated like the Declaration of Independence. I do not want this paper crinkled. In fact, I want to leave it at the Library of Congress, because when the farmers in my section of the country find out that Ike won—the headline is, " Ike Wins Senate Farm Fight!"—they will know who they are, and they will know who got trampled upon—namely, the farmers themselves.

Mr. President, my proposal is twofold. Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I rise to hasten to say that the letter read by the distinguished Senator from California, yesterday, came to the administration policy—which must include the President; I presume that he confers with Secretary Benson on these matters. The Vice President must have conferred with him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a presumption based on theory. Mr. MAGNUSON. This being the year 1956, I can understand why we have the letter.

But I desire to point out to the Senator from Minnesota—and I suppose he knows how apropos these figures are, in connection with what he has said today—that the Department of Labor issued statistics from which it appears that under the so-called Benson flexible-parity plan, farm income now has dropped to approximately $860 per capita, as against almost $2,000 for people in all other lines of activity. In other words, today the farmer—even with his capital investment—does less than one-half of the national income or national "take" per capita, or the average income per capita of all other classes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. In that connection, I wish to read from an article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, which appeared in yesterday's—March 11—edition of the Washington Post.

By the way, Mr. President, I wish to thank them for taking such an interest in this matter. There has been a dearth of such articles or columns. It is just as important that farmers be given economic justice as it is that city dwellers who use natural gas receive economic justice. In fact, the city dwellers are more well off than one-half of the national income or the average income per capita of all other classes.

Mr. President, my position is this: that if we give the farmer the same sort of right that we have given the urban citizen to receive natural gas, he will be able to assist himself, under present prices. I was opposed to the natural gas bill, which is another one of the attempts to steal; it was a privilege for special groups. It is just as important that farmers be given economic justice as it is that city dwellers who use natural gas receive economic justice. In fact, the city dwellers are more well off than one-half of the national income or the average income per capita of all other classes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. In that connection, I wish to read from an article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, which appeared in yesterday's—March 11—edition of the Washington Post.

By the way, Mr. President, I wish to thank them for taking such an interest in this matter. There has been a dearth of such articles or columns. It is just as important that farmers be given economic justice as it is that city dwellers who use natural gas receive economic justice. In fact, the city dwellers are more well off than one-half of the national income or the average income per capita of all other classes.

Mr. President, we should not put in the Department of Agriculture people who do not believe in price supports. But that is what has been done.

I repeat that this program is being administered in a spirit which does not lend itself to effective administration and which does not lend itself to a pro-
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From here on I shall desist from prog­nosticating as to when the Senate may complete consideration of the pending bill. In early January I predicted hope­fully that we would have a bill on the President's desk not later than Febru­ary 15. At that time I did not take into consideration the customary recess which we afford our friends across the aisle during the week of Lincoln's Birthday. At the time I stated that I hoped we would finish consideration of the bill by the 15th of March. We are only a few days away from that deadline and the end of debate is not in sight. As a matter of fact, we seem to be mov­

Today we started with an amendment which was proposed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] dealing with a subject entirely foreign to the subject which is now being dis­cussed. The Senator from Delaware first offered an amendment which had as its objective preventing the Government

from leasing lands owned by the Gov­ernment in order to grow crops now in surplus. Instead of proceeding with the consideration of that amendment, the Senator saw fit to offer as a substitute an amendment providing for a $25,000 limitation on the amount a farmer could borrow from the Government under the price-support program.

My good friend from Minnesota has now offered another substitute for that amendment which would provide for a modified 90 percent of par­lty price-support program.

For the last few days we have been debating as to whether or not we should retain in the bill 90 percent of parity price supports. Last week the Senate went on record against 90 percent price supports. Now we are confronted with the issue again, in a little different form. It places some of us in a peculiar posi­

In the past I have supported 90 percent price supports, and I am still for 90 percent price supports. However, this amendment would permit farmers to borrow up to $5,000 on the basic crops at the rate of 90 percent of parity. If this amendment is adopted, we shall have two sets of price supports, one appl­ing to small farmers, whose produc­tion is not greater than $5,000, and the sliding scale applying to the rest of the farmers. The arguments advanced by my colleague from Minnesota, is to assist the small farmer.

Mr. President, I bow to no man in the fight to help our small farmers, but this amendment would not give to the small farmer an acre more of land to cultivate than is being allotted to him under the present law; and yet that seems to be the objective of most of those who are now sponsoring a limitation of $50,000 or $25,000. They insist that by limiting support payments, they will help the small farmer obtain more acres to plant.

This, Mr. President, the amendment will not do.

It is a great pity that when this law was first placed on the statute books back in 1938, we have observed World War II and the Korean situation. We might have been able to provide ways and means by which we could better pro­tect the interests of the small farmer. It is my considered judgment that the only way we can now protect them, insofar as acreage is concerned, and in giving them more to sell, is by ultimately increasing their acreage.

It is true that during the war many farmers sold or leased their farms. They saw greater returns in our factories, so they abandoned the small farms. In the meantime, those who were able to maintain their farms made their operations larger and larger through outright acquisition, as well as through leasing of smaller areas.

In order to accomplish what some Senator or Senator from another State would have to change the entire law, because our farm­ers who produce basic crops are now oper­ating under allotted acreages. These allotments are arrived at on a historic basis, depending upon how much of cer­tain basic crops have been planted by cotton farmers, wheat farmers, tobacco farmers, rice farmers, and peanut farm­ers over a specified recent period of time.

It is provided in the law how those acres shall be distributed. The Secretary of Agriculture must follow a certain for­mula. We cannot now take away from the large farmers acreage allotments which have been acquired under an es­tablished formula.

Mr. President, I hope that from now on we shall not be going back and debating issues which have been passed upon by this Senate, because if we do, we may be here until Christmas before this bill is passed.

For almost a week the Senate has been operating under a limitation of debate, yet that number of amendments will dwindle and our progress will be hastened. That is my hope. Unless we enact legislation and have it on the Presi­dent's desk sometime this month, we might as well abandon the bill, and we might as well abandon the bill as a whole, for it will be too late to help our farmers this year.

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

Mr. Ellender. I yield.

Mr. Aiken. I might point out that even under the $5,000 proposal we would not help small farmers at 90 percent, because one may have $5,000 worth of wheat but $105,000 worth of livestock, hogs, and other commodities. Therefore, it does not follow that what is anticipated would happen under the pro­posal of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. Ellender. The Senator is put­ting the case in a manner a little differ­ent from the way I have presented it. A farmer who is, for example, who grows only one basic crop, may have a total production of no more than 4 bales; he cannot get $5,000, of course. However, it would not help this type of small farmer if the market price is not supported by loans to the farmers who can afford to take advantage of them.

Mr. Aiken. If he gets $400, he is doing well.

Mr. Ellender. The only way to help these farmers would be by giving them more land on which to plant basic crops. The only way that could be done would be by revising the entire acreage allotment program.

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

Mr. Ellender. I yield for a ques­tion.

Mr. Langer. I am quite sure that if in the State so ably represented by the Senator from Oregon, there were 1,000 cows, but if the average number of cows per farm was only 5 or 6, he would be advocating some measure of relief for the farmers who had 5 or 6 cows.

Mr. Ellender. I suppose all of us tend to look after our own State's inter­ests. However, it seems to me that we should proceed to enact the bill as soon as is reasonably possible. I do not
Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any time remaining on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the vote to be on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota providing for 90-percent support to producers up to the amount of $5,000, and then providing price support at the prevailing rate up to $50,000 worth of commodities?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will not undertake to interpret the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. That is my interpretation of it, and I shall vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk of the Senate, Mr. CLEMENTS, announced that the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAVUER] is absent on official business.

Mr. AIKEN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAVUER] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are absent. The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAVUER] would vote "yes."

So Mr. HUMPHREY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in accordance with a previous agreement with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATERMAN] and other Senators, I should like to modify my amendment at the desk by striking out "$25,000" and inserting therefor "$30,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. ELLENBERGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAVUER] has been recognized, before the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk for the information of the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk for the information of the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana if I may modify my amendment accordingly, unless Senators wish to have a vote on it. Mr. ELLENBERGER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, as modified.

Mr. ELLENBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. ELLENBERGER. What is the question now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, as modified.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana is the same as the amendment I had offered, which is on the desk of Senators, and is designated "2--25--63.B." I am wholeheartedly in favor of its adoption.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide a limitation of $50,000 on the amount which can be paid to any single participant in the acreage-reserve program.

As the bill is written, without some limitation, it provides that anyone can put up to 60 percent of his allocated acreage.
age into the reserve program or the so-called soil-bank program.

In the case of the latter, we would like to see the amendment. Let us consider an individual in the Montana area who has 340,000 acres of wheat. Without some limitation, he could put one-half, or 170,000 acres, of his wheat into the soil-bank plan and receive for it an average of approximately $20 an acre, or a total of $3,400,000 for taking one-half of his acreage out of production.

I think it is the intention of Congress that the proposed law should be applied for any such purpose as that. Neither is it the intention of Congress to undermine the farm operations of some of the larger insurance companies.

The bill, even with this limitation, would take care of over 98 percent of all the farms in the country with respect to the amount of acreage which could be set aside under the soil-bank plan.

Certainly, $25,000 would be a sizable check for any farmer to receive from the Government for not planting a specific crop or crops. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

It was never intended that this soil-bank proposal be a bonanza for the absentee farmer. Unless some provision is written in the law a small percentage of individuals will reap a major portion of the benefits.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It limits to $25,000 the amount which may be paid to any producer under the acre-age-reserve program. The main purpose of the provision regulating the soil-bank program is to curtail production of the basics so as not further to aggravate the present surpluses. The amendment, in my humble judgment, may prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from getting the desired number of allotted acres placed in the acreage reserve and thus may defeat the primary purpose of the farm bill—that is, to reduce the surpluses which now exist for all of the basic commodities.

In the bill we are now considering, the Secretary of Agriculture is given broad powers to accomplish the objective of curtailting our market surpluses, by encouraging farmers to refrain from planting a portion of their allotted acres.

I have explained before how the plan would work, but for the benefit of Senators who were not present in the Senate at that time, I will explain it again. The reserve- acreage provision covers only the allotted acres for the basic crops. The Secretary of Agriculture has been given broad powers to go into the States which produce cotton, peanuts, wheat, corn, rice, and certain types of tobacco in order to curtail as many acres as possible diverted from the production of those basic crops. The only limitation that we have in the bill with respect to the allotted acres is that we do not use more than 170,000 acres in the soil-bank program and the amount of the appropriation authorized. The total amount that may be spent in any 1 year for the acreage-reserve phase of the soil-bank program is $750 million.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if we start tying the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture in administering the program he might not be able to obtain the number of acres that ought to be set aside in order to bring the production of basic commodities in balance with demand. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator not have any fear that in the case of some low wheat acres, such as the wheat a farmer has subsequent to the $25,000 payment per acre, that the $20 payment per acre might actually result in paying to the operator more than the land could be sold for on the open market?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a possibility of that, but we tried to protect against such an eventuality by providing in the bill that the farm is to be operated on the same manner as it is now operated. The Secretary will have ample authority to set the level of payments so that abuses of this kind cannot occur. The only thing that farmers are to be protected and the Secretary can take steps to discourage their being put off the farm. I repeat—the objective of the acreage reserve provision is to get the farmer who has acreage allotments for the production of basic commodities, to refrain from planting some of their allotted acres and thus bring about a reduction in the market surpluses.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the Senator has a very good point in that respect.

Mr. ELLENDER. Whether the acres are obtained from small farms or big farms, the objective is to reduce the plantings of allotted acreage.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it is all right to provide a 100-percent loan against reasonable amount of one's cropland, but if that is going to be done for some of the very large wheat acreages I think the Government may find itself in a position of paying more than the land is worth.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Secretary has wide discretion to prevent such abuses. He may enter into a contract unless he determines that such a contract will further the objectives of the acreage-reserve program. The point I desire to make is that the size of the farm should not make any difference—an allotted acre for wheat that is placed in the acreage reserve will contribute just as much to the reduction of surpluses, irrespective of the size of the farm operation from which it is diverted. This is not a handout to farmers—it is an incentive program designed to reduce production of the basic commodities.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware to strike out the last paragraph.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is not eligible, because the question is on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. Therefore, the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee would not be in order at this time.

Does the Senator from Indiana seek further recognition?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment to the Williams amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, while it is true that this amendment would restrict the authority of the Secretary to a certain extent, it seems to me that it is hardly likely that anyone would be expected to put enough land from any one farm in the acreage reserve, which would require a payment of over $25,000. Assuming a payment of $50 an acre, that would permit 500 acres to be retired.

I doubt that there are many farms in the country which would be adversely affected by the amendment. I think it would be helpful to the Secretary to place limitations on the payments which could be made to any one person.

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

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, I yield. I am speaking about payments under the acreage reserve program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that, and I am in agreement. I think a limitation of $25,000 on such payments is adequate, but I make the proviso that the proposition which undertakes to limit loans to $25,000. I wondered how the Senator from Vermont would feel about increasing the amount to $75,000.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand how the amendment reads the total of price support loans to any one farmer would be restricted to $50,000. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that there is a question as to whether that is adequate or not, because there are many families in the United States today who produce more than $50,000 worth of crops on one farm. Let us consider some of the basic commodities, for example, the orchard business. If a farm family in the orchard business does not produce over $50,000 worth of commodities, it had better get out of the business completely, because it has to buy all the equipment which is necessary.

Personally, I think a limitation of $50,000 on loans for commodities would be rather small. However, I think the amendment which the Senate is now called to vote on, limiting payments under the acreage reserve to any one farm to $25,000, would be helpful.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand the parliamentary situation. I am not in any doubt as to the parliamentary situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may we have order? I cannot hear.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not understand the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana is to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. AIKEN. Maybe we are referring to two different amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.
Mr. JENNBER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Georgia, the original amendment, which, on the suggestion of the Senator from Utah and other Senators, was changed to provide for $50,000, is applicable only to crop loans and raises $50,000 worth of the reserve payments. In other words, if both proposals are adopted, a farmer would be able to draw up to $25,000 under the existing-revenue program, which is, in effect, is for nonplanting, and on the land which he planted he would still be eligible to receive up to $50,000 for crop supports.

I point out to the Senator from Georgia that after the amendment is adopted the original amendment would be open to further amendment.

Mr. RUSSEL. If the Senator will yield, I do not want to make the $50,000 proposition too attractive by adding a provision for a $25,000 soil-bank payment to it. I am perfectly willing to support the soil-bank payment limitation of $40,000 because it is reasonable, but I think the $50,000 limitation on loans is inadequate and is going to pinch some farmers. The margin of profit on some farm commodities is very low, and a margin of $50,000 worth of commodities may not be earning more than $1,200 or $1,500 a year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment to the Senate from Georgia, that after this amendment to my amendment is agreed to, I shall vote against the amendment as amended, unless the limitation on the crop loans is substantially increased.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Georgia that after this amendment to my amendment is agreed to, I shall have the opportunity for him to offer an amendment providing the other figure.

Mr. RUSSEL. I think I understand the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under the parliamentary situation, I think that can be done without obtaining unanimous consent. However, if unanimous consent is required for this purpose, there will be an opportunity for him to offer an amendment providing the other figure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. JENNBER) to the amendment as modified, is subsequently rejected, both amendments will be rejected, in effect.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then, Mr. President, I misunderstood the Chair's previous announcement. As I now understand, the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is an amendment offered to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. ALLOTT. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] is necessarily absent. I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Corcoran] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 9, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aiken</th>
<th>Frerer</th>
<th>Millikin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algot</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Monroney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldensen</td>
<td>Goober</td>
<td>Morse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkley</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Munds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Hargers</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bender</td>
<td>Hickenlooper</td>
<td>Neuberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrnes</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Nourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricker</td>
<td>Hruska</td>
<td>Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td>Perlitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capuchart</td>
<td>Johnson, T. C.</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td>Johnston, S. C.</td>
<td>Schoppep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case, N. J.</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case, S. Dak.</td>
<td>Knowland</td>
<td>Smith, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chavez</td>
<td>Kuchel</td>
<td>Smith, N. J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clements</td>
<td>Langer</td>
<td>Sparkman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Lehman</td>
<td>Stennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Magnuson</td>
<td>Thurmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>Metcalfe</td>
<td>Upshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duff</td>
<td>Martinez, M.</td>
<td>Weiker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugger</td>
<td>Marschak</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewing</td>
<td>McCarthy</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervin</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAYS—9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastland</th>
<th>Hayden</th>
<th>McClellan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elenader</td>
<td>Kerr</td>
<td>Smathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulbright</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Stennis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOT VOTING—2

| Cotton | Kefauver |

So Mr. JENBER's amendment to Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], as amended.
Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move to amend the original amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware by striking out the figure $50,000 and inserting the figure $100,000.

This is the reason for my amendment: The amendment just adopted deals with monies which are paid directly to the farmer. The $25,000 limitation on payments to any one farmer in any one State under the acreage reserve program is, in my opinion, a fair limitation; but we are dealing with a whole different part of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware. We are there dealing with loans which are made to farmers.

There are many farmers who produce $50,000 worth of commodities but who make a very small margin of profit. Some of them even lose money when they produce $60,000 worth of commodities. The Government does not pay out that money. The Government has the commodity on hand, and it may lose something in some cases. However, the $25,000 figure, I believe, will cap the ceiling for many small farmers and many men who need this support program if it is to operate at all.

The Senators will vote for this much more realistic approach to the support program. Bear in mind, this figure does not refer to payments which are made. It refers merely to loans made on commodities. There is a very great difference between the two programs.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Has there been any limitation upon such loans heretofore?

Mr. RUSSELL. None to my knowledge. I do not think there has been any at all. Under the soil-conservation program, there have been limitations as to the amount paid certain farmers.

The limitation has been in the law at $10,000, although several years ago, in an amendment, we got it up to $25,000. But there has been no limitation heretofore upon the amount of loans. I can understand the concern of Senators over loans of three or four million dollars. However, a gross production of $100,000 on a farm does not mean that we are dealing with a big, rich farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not saying that the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia would not destroy what we are trying to accomplish, namely, to place in effect ceilings which are paid directly to the farmer. I never said that the Senate at this time not to accept the amendment, we can still impose a lower limitation later if it is considered necessary.

The major feature of the amendment now before us is the establishment of the principle of placing a ceiling on the amount of crop support which a farmer may receive, and to restrict such support to bona fide farmers. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNESS] provides a most constructive restriction on the operation of the acreage reserve program, and would prevent it from becoming a bonanza for absentee farmers.

I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote. However, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be rejected but if not I shall still urge the Senator to adopt the final amendment as modified.

The amendment of the Senator from Georgia will not destroy the principle of what we are trying to do, namely, place some ceiling on these benefits and keep the Government assistance for bona fide farmers.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator remember the figure which was placed in the Record, showing those who, in the past, had loans of more than $25,000? In the case of wheat, only 1,468 farmers received loans of more than $25,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know whether that table has been incorporated in the Record, but if it has not been incorporated I would like to incorporate it. If it is available to the Senator from Utah, I shall ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the Record.

Mr. WATKINS. It has already been made a part of the Record. I did so when I discussed this particular topic.

When it comes to corn, only 104 farmers received loans of more than $25,000. That does not affect very many farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. Personally, I am not concerned with the figure of $50,000. I think it is adequate. The major objective is to establish something which will prevent a farmer from receiving loans which are made for the purpose of price supports. It permits a farmer to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation to get a loan of $100,000.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I merely wish to say, in answer to the able Senator from Utah, that his figures, I am sure, are correct. That is the very reason why we have low farm prices and why we have surplus commodities. It is because the farmers have not been complying with the acreage controls to entitle them to support prices. The reason we have low farm prices and surpluses is that farmers have not been complying with acreage controls. If they do adopt this program, we will defeat what we are trying to do with respect to reducing surpluses and raising farm prices in the market place.

We will be defeating the very thing we are trying to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEY in the chair). The time is under the control of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Does the Senator from Georgia yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I reserve the remainder of my time. I shall be glad to yield back my time if the other side is willing to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. The chairman of the committee was so badly defeated a few minutes ago, that he hesitates to make any further suggestions.

However, the same argument which I made shortly ago to go from the $50,000 limitation on price supports applies also to the $100,000 limitation. Let us not forget that the loan program is not a subsidy. It permits a farmer who has complied with his allotted acres the right to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and obtain loans on his crops. The purpose of the program is to prevent the farmer from being compelled to dump his production on the market and in that way force the price down.

If we limit the amount of price-support loans to $100,000 per acre, it will mean that the larger grower of any commodity, whose production is in excess of $100,000, will have to sell or dump his crop on the market and thereby break the market. This certainly would be injurious not only to the Government, but eventually to all farmers.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, it would work two ways: First, the producer could not keep his crop off the market by putting it into the soil bank; and, second, the commodities he would produce on those acres he would have to dump on the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. My distinguished colleague is eminently correct. That was the second point I was about to raise. So far as the $25,000 limitation on the acreage reserve is concerned, that, in my humble judgment, will tie the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

As the bill is now written, the Secretary of Agriculture may go into a State where there are probably 2, 3, or 5 very small farmers who might be willing to underplant their acreage, thereby reducing production of commodities now in surplus. It should not make any difference to the Government where the reduction is made. It will cost just as much per acre whether we take them from a wheat grower who has 100,000 acres, or from 1 who has 10,000 acres, or from 1 who has 5,000 acres or 5 who have 2,000 acres. We are trying to do the same thing: to reduce the surplus and free the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. The chairman of the committee was so badly defeated a few minutes ago, that he hesitates to make any further suggestions.

However, the same argument which I made shortly ago to go from the $50,000 limitation on price supports applies also to the $100,000 limitation. Let us not forget that the loan program is not a subsidy. It permits a farmer who has complied with his allotted acres the right to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and obtain loans on his crops. The purpose of the program is to prevent the farmer from being compelled to dump his production on the market and in that way force the price down.

If we limit the amount of price-support loans to $100,000 per acre, it will mean that the larger grower of any commodity, whose production is in excess of $100,000, will have to sell or dump his crop on the market and thereby break the market. This certainly would be injurious not only to the Government, but eventually to all farmers.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, it would work two ways: First, the producer could not keep his crop off the market by putting it into the soil bank; and, second, the commodities he would produce on those acres he would have to dump on the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. My distinguished colleague is eminently correct. That was the second point I was about to raise. So far as the $25,000 limitation on the acreage reserve is concerned, that, in my humble judgment, will tie the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

As the bill is now written, the Secretary of Agriculture may go into a State where there are probably 2, 3, or 5 very small farmers who might be willing to underplant their acreage, thereby reducing production of commodities now in surplus. It should not make any difference to the Government where the reduction is made. It will cost just as much per acre whether we take them from a wheat grower who has 100,000 acres, or from 1 who has 10,000 acres, or from 1 who has 5,000 acres or 5 who have 2,000 acres. We are trying to do the same thing: to reduce the surplus and free the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. The chairman of the committee was so badly defeated a few minutes ago, that he hesitates to make any further suggestions.

However, the same argument which I made shortly ago to go from the $50,000 limitation on price supports applies also to the $100,000 limitation. Let us not forget that the loan program is not a subsidy. It permits a farmer who has complied with his allotted acres the right to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and obtain loans on his crops. The purpose of the program is to prevent the farmer from being compelled to dump his production on the market and in that way force the price down.

If we limit the amount of price-support loans to $100,000 per acre, it will mean that the larger grower of any commodity, whose production is in excess of $100,000, will have to sell or dump his crop on the market and thereby break the market. This certainly would be injurious not only to the Government, but eventually to all farmers.
Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the statement just made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I wish the record clearly to state that the reason I voted for the preceding amendment was that the spokesman for the administration—and the soil-bank programs, the senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I think it is—I opposed the nonpopularity proposal—had stated publicly on the floor that the $25,000 limitation is adequate to take care of it. That is the only reason I voted for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. When was that statement made? It was not made before the committee. There was no limitation before the committee on payments for a voluntary acreage reserve program. That was never mentioned.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand. If the distinguished chairman will allow me to continue, I should like to say that, while the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia is vastly preferable to the original form of the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I still think it is a limitation, and I think it is unrealistic. It is coupled now with the $25,000 limitation on the acreage reserve. The acreage reserve is presumed to be, in general, about a 100 or a 50 percent reduction of the production value would be if the acreage was actually used to produce. Therefore, the $25,000 acreage reserve limitation is about equal to $50,000 of total production.

If the $100,000 figure advanced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is adopted, it would mean that we would be applying a limitation which is completely out of line with what we have been planning, because I have not heard anyone suggest that it is hoped to retire in the soil bank one-third of the acreage of any sizable holdings. That puts the production value $100,000, so that the estimate is about the $100,000 productive value, and I believe it indicates very clearly that we are not adopting a limitation which is in line with the real program, that of retiring 10 to 15 percent of the farmers.

As the distinguished chairman of the committee well knows, the 2 figures would be hopelessly inconsistent with each other in the 2 phases of the program, and I would desire to see even the more generous figure suggested by the Senator from Georgia adopted, although I greatly prefer his figure to the one originally suggested by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Therefore I completely agree with the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, in the argument he has made.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it the principle of the bill that there be an incentive to retire allotted acres as reserve acres on a purely voluntary basis under the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Then, as I have understood the chairman of the committee, he has stated to the Senate that his reliance upon this feature, the bill to bring about the retirement of adequate acres to bring production into balance with demand has been, first, that it is voluntary; second, that there is an added incentive to bring about a retirement of allotted acres; and, third, that if the incentive is held out, and possibly 25 or 50 or 75 percent of the farmers do not retire, the whole percentage may respond to the extent that the overall program will be successful in bringing about the retirement of an adequate number of allotted acres to accomplish the result of a $100,000 reduction to bring it in line with demand?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Then, is it not a fact that the $25,000 limitation which we have placed on the reserve- acre-retirement program is a brake or a self-imposed limitation upon the opportunity of the farmers to make it successful?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it is a brake that the Congress will have imposed, should the so-called Jenner amendment become law.

Mr. KERR. Having placed that limitation, if we place a $100,000 limitation on the loan available to a farmer who produces from his allotted acres which he does not retire from production, under another phase of the soil-bank program, it is merely another limitation which will result, in many cases, in the production of an amount greater than the $100,000 would provide for, thereby creating production which would not be available for loans, and thereby creating a further weight on the overall market for the particular product?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that the farmer, either large or small, would be limited in his production because of acreage allotments. In other words, he could not increase his acreage base without incurring marketing penalties.

Mr. KERR. I am talking about his allotted acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. KERR. So if he has a large number of allotted acres under the existing law, then, under the amendment just adopted, he could not retire enough to consume $100,000 without the limit of being limited with the limitation on his allotted acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I am complaining about. He may be 1 or 2...
or 3 in the community who might be willing to retire a large proportion of his acreage. Actually, while the remaining farmers in the area refuse to participate in the acreage reserve.

Mr. KERR. Having done that, if he still has allotted acres sufficient to produce crops at present under their allotted acres valued at more than $100,000, such a producer could place only $100,000 of his crop under price support loans, and if he could not find anyone to finance his retaining the rest of it until the market price firmied up, he would have to dump his product on the market and thereby ruin the market, not only for himself, but for all other farmers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe the conclusion of the Senator from Oklahoma is quite correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understood the Senator from Oklahoma, he was referring to the operation on allotted acres. There are many wheat producers who produce crops at present under their allotted acres valued at more than $100,000. Such a producer could place only $100,000 of his crop under price support loans, and if he could not find anyone to finance his retaining the rest of it until the market price firmied up, he would have to dump his product on the market and thereby ruin the market, not only for himself, but for all other farmers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The wheat producer would have to have his certificate to qualify him to sell his wheat. If he were in excess of his allotted acres, of course he would be under penalty if he sold any wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. So, we have a problem here. While we admit that only a few producers should have an allotment of $50,000, we would foreclose the membership of possibly many acres from wheat, because that would put the farm operators in a position where they could not qualify one way or the other. Therefore, I think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia might have more commonsense than is indicated simply by the figure $100,000 as against $50,000. Other factors must be considered. First, we must have compliance with acreage allotments, and if the farmer is growing more wheat than is represented by a loan of $100,000 or a loan of $50,000, we simply foreclose that man's farm operations, because we deny him the right to a commodity loan when he is in compliance in every other respect.

I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia is sound. On the face of it, we might question the figure of $100,000, but when we stop to consider precisely the situation, it is not unreasonable to permit a farmer to remain in compliance and to qualify for a commodity loan. If we fail to do that, it seems to me we shall place the entire program in jeopardy.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I state to my good friend from Minnesota that if the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator is adopted in its present form, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Utah. But the point I am making is that in the case of a farmer who produces cotton far in excess of his allotment, we are in the position of having to go along with it if he cannot borrow on it to pay current expenses and things of that kind? The answer is obvious—he is going to dump the commodity on the market.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield, that is exactly the reason why I say that even though the farmer may be in complete compliance, he would be denied a loan, and the ultimate result would be noncompliance, which would jeopardize the entire program in its entirety.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. As he knows, the Secretary of Agriculture has already established acreage allotments for the basic crops. One of the assumptions was the basis for the crop, the assumption that the law then on the statute books would be the one by which he would be guided. But here we are changing the rules in the middle of the game.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is entirely correct. We have noted that a few commodity loans were in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, and no one would expect that to remain in a situation. However, if we prevent many farmers from qualifying for commodity loans, we shall place the entire program in jeopardy.

Mr. THYE. It is for that reason that I say to my friend that even though some of us are critical of allowing one individual producer a loan of $50,000, the entire program might well be jeopardized if we restrict it that we make it impractical and impossible for producers to comply.

On wheat a double restriction is imposed. First, an acreage allotment; second, if the operator will be required to enable the farmer to market what he might produce in excess of the quota. Thereby, he will be denied the right to sell in excess of his quota.

On cotton, the producer might sell in excess of the amount permitted by the program, because we say he cannot get a commodity loan in excess of $50,000. He will say, "What is the use? That would be only a fraction of my crop," therefore, I will disregard the acreage allotment; I will disregard the program. I will try to sell on the open market for what I can get."

Then, without compliance, more cotton will be thrown on the market than would have been the case if a higher commodity limit had been established as a $100,000 limit, thereby assuring a greater degree of compliance on the part of the producer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, an effort is now being made, I am sure, by many Senators to carry out the suggestion made by the President in his message to Congress. His recommendation No. 4 is headed "Dollar Limit On Price Support," and reads as follows: "The average size of American farms in American agriculture, as measured by capital or by acres, has rapidly increased. To the extent that this trend is associated with more efficient farm units, it is in the interest of farm families and of the Nation. To the degree, therefore, that the removal of risk for large farm business by reason of price supports, it is much less wholesome and constitutes a threat to the traditional family farm."

When that matter was discussed before our committee with the Under Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants, they realized the proposal was still in the process of being studied, and they were not ready. He is not going to do the job that he has to do, and he wants to do it carefully. He wants to do it even more carefully, and it may be a long time before we are ready to take any action on that. If you will look at the table, the small farmer is concerned about the little farmer just cannot afford to do it without a loan. The little farmer just cannot afford to do it without a loan. He cannot afford to do it. He cannot afford to do it because he is growing more wheat than is to be sold on the open market for what I would have to do it. He cannot afford to do it because he is growing more wheat than is to be sold on the open market for what I would have to do it. He cannot afford to do it because he is growing more wheat than is to be sold on the open market for what I would have to do it. He cannot afford to do it because he is growing more wheat than is to be sold on the open market for what I would have to do it.
care, if we want more production instead of less production, then go ahead and place a limitation on the farmers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 2 minutes to me, so that I may reply to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Would the Senator from Indiana object to a $100,000 loan limitation?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would object to any limitations.

Mr. THYE. The Senator would object to any limitation whatever?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, because any kind of limitation would defeat the very thing we were trying to accomplish.

Mr. THYE. That was my contention; but the $100,000 limitation would, in my opinion, meet the basic objectives sought.

In the case of cotton, if a farmer is disqualified from getting a commodity loan, then he may stay outside the program and pay the price of the absentee farmers.

On oaks, 43,845 loans were under $5,000; 4,800 were between $5,000 and $10,000; 59 loans were between $10,000 and $25,000; and only 10 loans in the entire United States were over $25,000.

On barley, 33,185 loans were under $5,000; 518 loans were between $5,000 and $10,000; 183 were between $10,000 and $25,000; and only 3 loans were in excess of $25,000.

On soybeans, 59,717 loans were under $5,000; 746 were between $5,000 and $10,000; 56 loans were between $10,000 and $25,000; and only 5 loans were in excess of $25,000 for soybeans.

When the figure is raised to $50,000 or $100,000, a substantial number of those loans would be eliminated.

Less than one-fourth of their acreage would be affected, even by the $25,000 figure. Increasing the amount to $100,000 would reduce the number by at least half.

The amendment previously adopted, which the Senator from Indiana is a substantial part of the program. It would limit the payment which any single farmer could receive under the soil bank plan to $25,000.

As an example, there is one farmer in this country, who has a $40,000 wheat-acreage allotment. He would be eligible to receive a check from the United States Government for $3,400,000 for doing nothing but letting one-half of his farm operations stay idle.

Certainly we are not trying to take care of that family, and I am not joining the Senator from Indiana in taking care of it.

I urge the Senate to adopt both these amendments, placing some safeguards on the expenditures, thereby limiting the benefits to real farmers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me, so that I may answer the Senator who answered?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I shall vote for the Russell amendment to the Williams amendment, but when and if it is adopted, or if it is adopted, I see no alternative but to vote against the Williams amendment.

I favor the limitation of loan benefits to the farmer. I favor that, however, in connection with a program of an adequate amount of incentive to bring about the retirement of allotted acres.

As I understand, the soil bank proposal as it came to the Senate, contained a section calculated to provide incentives to bring about retirement of allotted acreage.

It embodied a provision which was unrestricted, whereby if the Secretary could not secure retirement by operators of average sized farms, he could secure very substantial retirement of acreage from big farmers.

Under the adoption of the Jenner amendment, we have limited the Secretary to such an extent that we do not know whether he will be able to bring about the retirement of an adequate number of acres.

Having done that, we then fix it so that if a man wants to plant all of his allotted acres, and have enough to produce more than $25,000, he can do so.

Unfortunately, he has no alternative except either to hold them out of production without compensation, or put them into production and dump his production on the market, regardless of price, although he may be in full compliance with the provisions of the law with reference to the allotment of acres.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the Russell amendment should be adopted, but then I think the Williams amendment, as amended by the Jenner amendment, would have to be defeated, or we would have an impossible soil bank to work.

Mr. WATKINS. Those are farmers who have not been complying with acreage controls. Had they complied with acreage controls, there would not have been any surplus.

With high prices for the farmer. That is the reason why we are considering the pending measures. The farmers have not complied with acreage reductions, and they have grown more in the past year.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 2 more minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Why would they not be taken care of by the $50,000 provision? According to the past history, only 104 corn farmers complied.

Mr. CAPEHART. Only 104 corn farmers who complied with acreage controls. A farmer has to comply with acreage controls before he can take advantage of the rest of the program. Corn farmers generally did not do that. Only 104 were complied. The acreage surpluses were piled up. That is why we have low prices.

Mr. WATKINS. With $50,000 it would take in practically every farmer, and with $100,000 there would be only 5 or 6 exceptions in the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Where does the Senator get his figures?

Mr. WATKINS. From the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CAPEHART. Those are figures of farmers who complied with acreage controls and took advantage of support prices. Those few did. There must be hundreds and hundreds more who did not. That is why there are the huge surpluses. That is why we have low prices.

That is the aspect the Senator is overlooking. The figures prove very poorly, because the Senator knows there are more than 104 farmers in the United States who are growing those quantities. The Senator is trying to do, because the little farmer cannot reduce his acreage. He cannot put anything in the soil bank. He does.
not have enough acreage now. If acre-
age reductions are not obtained from the
high, it may or may not be obtained. If
acreage reductions are not obtained, there
will be more surpluses, and there will be lower farm prices rather than higher farm prices. I think I know what I am talking about.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I would not want to leave the record with the suggestion that the farmers had not complied with the provision of the Senate. The Chair has ruled that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], dealing with the withdrawal of some cotton, has not been voted on. So, I rise today not to reopen the issue or to debate its merits, but merely to advise the Senate that a new precedent was established; and that, therefore, the point of order was not well taken. If the Speaker is still examining the precedents in the other body, where the Speaker by custom many times votes only to unite an issue, we must be prepared for it. So I am not now undertaking, as I have said, to reopen the issue or to debate its merits or demerits, but I rise merely to advise the Senate that an unprecedented situation has been established.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Tennessee to say that in the House, the Speaker can vote to unite a tie vote?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. Mr. President, the situation before the Senate is this: If there is a parliamentary procedure by which an issue is closed, it is the making of a motion to reconsider, and then the laying of that motion on the table. Indeed, in this particular case the author of the amendment, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], moved to reconsider. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Knowland] moved to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to. That is as final an act as the Clerk may have a right to do, and custom, that is generally the only time when the Speaker does vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. But if he had voted on a yea-and-nay vote, then he has a right to do that too. I am a Member of the House, he could not thereafter vote to unite a tie vote in which he had participated.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. President, on Friday the Junior Senator from Tennessee made a point of order that after an issue had been settled, after a motion to reconsider had been laid on the table, no Senator then could change his vote upon recapitula-
tion; nor could the Vice President then vote.

I rise today merely to advise the Sen-
ate that I, my staff, and to some extent the Senator from Indiana, I am sure, have been watching the situation over the weekend. Insofar as we can ascertain, a new situation was presented to the Senate. Within a narrow field it was an unprecedented action.

If I did not rise today to attempt to re-
open it. The distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Knowland] was eminently correct in his observation that whatever rights may have been available to the junior Senator from Tennessee or to any other Senator, expired for failure to challenge the para-
liminary ruling, immediately after the ruling was made. So I rise today not to reopen the issue or to debate its merits or demerits, but I rise merely to advise the Senate that an unprecedented situation has been established.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Tennessee to say that in the House, the Speaker can vote to unite a tie vote?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. Mr. President, the situation before the Senate is this: If there is a parliamentary procedure by which an issue is closed, it is the making of a motion to reconsider, and then the laying of that motion on the table. Indeed, in this particular case the author of the amendment, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], moved to reconsider. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Knowland] moved to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to. That is as final an act as the Clerk may have a right to do, and custom, that is generally the only time when the Speaker does vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. But if he had voted on a yea-and-nay vote, then he has a right to do that too. I am a Member of the House, he could not thereafter vote to unite a tie vote in which he had participated.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. President, the situation before the Senate is this: If there is a parliamentary procedure by which an issue is closed, it is the making of a motion to reconsider, and then the laying of that motion on the table. Indeed, in this particular case the author of the amendment, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], moved to reconsider. The distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Knowland] moved to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to. That is as final an act as the Clerk may have a right to do, and custom, that is generally the only time when the Speaker does vote.
I am prepared to concede that the moral suasion presented so eloquently and the Junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KNOWLAND] was strong. Certainly the Vice President should have been allowed to unite the issue. But the proper way to have done it, according to the parliamentary rules, was to reconsider the issue. Procedure by which to do that was open to the Senate. That procedure, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, was not taken. For that reason, the Junior Senator from Tennessee raised a point of order—not to deny the Vice President a right, but to direct him the right to vote unless and until the parliamentary rules governing the procedure in the Senate were followed.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Junior Senator from Tennessee aware of the fact that the error which occurred at the desk was not determined until the ye­an­d­nay vote on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was well under way?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I merely wanted to ask the Senator whether he was aware of that fact.

Mr. GORE. Yes. I think that adds strength to the moral position taken by the senior Senator from California. However, conflicting parliamentary interpretations and views were rendered by the two Houses, and I am unable to understand fully what the distinguished Senator from Texas has said.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate, but I do not want the statements made by the Senator from Tennessee to stand unchal­lenged.

In the first place, I desire to call the attention of the Senate again to the debate which occurred in connection with this matter, as it appears in the Congres­sional Record of March 9, 1956, commencing at page 4427. The parli­amentary situation which was presented the other evening—as Senators who then were present will recall—was that on the vote on the so-called Alkire amendment, the Vice President, who was then presiding, was misinformed as to the result, and he recorded it as 46 years to 45 nays.

The customary motion to reconsider was made by the Senator from Vermont, and I made the motion to lay that motion on the table. That motion was car­ried by a vote of 46 to 41. It was subse­quent to that time that the quorum and discussion to which I have referred took place.

As was pointed out the other evening, the Vice President was in the chair and presiding during this whole time. He has a constitutional right to break a tie. He has an opportunity to vote only when there is a tie. Had the vote been the other way, and had the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont been lost 46 to 45, obviously the Vice Presi­dent would not have been able to vote. He was not able to vote on the basis of the roll call announced from the Clerk that the motion had carried 46 to 45. It was only when the recapitulation took place and when it was determined that the vote was a tie, that the Vice President, in accordance with the Constitution, had the right to cast his vote.

As the minority leader stated the other night, the Senate having gone through the process of a vote, and announcement having been made based upon mis­information given to the Chair that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont had carried, and we hav­ing won a second victory—if the first announcement had been correct—by the motion to lay on the table, which car­ried by an even larger margin, at that time the distinguished majority leader may have been to some extent misled in his interpretation of the facts. But there was no discrepancy, because one of the clerks had got one total and an­other a different total, and asked that there be a recount.

Some discussion took place at that point, but before the question was finally decided the minority leader raised the question as to whether or not we would be permitted under the same parliamentary situation which would have been presented had the correct to­tal been given to the Chair. It was made very clear at that point the Vice President would have been permitted.

It was only upon this parliamentary ruling that the minority leader then asked that Members on this side of the aisle join in the request of the majority leader that there be a recount. Of course, the Record is very clear in that regard.

It is not the contention of the mi­nority leader, nor is it the contention at that time—that when that una­nious consent was given, when the parli­amentary ruling was requested of the Chair, and when that ruling was not challenged by any Member, and when the Senate, in its wisdom, gave its una­nious consent, at that point it had the effect of rolling back the legislative pro­cess to what it would have been at the time the vote was announced, had it been correctly announced at that point. I believe that view is sustained by the fact that when this entire operation was concluded the minority leader then asked unanimous consent that the pre­vious vote, by which the motion of the Senator from Vermont was laid upon the table, should be considered, with­out the necessity of rolling back to make that motion all over again.

Some mention has been made of the precedents in the House. For the in­formation of the minority leader, there would likely be three points to read into the Record at this point two precedents which I think have some interest in this connection.

Hind's Precedents of the House of Rep­resentatives, section 5963, volume 5:

The Speaker has voted when a correction on the day after the rollcall has created a condition wherein his vote would be dele­

Where a Member votes and the Journal fails to include his name among the yeas and nays, he may demand a correction as a matter of right before the approval of the Journal.

On December 4, 1876, the House, by a vote of 156 yeas to 78 nays—exactly the two­thirds vote required—suspended the rules and passed a resolution declaring that Abram S. Hewitt, of New York, providing for special committees to investigate the recent presidential election in Louisiana, Florida, and South Carolina.

On the following day, December 5, Mr. Nance, of Banks, of Mississippi, moved that the Journal and Records of the House be corrected as to include the name of Mr. Harris M. Plaisted, of Maine, in the negative on the adoption of the resolution, submitted the previous day by Mr. Abram S. Hewitt.

The Speaker decided that it was the right of the gentleman from Maine to have his vote recorded upon the said resolution, upon the statement made by Mr. Plaisted that he did vote in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. Benoni S. Fuller, of Indiana, asked that the Journal and Records might be further corrected to show that the decision was affirmative upon the aforesaid resolution, stating that he was present and so voted and his name was omitted.

The Speaker decided, as in the case of Mr. Plaisted, that the gentleman from Indiana was entitled to have his name recorded.

Therefore the names of Mr. Plaisted and Mr. Fuller were recorded, the first in the negative and the last­named Member in the affirmative on the adoption of the afo­resaid resolution.

After the two votes had been recorded the Speaker said:

"The votes on the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. Hewitt, as announced, was, ayes 166, noes 78. There were two votes challenged, and if corrected, would have made the vote 157 to 79. The Speaker was ready on yesterday to have voted, as was his constitutional right, if his vote would have produced a result either way; and if the Journal had shown the vote to be 157 to 79 he would have voted in the affirmative, still making the two­thirds. ** * * * The Chair must insist upon his right to vote in those instances that his vote is the deciding result. ** * * The Chair, then, exercises that right, and asks that his vote may be re­corded in the affirmative."

The other House precedent is, from Hind's Precedents of the House of Represent­atives, section 5970:

In case of error, whereof the correction leaves decisive effect to the Speaker's vote, he may exercise his right even though the result has been announced.

The Speaker's name is not on the voting roll and is not ordinarily called.

On July 19, 1882, during the consideration of the contested election case of Small v. Tiller, the question was taken on the reso­lution declaring that Tillner was not elec­ted, etc., and the announcement was made that there were yeas 145, nays 1, not voting 145.

The vote was next taken on the resolution declaring that Smalls was elected, etc., and there were yeas 140, nays 5, not voting 145.

The vote total of 145—1 less than a quorum—yeas 141, nays 6, a total of 146—just a quorum.

The Speaker thereupon announced that on the vote preceding the last there had been an error in the tabulation, and that in reality the result on the resolution declaring Till­man not elected had been yeas 144, nays 1, total of 145—less than a quorum—yeas 141, nays 6, a total of 146—just a quorum.

The Speaker declared that he would vote, and did so, making the result 145 yeas and 1 nay—a quorum voting.
Mr. Gibson Atherton, of Ohio, made the point of order that the Speaker might not vote in such a manner.

After debate, the Speaker (Samuel J. Randall) cited precedent. In 1808, 1809 to show that such a vote was proper. He further said: "In the rule or practice for the Speaker's name to be called in the regular rollcall, and therefore the Speaker did not show his rollcard. He therefore Members do, nor does he come within the provision of the rule which is applicable to other Members whose names are upon the roll."

Therefore the Speaker held that, while a Member might not have his vote recorded at the conclusion of the rollcall, the Speaker might.

On the following day a resolution providing for an examination of this act of the Speaker was introduced and debated, but subsequently withdrawn after a full discussion of the matter.

Of course, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Barkey) is eminently correct when he says that the Speaker has a right, as a Member of the House, to vote upon any issue. However, custom does not suggest that does not appear on the rollcard, and apparently the custom in that body is for him not to cast his vote. The precedents I have cited indicate, however, that when errors had been found after they had passed his right so to speak, he did exercise it. The difference between the two Presiding Officers is that under the Constitution the Vice President has a right to vote only in case of a tie. Unless the vote is correctly announced as a tie, of course, he has no right to vote under the Constitution.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Over the weekend I have had an opportunity to examine both the precedents which the distinguished senior Senator from California cites, and other precedents. In neither of the precedents which he has cited is there indication that the Senate has understood its position of reopening an issue on which a motion to reconsider had been laid upon the table. It is that particular element which has not been, so far as the record, or my staff has been able to find, before either the House or the Senate.

If the Senator from California will indulge me further, I should like to say it is true that the Vice President has a constitutional right to unite a vote in the Senate. Likewise, every Senator has a constitutional right to vote on any issue before the Senate. However, both the Senator and the Vice President must exercise their constitutional right of voting at such time and under such circumstances as that opportunity is available.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The very difference is that a Member of the Senate has his opportunity and right and privilege and obligation to vote when the roll is called. The Vice President possesses both a vote until the vote of the Senate has been tabulated, to determine whether it is a tie vote. It is only when it has been determined that it is a tie vote that the Vice President can exercise his constitutional responsibilities.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The question comes down to the ability of the Senate to close an issue before the Senate, and then abide by the rules to reopen that issue. The opportunity was available to the Senate in two ways. Indeed, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Knowland) said there was an unanimous-consent request that the vote be reconsidered in order to preserve orderly procedure in the Senate and to afford the Vice President the right to vote. That consent was offered to reopen the issue further into the argument, but merely to say that, rightly or wrongly, a precedent was set in the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The protection of the benefit of the Members of the Senate who were not present on Friday at the time this matter came up I should like to read from the Record of March 9, at page 4428, following the column:

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The Vice President. The Senator from California asks me a question regarding the precedents which the distinguished Senator from Vermont has referred to. That Senator has made two propositions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know what the recapitulation will show; but if the recapitulation shall show a tie vote, will the point where it would have been at that point if a tie vote had been announced?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct; and the Vice President then would have one of those rare opportunities to break a tie.

Mr. President, it seems to me that that is a compelling factor in this situation. The fact that the Members of the Senate had an opportunity to examine both the precedents of the 1803, and the other precedents. In neither of the rulings, or the giving of parliamentary advice by the Speaker, is it clear that, while the Vice President may have had the privilege of making a motion to reconsider, and I would not have had the privilege of making a motion to lay his motion on the table, because to do so a Senator must have voted with the prevailing side.

In that case the prevailing side would have been the side of the opponents of the amendment, because we would have lost the vote, instead of having won it.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In that event, even though the Vice President may have returned 2 days or 2 weeks later, if the issue was still unresolved before the Senate, he could have then voted. However, the Senate proceeded, not according to the rules, but according to the ability Senator from California has described, but proceeded to lay upon the table, by motion of the senior Senator from California, a motion to reconsider, thereby, in effect, quarantining the procedure available to the Senator was concerned, closing the door on that issue. There were two ways to reopen it, but neither way was used.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I respectfully differ. One way was used, and that was by unanimous consent given by the Senate to roll back the legislative process to that point. I think that was understood by all Senators.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. There is one point which I believe should be noted in the Record. I tried to get it into the Record the other night when the debate was under way. I should say that it was a very interesting debate indeed. The purpose of the rules of the Senate, it seems to me, as well as of the precedents of the Senate, is to bring out what the true sense of the Senate is in connection with any vote.

It seems perfectly clear from the Record, by virtue of the remarks of the majority leader, the remarks of the minority leader, and the remarks of the Vice President, on pages 4427 and 4428, that the whole purpose of the recapitulation was to find out what the true sense of the Senate was at that time. That was the purpose of the recapitulation.

If our good friend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee had his way when he raised his point of order, then indeed the true sense of the Senate could not have been had, because the Vice
President would have been deprived of his vote. I believe the Republicans should show the right of the Senator from Tennessee to raise that point of order would have been after the announcement of the Vice President:

The Vice President. That is correct; and the Vice President then would have one of those rare opportunities to break a tie.

If that parliamentary point was to have been raised, that was the time it should have been raised. Otherwise the purpose of raising it would only have been defeated the opportunity to find out what the sense of the Senate was.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who has always been interested in parliamentary procedure and has studied the subject for a great many years, I think I was prouder last Friday night to be a Member of this body than I had ever been previously. I think the majority leader, the minority leader, and the Vice President, following parliamentary practice, acted quickly, accurately, and honorably. It seems to be that at the result of the vote for the benefit of the whole country.

As the Senator from Connecticut has said, the majority leader, the minority leader, and I think the whole country.

Mr. President, as soon as the error of Friday night was discovered, the majority leader brought the matter to the attention of the Vice President and of the minority leader, and those men acted as honorable leaders of this body. Every Member of the Senate was put on his honor and lived up to that obligation by not trying to take any advantage of the extraordinary parliamentary procedure that has been laid down in this body. I think they are marvelously accurate, of the votes and the result of the vote for the benefit of the whole country.

If we are going to carry forward the debates in this body and get the desired result, they must be conducted as accurately, as factually, and as honorably as they can be conducted. Parliamentary rules are based on the honor of the Members of this body correctly following the procedures laid down in parliamentary practice over the years.

Mr. President, as soon as the error of Friday night was discovered, the majority leader brought the matter to the attention of the Vice President and of the minority leader, and those men acted as honorable leaders of this body. Every Member of the Senate was put on his honor and lived up to that obligation by not trying to take any advantage of the extraordinary parliamentary procedure that has been laid down in this body. I think they are marvelously accurate, of the votes and the result of the vote for the benefit of the whole country.

The Senate from Tennessee, who brought this situation up, is an honor to be a Member of this body. The Senator from California has raised that point of order. That is correct; and of the way in which it was handled on both sides of the aisle and by the Vice President, the Vice President, on the advice of the Parliamentarian. I think we can be very well satisfied, on whichever side we were, that the result was brought out by the final vote.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Vice President from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, we may be setting a precedent here. If so, I think it is a very good one. The situation was such that the majority had voted "Yea." The minority leader was with the prevailing side. The result was announced. There was a motion to reconsider and a motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider. The motion to lay on the table had carried.

Thereafter, a unanimous-consent request was made to recapitulate the vote. The minority leader agreed to that. It required unanimous consent to recapitulate. When the Vice President made it, was a tie vote. If anyone had urged at that time that the Vice President did not have a right to break the tie, the unanimous-consent request might well have been objected to unless the right of the Vice President had been protected.

When Senators were asked to vote, they make a mistake, of course, it is honest. If it turns out that it is not an accurate record, if a mistake is later discovered, it cannot deprive the Vice President of his constitutional right to vote in case of a tie. Therefore, I think the Vice President had a right to vote. I am not sure that it required a unanimous-consent agreement to recapitulate the vote. The Vice President would have a right to vote.

The situation in the House of Representatives is different. The Speaker can name a tie vote in the House. The House has a fundamental right to vote as a Member of the House. By custom, the Speaker's name is called, but he can always order that his name be called in order, to vote as a Member of the House.

The situation in the House of Representatives is different. The Speaker can name a tie vote in the House. The House has a fundamental right to vote as a Member of the House. By custom, the Speaker's name is called, but he can always order that his name be called in order, to vote as a Member of the House. But when he asks that his name be called, he is asking it as a Member of the House, which he has the right to do.

I have asked the Senate from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to remain in the Chamber for a moment, because I recall that when I was the majority leader a very long time ago as a Member of the Senate from Oregon, Mr. McNary, was the minority leader, there had been a yea-
Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is quite correct, and he has stated the matter of fact, the bill was lost on a tie vote. As I recall, the vote was 38 to 38, although I am not certain of the figures.

The Senator from Kentucky will recall that every effort was made to find the then Vice President of the United States, Mr. Henry Wallace, in order to break the tie. The Vice President could not be located, and the resolution was passed by a majority of one vote.

Upon reading the newspaper that evening, in which the vote was recorded, as the newspapers used to do quite regularly, the result of the vote was shown as 38 to 38. It happened to notice that my name was not listed.

The next morning I came to the Chamber early and consulted with the majority leader, with the Parliamentary Counsel, and with other persons. A resolution was prepared to vacate the entire proceedings and to amend the Journal, so as to make it reflect the truth that the bill had passed by a majority of one vote, whatever the vote was.

I apprehended that a very violent debate might take place on the resolution; but as soon as the resolution was offered, the then minority leader, Mr. McNary, rose in his place and said that he had heard the Senator from Georgia vote, and knew how he had voted. He chided me, as I recall, because, as he said, I did not have quite the same information as a general proposition, and he thought also that I should have stayed in the Chamber during the recitation. But he acquiesced in the result of the resolution, and by unanimous consent the resolution to correct the Journal and make it show that the bill had passed was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Georgia for confirming my recollection of the incident. The action was taken by offering a resolution to correct the Journal and the Record and to enable the Senator from Georgia to vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. To make the Journal show the truth as to how I had voted.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct, even though the Senator had adjourned over night and had come back the next day and discovered its error.

The point I wish to make is that the Senate cannot, under any circumstances, correct an error in a yes-and-no vote, because it is the fundamental right of every Senator to vote and to be recorded as to how he votes. Therefore, I doubt very much that unanimous consent was necessary in order to vacate the record of the vote, and to show that the Senator from Georgia voted and how he voted. As the Senator from Georgia said, the Senator from Oregon, Mr. McNary, rose and said he remembered that the Senator from Georgia had voted, and recalled how he had voted.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have read the precedent concerning the distinguished Junior Senator from Georgia. It involved almost precisely the procedure which the Junior Senator from Tennessee requested Friday evening, to wit, unanimous consent that the vote be reconsidered.

I agree with the distinguished Junior Senator from Georgia. It involved almost precisely the procedure which the Junior Senator from Tennessee requested Friday evening, to wit, unanimous consent that the vote be reconsidered.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; except that the Constitution prescribes the only way in which the Vice President can vote; while a Senator can vote under any conditions in the Senate.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. To my mind, there is a great deal of difference between the right of the Vice President to vote in this body and the right of a Senator to vote. It is often said that the Senate can do anything by unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. That remark was made by a former Vice President, who is still living in Texas and is healthy at the age of 87.

Mr. RUSSELL. We know that, practically speaking, his statement is correct, because when a Senator acquiesces in unanimous consent, he waives his right. But I do not believe the Senate, even by unanimous consent, can deprive the Vice President of his right to vote. The Constitution says that the Vice President can vote in case of a tie. That is the only proceeding which take in the proceedings of the Senate.

If a Senator were to ask unanimous consent that the Vice President not be permitted to vote, the Vice President would have the right to object; but I think that he could not be denied his constitutional right to vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator from Georgia about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a great deal of difference between the right of a Senator to vote and depriving the Vice President of his constitutional right to vote in the one instance in which he may vote. Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose that last Friday night, for instance, unanimous consent had been given with reference to the vote on the motion to reconsider. Was the Vice President to be deprived of his constitutional right to vote because some Senator objected to unanimous consent to vacate the vote or to change something in the Record? I do not think so, because the Constitution says that in case of a tie vote, which is a constitutional, fundamental right.

If last Friday night the Senator from Tennessee, or any other Senator, had objected to unanimous consent, and it had been withheld, so that the vote on the motion to reconsider had stood, although the result might have been the reverse which was reversed at a later time based upon a falsity, an inaccurate record, or a mistake, do Senators mean to tell me that the right of the Vice President would be denied, even by the unanimous consent of the Senate, whether the error had been discovered that afternoon or the next day, was to be denied, because some Senator rose and objected to unanimous consent? I do not think so. It is often said that the Vice President has a right to vote in case of a tie. If the Motion to reconsider had stood, I do not think so.

Mr. BUSH. Or even an adverse vote of the Senate could not deprive him of the right to vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think it could.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to express my personal appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for the observations he has made. I had the feeling a little earlier that possibly this precedent had its origin in a matter of courtesy or upon a matter of the granting or withholding of unanimous consent which, while sound in this case, is not necessary. It is one of the rights of the distinguished minority leader, Mr. KNOWLAND, might not always be in evidence.

Personally, I agree entirely with the point of view so ably expressed by the Senator from Kentucky, who is a distinguished former Vice President of this body, that the constitutional right of the Vice President to vote in case of a tie comes into operation at the moment the tie vote is determined and that no rule of the Senate and no agreement can destroy it if he is present then to exercise it. I should like to make this further observation: During the time I was a Member of the House of Representatives, I took a great deal of interest in the rules of that body. I recall that recitation of rules was never entirely uncommon. But a recitation was never an idle thing. That is, a recitation was not made simply for the purpose of having the name of the rule read again; a recitation was made for the purpose of determining whether a vote had been accurately recorded and accurately reported.

If a recitation showed that an error had been made, then an opportunity...
was given to correct the error, whether the error was an error in the addition of the votes cast or an error in a failure to record a vote which had been actually cast.

As has been pointed out, the Speaker of the House of Representatives is a duly elected Member of that body and may vote on any question if he so desires. His name is not called customarily, but only when he so requests.

Flowing from this, the Speaker of the House also enjoys one right which his name be called and then vote in the negative to create the tie that loses the question. The Vice President, as we know, votes only when the vote is already tied.

That right of the Speaker to cast his vote would, I feel sure, be upheld if a recapitulation showed an error, which, when discovered, could have been corrected, a situation where the Speaker’s vote could affect the result.

I have not taken the occasion to examine the precedents, but I am sure the precedent would have been that when a recapitulation was made, if a Member was on the floor and actually voted, but his vote failed to be recorded, he would be accorded the opportunity to have his vote recorded so that the error could be corrected, and the proper record and proper addition made.

In the matter presented before the Senate, however, again, was not an idle thing. If there had been any Senator who had voted on Friday night, but whose vote failed to show in the recapitulation, the recapitulation would have let the Senator have his vote recorded, although he could not have changed his vote; and a Senator who had not voted, would not have been accorded the privilege of changing his vote for which he had voted, and whose vote was either wrongly recorded or not recorded at all, could have had his vote recorded as he originally voted.

That is the basis for the discussion Friday night I posed the question to the Senator from Tennessee asking if he had voted, and his vote had not been properly recorded, if the recapitulation would not have given him the opportunity to have had it recorded and the addition for the total corrected. He agreed that was correct but disagreed with my conclusion that the establishment of a tie created the opportunity for the Vice President to vote. On that, I submit that condition for which the Constitution prescribes could not have been known to the Senate in the absence of the recapitulation which demonstrated the tie vote. Therefore, I was very happy to hear the former Vice President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, point out that there was a tie and the Member involved. I think he was eminently correct.

I think the present Vice President ruled correctly when he responded to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader that if a tie vote was shown, he would have an opportunity of voting. That right would have existed, in my humble opinion, regardless of any unambiguous consent to vacate the proceedings of reconsideration.

In the long run ahead for which we all hope this Senate may serve, it is well and good that this precedent should have had the mature opinion of the Senator from Kentucky, coming as it does from one who is of a political party other than that of the present Vice President. He has added to the rich heritage of this body.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I wish to make just a brief observation, because I am anxious that the cotton farmers get their plantings in before sundown as is any other Senator.

Recapitulation of a vote has two purposes. One is to make certain that every Senator is recorded as voting as he actually voted. Then there is the collective right of the Senate to see that the vote is accurate, in order to ascertain whether the vote on an amendment or other proposition has been carried or lost.

My position is that whenever a situation is discovered which, if discovered in time, would have given the Vice President the right to vote need not pro tune. We lawyers know what that means—now as then. He has a right to vote regardless of what happened in the meantime. I did not intend to say as much as I have, but since I received such a nice compliment from the Senator from South Dakota I thought I would say it.

Mr. GOER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia observed in his opinion the Senate could not deprive the Vice President of a vote even by the granting of an unanimous consent, which constitutes a unanimous action. I suggest the Senate could not deprive a Senator of a vote by similar action. I must respectfully request an interpretation of the Constitution that confers upon the Vice President a more positive right to vote in this body than that which is conferred upon a Member of this body. Both rights must be exercised under similar circumstances as they may be available. Whether the precedent established is sound or unsound, the precedent is established. I accept it.

I rose to advise the Senate that the point of order was not made lightly, or maliciously, or with political intent. Insofar as the precedents as of that hour were concerned, the point of order was, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, a valid point of order. Now that the ruling has been made and the precedent established, I wish to say that I do not question the precedent; but I do feel grateful that it has provoked an examination of the rules and precedents of the Senate.

I should like to conclude with this one observation to the distinguished minority leader that if a tie vote was shown, he would have an opportunity of voting. That right would have existed, in my humble opinion, regardless of any unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings of reconsideration.

In the long run ahead for which we all hope this Senate may serve, it is well and good that this precedent should have had the mature opinion of the Senator from Kentucky, coming as it does from one who is of a political party other than that of the present Vice President. He has added to the rich heritage of this body.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say I am almost greatly impressed with the wisdom of that rule. I happen to be sitting in the chair of the President of my State, and a Member of the United States Senate. I am sure the Vice President has the right to vote.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say I am. The President of the Senate has the right to vote. I think the point made by the Senator is an excellent one. I happened to be sitting in the chair of the President of our other constitutional House, and it is there that when a tie occurs, and the Parliamentarian at that time interposes a volume on which they are working.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, at least the second time. I should like to say to my delightful friend from Tennessee the Senate already has acted on a resolution authorizing the printing of the proper record of the precedents. Last week the major-
Thomas amendment, I think we can see how the Senator from Kentucky, who was the Acting President of the United States, had ruled on that occasion and the reasons for the Parliamentarian's advising the Chair to rule as he did on this occasion. The Chair reads only two brief portions—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 15, 1949, volume 95, part 10, page 12931.

Mr. McCARTHY. Do I correctly understand the Chair's ruling that the recitation of the vote on the oil amendment to be that the position of the President of the Senate was not present at the time of the vote or Senators who did not vote at that time could not vote on the recapitulation?

The Chair. That is correct. The recitation is merely for the purpose of seeing whether any Senator has been recorded incorrectly on the roll-call—not for the purpose of giving Senators a right to change their vote or other Senators an opportunity to vote.

And then, further on:

Mr. McCARTHY. Do I correctly understand that the position of the President of the Senate is that even though business has transpired since the vote was had on the motion to reconsider the vote on the floor amendment, and even though another vote has been taken since then, the President of the Senate could now go back and cast his vote on the motion to reconsider? Is that the ruling of the Chair?

The Chair. If the vote on the motion to reconsider were recapitulated so as to create a situation which would give the Vice President a right to vote as he would have been the case if the result had been correctly announced—the Chair feels that he could not oppose that the right to vote by reason of those circumstances.

Those were the precedents upon which the rulings on Friday were made; and the Chair feels that having the matter settled out, as it has been, very persuasively and articulately today in the course of this discussion will aid in seeing to it that the precedents in connection with this matter are better understood.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Gore). Does the Senator from Tennessee withdraw his amendment?

Mr. GORE. I do. Mr. ELLENDEER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The Chair. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Morse
Mundt
Murray
Neuberger
O'Mahoney
Pastore
Payne
Porter

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], as amended.

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

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMMER. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 11, as follows:

YEAS—78

Alken
Aliott
Barkey
Bennett
Biddle
Bricker
Bridges
Bush
Byrd
Carlson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chaves
Clements
Curtis
Davis
Dirksen
Douglas
Dwyer
Erlington
Farley
Flanders
Frear
Fulbright
Furgeson

Moneymaker
Morse
Mundt
Murray
Neuberger
O'Mahoney
Pastore
Payne
Porter

Purcell
Saltisall
Schoepel
Seaton
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Smith, J. E.
Sparman
Stennis

Symington
Thurmond
Thye
Wadsworth
Walter
Wilkins
Williams
Young

Washington

NAYS—11

Anderson
Bean
Bender
Bennett
Bibb
Blender
Bricker
Bruges
Bunce
Butler
Byrne
Carlson
Case, S. Dak.
Case, S. Dak.
Chaves
Cheney
Clements
Davis
Dirksen
Douglas
Dwyer
Erlington
Flanders
Frear
Fulbright

Knowland
Lawder
Langer
Lehman
Lehman
Lincoln
Long
Lucas
Lugar
Lugar

Mankin
Martin
Martin
Martin, Pa.
Martin, Pa.
McCaskill
McCurdy
McDowell
McMillan
McMillan
McNamar.
McNamar.
McMurray
McMurtrie

Not Voting—6

Capehart
Case, S. Dak.
Case, S. D.
Chaves
Cheney
Clements

Kelafner
Keller
Kerkhoff
Kirkwood
Kuchel
Kuchel

Kunz
Langer

Kunz
Langer

Kuchel
Kuchel

Kuchel
Kuchel

Kuchel
Kuchel

Kerr
Kerr

Kerr
Kerr

Kerr
Kerr
"APPORTIONMENT OF DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTA"

Sec. 380c. (a) The domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned among the several States on the basis of the total production of wheat in each State during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period.

(b) The State domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on which wheat has been seeded for the production of wheat during any one or more of the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period.

(c) The county domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on which wheat has been seeded for the production of wheat during any one or more of the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period.

(d) The Secretary is authorized and directed through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates to any marketing year pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. For the purpose of facilitating such purchases during any marketing year, the Secretary may establish and operate a pool or pools and he may also authorize and direct any marketing year pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. For the purpose of facilitating such purchases during any marketing year, the Secretary may establish and operate a pool or pools and he may also authorize and direct the Secretary to act as his agents, either directly or through the pool or pools.

(c) Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil action brought in the name of the United States. "ADJUSTMENTS IN DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTAS"

Sec. 380h. If the Secretary has reason to believe that because of a national emergency a marketing year for wheat should be increased or suspended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made of whether the increased or suspended marketing year is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase or decrease in demand for wheat. If the Secretary finds that such increase or suspension is necessary, he shall immediately proceed to find such increase or suspension. In the absence of such investigation and without any farm on the basis of their respective shares in the wheat crop, or the proceeds thereof, produced on the farm. The Secretary shall also issue and sell marketing certificates to individual producers on the basis of the total production of wheat in each State during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed.

"MARKETING CERTIFICATES"

Sec. 380d. (a) The Secretary shall prescribe for issuance in each county marketing certificates aggregating the amount of the county domestic food quota and (b) Such marketing certificates shall be issued and sold marketing certificates to individual producers on the basis of the total production of wheat in each State during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period.

"CONVERSION FACTORS"

Sec. 380f. The Secretary shall ascertain and establish conversion factors showing the amount of wheat contained in food products produced wholly or partly from wheat.

"CIVIL PENALTIES"

Sec. 380g. Any person who violates or attempts to violate any of the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of section 380e of this act shall forfeit to the Secretary an amount equal to the domestic food quota of such person. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil action brought in the name of the United States. March 12

Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil action brought in the name of the United States. "REPORTS AND RECORDS"

Sec. 380i. (a) The provisions of section 373 of this act shall apply to all persons, except the producers or small shippers, the provisions of this subtitle, except that any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required thereby, or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 for each such violation.

(b) The provisions of section 373 (b) of this act shall apply to all wheat farmers who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle.

"REFERENDUM"

Sec. 380j. In the referendum held pursuant to section 336 of this act on the national marketing quota proclaimed for the 1957 crop of wheat, the Secretary shall also submit the question whether farmers favor a marketing certificate program under this subtitle. If more than one-half of the farmers voting in the referendum favor such marketing certificate program, the Secretary, shall, prior to the effective date of the national marketing quota proclaimed under this subsection, order the conversion of such quota and a marketing certificate program shall be in effect for the 1957 and subsequent wheat crops under the provisions of this subtitle.

"PRICE SUPPORT"

Sec. 380k. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(a) Whenever a wheat marketing certificate program under this subtitle is in effect, such program shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Such price-support operations shall be determined by the Secretary, except that the level of such support shall be determined, after taking into consideration the following...
factors: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat, (3) the provisions of any international agreement relating to wheat to which the United States is a party, (4) foreign-trade policies of friendly wheat-exporting countries, and (5) other factors affecting international trade in wheat including exchange rates and currency regulations.

(c) Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices (excluding marketing quotas under the Agriculture Act of 1954) as prescribed and required by the Secretary as a condition of eligibility for price support and for the receipt of wheat-marketing certificates."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate continue to order of business and that the adjournment be until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF THE EVENING AND TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, along with the minority leader (Mr. KNOWLAND) and the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky (Mr. CLEMENTS), I announce that it is planned to consider this evening Senate bill 3091, a bill to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act, as heretofore amended. The bill permits the disposal of the plant at Louisville, Ky., to dispose of the bill before we adjourn. We do not expect to have any more yeas-and-nay votes this evening. I hope we can expedite action on the farm bill tomorrow. We will call for adjournment and then we will proceed to the consideration of the Executive Calendar during the morning hour. At that time, I may say to the distinguished minority leader, we will consider the nominations which have previously been passed over, namely, those of Mr. William E. Dowling and Mr. James Weldon Jones to be members of the United States Tariff Commission. I understand that the senior Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) is interested in the nominations, and that he has been notified. I should like to have him present when the nominations are taken up. We plan to dispose of these before we consider the amendments of the Senator from Kansas to the pending farm bill.

Mr. President, I now have a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is my understanding that before the conclusion of the morning hour, the Senator from Kansas will be recognized on his amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. I am ready to proceed with the amendment, but I would prefer to be given some time tomorrow, instead of using it this evening. It will take a little longer than I anticipated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is why I made the request, so that the distinguished Senator from Kansas would have that opportunity tomorrow.

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

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Kansas will not proceed tonight with the consideration of the amendments, because I should like to have some time on the Senate's request to make the amendment. I should appreciate it very much if the majority leader would permit us to begin the debate tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We will dispose of S. 3091 this evening and adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow. We will have a morning hour tomorrow, and probably consume 45 minutes on the nominations to the Tariff Commission; then we will proceed to take up the amendments of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. CARNALSON) to the unfinished business. I assure the Senate that we will have a quorum call.

AMENDMENT OF RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL ACT OF 1933

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROLMAN in the chair). What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1672 (S. 3091).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The bill is a bill (S. 3091) to amend the Rubber Producing Disposal Act of 1933, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plans No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3, in Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this is the last of the Government-owned rubber-producing plants, which the Government built during the war. It is presently under lease for a period which extends to 1958. The bill authorizes the present Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, or such other agency as may take over the plant under the direction of the President, following the expiration of the life of the present Commission, to either grant a long-term lease for this property or to enter into a sales agreement if a satisfactory bid is made on it. The terms of the bill are similar to legislation under which all other plants of this kind have been disposed of. The urgency, as stated by the distinguished majority leader, is based upon the expiration date of the Rubber Commission.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the purpose of the bill to consummate a sale or to authorize negotiations?

Mr. CLEMENTS. To authorize negotiations for a sale.

Mr. CURTIS. At the present time the plant will be sold to a synthetic rubber producer from alcohol; is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. For what purpose can it be sold under the bill as written?

Mr. CLEMENTS. For what purpose?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It may be sold for use in making the same product.

Mr. CURTIS. Could it be sold for any other use?

Mr. CLEMENTS. No. There is a security clause in the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. It must be sold for a synthetic rubber plant. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. It must be sold for a plant that produces rubber from alcohol. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the matter come back to Congress after the sale?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I must come back to Congress for review.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator. Mr. CLEMENTS. It must come back either in the form of a lease or of a sale.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, who is a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe the Senator has already mentioned the fact that there is a time limit with reference to the present arrangement in Louisville, and that it is necessary that the bill be passed promptly, in order that the time limit may not extend beyond the point where it would be more embarrassing. It is necessary to carry on negotiations or consummate a sale. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. My colleague is correct. The expiration date of the commission is the 22nd day of March. It is necessary to get action in the House before that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under those conditions, it will be necessary to delay the passage of the bill; therefore I will take no further time of the Senate.
Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] desire to have the floor?

Mr. FREAR. I have nothing to say, because I am representing the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] who has very well stated the situation. I hope that favorable action on the bill will be taken by the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am entitled to have the observation of the Senator from Delaware, who is the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill in committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there are several committee amendments before the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. There are several committee amendments, in which the sponsors of the bill concur, and which had the unanimous support of all members of the subcommittee and of the full committee.

Mr. FREAR. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The committee amendments were on page 2, line 9, after the word "exceed", to insert the word "thirty". On page 4, line 4, after the numeral "4", to insert "(a)"; and line 14, to insert a new subparagraph, as follows:

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 8 (a) (3) and 9 (f) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 relating to the period for review of the proposal submitted to the Commission, before submission to the Congress of a lease or lease extension relative to the Louisville plant, shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall, within 7 days after receiving the lease or lease extension, advise the Commission whether the proposed lease or lease extension would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws.

At the top of page 5, to insert a new subparagraph, as follows:

(c) Within 10 days after the expiration of the lease negotiations authorized in subsection (a) of this section, or, if Congress is not then in session, within 10 days after Congress next convenes, the Commission shall report to the Congress the lease or lease extension negotiated pursuant to this section. The Commission shall submit at the same time the statement of the Attorney General approving the proposed lease or lease extension in accordance with the standard set forth in subsection (b) of this section, and the names of the persons who have represented the Government or lessee in conducting negotiations for the lease or lease extension on the Louisville plant. Unless the lease is disapproved by either House of Congress the commission prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 9 (c) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953) of the Congress following the date upon which the lease or lease extension is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the lease or lease extension shall become fully effective and the Commission may enter into contracts of sale and may from time to time enter into leases for all or any part of such manufacturing equipment now situated in Baltimore, Md., and generally described in the Commission's brochure M-2 dated March 1954.

(b) Except as provided in this paragraph, each such subparagraph shall contain such terms and conditions including type of use and duration (up to 15 years) of any lease, as the Commission deems desirable in the public interest. Before making such sale or lease, the Commission shall secure the advice of the Attorney General as to whether the proposed lease or lease extension would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Each such lease or lease extension shall contain a national security clause, containing such terms and for such duration (10 years or less) as the Commission deems desirable in the public interest, and any such lease shall provide for the recapture of the equipment thereby leased and the termination of the lease, if the President determines that the national interest so requires.

The price for any part or all of such equipment as determined by the Commission may be changed by a subsequent act of Congress. The price for the proposed lease or lease extension shall be an amount which the Commission determines to be the maximum amount obtainable in the public interest, but not less than fair value as determined by the Commission.

(c) Any of such equipment not sold or leased, for which application has been made and maintained in adequate standby condition pursuant to, and be otherwise subject to, the provisions of section 14, to insert a new subparagraph, as follows:

The price for any part or all of such equipment as determined by the Commission may be changed by a subsequent act of Congress. The price for the proposed lease or lease extension shall be an amount which the Commission determines to be the maximum amount obtainable in the public interest, but not less than fair value as determined by the Commission.

(d) All the powers and authority conferred by this section upon the Commission may be changed by a subsequent act of Congress. The price for the purchase of the Louisville plant is then pending in the Commission shall cease to exist at the close of the 90th day following the termination of the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant has expired as provided in section 27 (a) of that act, unless no sale of the Louisville plant is recommended by the Commission to the Congress pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, in which event the Commission shall cease to exist at the close of the 90th day following the expiration of the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant is then pending or in effect, extend the existing lease or enter into a new lease on the Louisville plant for a term of not less than 5 years nor more than 15 years from the date of termination of said existing lease.

So as to make the bill read: Be it enacted, etc., That the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section: "Sec. 90. Notwithstanding the second sentence of section 7 of the act of March 31, 1955, and section 20 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Commission or its successor may, at its discretion and without receipt of proposals from any other party, enter into a contract of sale or lease of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 upon the condition that the sale or lease shall be pursuant to the terms and conditions of the proposed contract of sale as submitted to the Attorney General for his approval as provided in section 9 (c) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, which contract of sale shall be an amount which the Commission determines to be the maximum amount obtainable in the public interest, but not less than fair value as determined by the Commission. The price for any part or all of such equipment as determined by the Commission may be changed by a subsequent act of Congress. The price for the proposed lease or lease extension shall be an amount which the Commission determines to be the maximum amount obtainable in the public interest, but not less than fair value as determined by the Commission. All the powers and authority conferred by this section upon the Commission may be changed by a subsequent act of Congress. The price for the purchase of the Louisville plant is then pending in the Commission shall cease to exist at the close of the 90th day following the expiration of the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant has expired as provided in section 27 (a) of that act, unless no sale of the Louisville plant is recommended by the Commission to the Congress pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, in which event the Commission shall cease to exist at the close of the 90th day following the expiration of the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant is then pending or in effect, extend the existing lease or enter into a new lease on the Louisville plant for a term of not less than 5 years nor more than 15 years from the date of termination of said existing lease.

(d) All the powers and authority conferred by this section upon the Commission may be changed by a subsequent act of Congress. The price for the purchase of the Louisville plant is then pending in the Commission shall cease to exist at the close of the 90th day following the expiration of the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant has expired as provided in section 27 (a) of that act, unless no sale of the Louisville plant is recommended by the Commission to the Congress pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, in which event the Commission shall cease to exist at the close of the 90th day following the expiration of the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant is then pending or in effect, extend the existing lease or enter into a new lease on the Louisville plant for a term of not less than 5 years nor more than 15 years from the date of termination of said existing lease.

(c) Within 10 days after the termination of the lease negotiations authorized in subsection (a) of this section, or, if Congress is not then in session, within 10 days after Congress next convenes, the Commission shall report to the Congress the lease or lease extension negotiated pursuant to this section. The Commission shall submit at the same time the statement of the Attorney General approving the proposed lease or lease extension in accordance with the standard set forth in subsection (b) of this section, and the names of the persons who have represented the Government or lessee in conducting negotiations for the lease or lease extension on the Louisville plant. Unless the lease is disapproved by either House of Congress the commission prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 9 (c) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953) of the Congress following the date upon which the lease or lease extension is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the lease or lease extension shall become fully effective and the Commission may enter into contracts of sale and may from time to time enter into leases for all or any part of such manufacturing equipment now situated in Baltimore, Md., and generally described in the Commission's brochure M-2 dated March 1954.
lease or lease extension shall become fully effective, the omission shall be deemed to carry it out in accordance with its terms. 

Sec. 5. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the disposal or lease of the Louisiana plant shall be subject to all the provisions of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 and such criteria as are approved by the Commission in handling disposal of other Government-owned rubber producing facilities under that act. Such provisions shall be provided for in sections 7 (j), (k), 10, 15, and 24 of that act shall not apply to the disposal or lease of the Louisiana plant. 

Sec. 6 (a) Notwithstanding any provision of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as amended, or of this act, the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission may enter into contracts of sale and may from time to time enter into leases for all or any part of the catalyst manufacturing equipment now situated in Baltimore, Md., and generally described in the Commission's brochure M-2 dated March 1954. 

(b) Except as provided in this paragraph, each such lease or contract may be made on a year-to-year basis, and shall be subject to termination at any time by the party of the first part. 

(c) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the party of the second part may designate for the purpose, and for this purpose such successor agency may exercise all the authority conferred in the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 upon the Commission. 

The amendments were agreed to. The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed. 

NEED FOR REALISTIC ELECTION LEGISLATION 

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 3 minutes, and not to exceed the time being charged to either side. 

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the period of considering the effects of recent weeks has been the widespread recognition of the need for early action on a realistic elections bill. This need has been emphasized by the comments of observers on both sides of the political fence. It is being met by the nonpartisan support that has been granted to the election bill which was drafted by leaders on both sides of the Senate aisle. 

At the present time, this bill is before the Senate Rules Committee with 83 sponsors from the majority and 44 from the minority. This strong indication that action will be taken in this session when it is needed to bring realism into the approaching elections. 

I am hopeful that the Rules Committee will act at an early date so the measure may be considered on the floor within the next few weeks. 

Those of us who are sponsoring this measure do not claim that it is the final answer to all the problems of honest elections. We are aware of the fact that the Senate may desire to take further steps in the light of investigations which are forthcoming. 

But the measure does represent an honest effort to act realistically within the framework of information that is available to us now. 

This bill is based upon the assumption that the American people can best exercise their right to select their representatives when they can act as fully informed citizens. As our country has expanded, our need for information has expanded and we are trying to meet that need. 

Therefore, the measure would provide 

1. A provision that the measure would provide full and complete reporting on campaign contributions and expenditures. It would also set realistic ceilings on spending—ceilings which are low enough to be meaningful but high enough to remove the invincibility of the campaign that now exists. 

In these respects, the measure is somewhat similar to the bill sponsored by the late Representative Froman, Mr. Harris of Missouri [Mr. Froman]. In view of the need for early action, I do not believe the differences between the two bills should delay action. 

S. 3308, our bill, would also permit radio and television broadcasters to accredit equal, free time, if they choose, to the nominated candidates for President and Vice President. They could do so without the threat—which is now present—of being bombarded by requests for similar time from "fringe" candidates of minor parties. 

I point out, Mr. President, that only this week's candidate of the America First Party, in the Midwest, asked the networks to grant time equal to the amount given to the President of the United States. I think this bill will cure such a defect. 

To obtain early action, we may have to delete temporarily from the bill those sections which would allow income-tax deductions for political contributions. This type of legislation must originate in the House. 

It is my intention to press for enactment of this section this year, but I will not jeopardize the passage of the pending Senate action if such postpone would expedite consideration of the whole measure. 

Perhaps the only belief that election laws are not matters for partisan presentation or action. All public servants—regardless of their political creed—have an equal interest in good, honest, and realistic election laws. 

None of us has a mortgage on wishing to see this brought about. The American people want no partisan meddling in such issues. The bipartisan sponsorship of the best guaranty that they will have their desire. 

Mr. President, I have collected a few of the articles and editorials which have appeared throughout the country in support of this bill. They have appeared in the Scripps-Howard Alliance, the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Washington Evening Star, the Washington Daily News, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the New York World-Telegram, the Dallas Times-Herald, the San Angelo Standard-Times, the Shreveport (La.) Times, the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American News, and in Broadcasting and Telecasting magazine. 

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record some of the editorials and articles which have appeared in these publications. 

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record. 

[From the Washington Star of March 8, 1956] 

GOOD BIPARTISAN CAUSE 

The bipartisan support pledged to the Johnson bill to revise the law regulating campaign expenditures for national elections in an election year. 

For present restrictions not only are unrealistic in terms of current campaign costs; they also are ineffective because of their many loopholes. Perhaps no legislation with a chance for adoption would do more than the Johnson bill—co-sponsored by a bipartisan majority of the Senate—at least would establish more practical ceilings for election spending and would provide for more complete and informative reporting on the source of funds. One result may be to reveal for the first time the approximate total cost of a presidential campaign. 

Among the important liberalizations provided the Johnson bill was an increase from $8 million to approximately $12 million the limitation on spending by national political committees; to raise the ceiling for senatorial candidates from $25,000 to $75,000 or even higher on a formula of 20 cents per vote cast during the preceding 4 years; and to raise the ceiling for House candidates from $5,000 to $15,000 or higher on the 20-cents-per-vote formula. In addition, as an incentive to small contributions, income tax deduction would be allowed up to $100 per individual contributor. Since tax legislation that originated in the House, a bill to implement this deduction provision already has been reported out by Ways and Means Committee. 

Some criticism of the pending measure already has been voiced on grounds it does not go far enough. Of course, all secondary contributions and expenditures. It attacks this problem only to the extent of requiring that candidates file with the Senate or House the same statements required in their individual States. These do not have the same effect, and the reporting requirements differ widely. For this reason, it was recognized that a measure which attempts to implement Federal requirements, but the thought
is that the possibility of national publicity through the efforts of the organized press would tend to discourage local campaign excesses.

It has been recognized that both reform and liberalization on campaign fund regulations are long overdue. The pending bill makes a substantial start, at least, and it should be enacted in time to be effective this year.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 5, 1956]

EMERGENCY MEASURE

Senator HENNING's unwillingness to support a bill that would amend the campaign contributions bill is a reminder that it does not reach all the problems related to the use of money in political campaigns. Mr. HENNINGS, the former chairman of the Senate Elections Subcommittee, prefers his own bill because it would apply to primaries as well as elections. That is a reasonable point of view. In about one-third of the States the primary elections are the crucial contests. They ought to be subjected to the same rules in regard to campaign spending as are the final elections. There is much opposition in Congress, however, to the inclusion of primary elections in the bill. In deference to that view the authors of the bill provided only that they would take steps to make effective the provisions of their bill in Washington whatever reports may be required by their States in primary contests.

The important objective at the moment is to pass a bill that can be made effective this year. With 49 signatures, the Johnson-Knowland bill already has support enough for passage through the Senate. It has attracted widespread approval because it would permit the deduction of political contributions from taxable income; it would enable both individuals and organizations to make the big campaign contributions that are essential for running a campaign. It would provide for full reporting of both campaign gifts and expenditures. These are major gains. They should be made effective for this year's contests. In our opinion, it is far more important to modernize the law in these particulars than to seek improvements the Rules Committee can make after they read of the 4 and 5-figure sums put into political war chests by lobbyists, or the special interest they represent.

And there are many special interests that do contribute. Organized labor is one of the biggest. So are the oil and gas interests.

But the plain fact of the matter is that they make their contributions when it suits them; the street creates. Political parties are a vital cog in our machinery of Government. And it costs money to run them.

Neither of the pending bills, however, does anything to stop the waste and the fraud that occur when money is raised to pay for illegal, hidden expenditures that are not reported. They permit candidates to obtain more free time on radio and television; it would permit them and their organizations to campaign and provide for full reporting of both campaign gifts and expenditures. These are major gains. They should be made effective for this year's contests. In our opinion, it is far more important to modernize the law in these particulars than to seek improvements the Rules Committee can make after they read of the 4 and 5-figure sums put into political war chests by lobbyists, or the special interest they represent.

The citizen benefits immensely by the role that the two-party system plays in our democratic form of government. And there is no logical reason why he should expect them to be able to perform that function for him, for free.

The American voter should be glad to dig down in his pocket to help support the party of his choice. In fact, he does so indirectly already.

For when you get right down to it, the money that is given by corporations or labor unions eventually comes from him anyway. It is the way that he is able to participate in the responsible form of a contribution solicited by his shop steward, or as one of the items of cost that goes into price of the product he buys.

Not long ago, a survey showed that millions of Americans would be willing to give a sum as high as $6 to help pay the expenses of the party to which they belong. This poll indicated strongly that the parties themselves have been derelict in their duty in not shaking this tree.

For then they would be free of the obligations, real or imagined, that arise when they depend on a few big contributors for their campaign funds. They would wear no man's collar.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 5, 1956]

HONEST ELECTIONS BILL

The bill that can be made effective this year is the Johnson-Knowland bill. It has been recognized that both reform and liberalization on campaign fund regulations are long overdue. The pending bill makes a substantial start, at least, and it should be enacted in time to be effective this year.

[From the New York World-Telegram of March 12]

TOWARD AN ELECTION CLEANUP

Led by the party leaders, LYNDON JOHNSON and William F. Knowland, a start has been made in the Senate to clean up the money end of the political campaigns.

We hope this becomes a vigorous movement, not merely a timely drift.

There are two leaders who have introduced a bill designed to throw the spotlight on campaign contributions. Forty-eight other Senators have joined in sponsoring the bill.

Out of all these proposals and the debate on them, plus the upcoming Senate investigation, contributions and lobbying, there ought to come a constructive law. The conscience of Congress has been challenged by this field. A good, workable law, along with the proposed inquiry, is the only proper answer.

If the American people knew the facts and the conditions surrounding public men, there would be a sympathetic attitude toward remediial legislation.

The conscience of Congress has been challenged by this field. A good, workable law, along with the proposed inquiry, is the only proper answer.

If the American people knew the facts and the conditions surrounding public men, there would be a sympathetic attitude toward remediial legislation.

The most expensive political campaign in our history is getting under way. The time is ripe for an airing of the inside facts, and a law which will meet the facts head-on.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 5, 1956]

NO MAN'S COLLAR

We hope this becomes a vigorous movement, not merely a timely drift.

The evil that has come sharply into focus as a result of the nature of our democracy is not the spending of money in political campaigns. The people must be informed about issues and candidates before they go to the ballot box to vote intelligently. Our democratic system is admittedly expensive to operate. The real danger arises when special interests contribute heavily to political campaigns in the expectation that the legislators elected with such help will pass bills that will benefit special interests and the statesmen who have overhead and bills that will benefit special interests.

The Johnson-Knowland bill deserves a high priority on the Senate's calendar.
would notably ease the high cost of campaigning.

Third, expenditure limits would be lifted to make the law meaningful, and reporting requirements would be drastically tightened. Means should also be found, in our opinion, of extending the safeguards of the bill to campaign managers, who are not covered now. In one-third of the States, equivalent to elections.

Senator MUSSEY's proposal that congressional campaigns be required to file in advance an abbreviated picture of the law. Any other administrative proceeding is easier said than done. The important objectives are to stimulate a flow of contributions from the right sources, and to press at this session to pass a law containing the statutory requirements which the proposed law should be written.

Periodic concern for the integrity of the Federal Government, especially the legislative branch, has been both frequently and consistently nonproductive. This record is both good and bad. No legislative assembly in the world has ever overthrown an established government. That is good. It is also, that after 170 years, the number of Senators and Representatives found deserving of censure for allowing improper influence. The actions can be counted on the fingers of both hands. Bribery, vote selling, under-the-counter moneylending, illegitimate influence on the public in Washington duplicates of their reports to the States on campaign contributions and expenditures appears to have a good deal of evidence.

This is where the new lobby-campaign fund investigation comes in. There isn't any reason, as Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND suggest, Congress can't pass a new election-money law at this session, even if the investigation is incomplete. There are ample precedents in the present law which device to any practical observer.

But before it is ended the Senate probe ought to give the lawmakers an abundance of useful data on the workings of the law. Certainly, that will be the result if the committee runs a hard-hitting inquiry as promised.

The bill which Senator LYNDON JOHNSON and Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, as Senate leaders for the two parties, had been swayed by the hysteria of the goldfish bowl election, requires stringent reporting of campaign spending law. Realistic and modern, it would permit individual senatorial candidates to spend from $100,000 to $1,910,000 in their campaigns. The latter figure is based on some measure of reform can be passed now the means the least of our blessings.

The problem brought into focus by the celebrated attempted campaign contribution from Howard Keck, California oil magnate, to Senator Case of South Dakota was the problem of an out-of-date, unrealistic law. The existing statute, passed decades ago, and the public has been hysterically crying for punitive exploitation of the Case incident—has been a party to much calculated evasion. If Senator LYNDON JOHNSON or Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, or one of the other Senate leaders, has been hysterically crying for punitive exploitation of the Case incident—has been a party to much calculated evasion. Under the Johnson-Knowland approach, hypocrisy and dignified deceit no longer need characterize election spending reports.

More importantly, we think, Senators Johnson and Knowland, who are co-sponsors of their bill a sound and tested principle of honest Government: Reliance upon public disclosure and open government is a major principle of integrity in American Government has been achieved not by laws alone but by the ever-present knowledge that the powers of investigation—abated by the light of publicity and courage of a free press—assured no wrong-doer the secrecy indispensable to corruption.

The public accepts the fact that modern campaigning is expensive and that few candidates for seats in Congress can make strong bids for election without accepting money from undisclosed sources. Just what should the public not know the sources of this aid?

However, even though the laws relating to campaigning for seats in Congress are greatly strengthened, they are not likely to prove a guaranty against corruption. Methods of evading the law will be found. It will still be possible for a situation to arise like the one that caused the President to veto the natural gas bill which would be made possible by a law that will encourage the public to offer a candidate a campaign "donation," but there are always men who will take chances when the stakes are high.

The public would have been led to believe that an evil had been cured, but violations of the law would have continued unreported. The only serious error would have been to get caught. If Senator Lyndon Johnson or Senator William Knowland met this situation by offering the Congress an election spending bill. This clearly indicates a belief that the House is to be expected to move as promptly and decisively. If this reform measure becomes law, the Senate, and in particular any Senator, needs the House to be grateful to the two Senators for keeping their heads when others among us were losing theirs, and for a potential black mark on the Senate record will stand instead as a lasting credit.
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

March 12

PROGRAM TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Senate will sit tomorrow until approximately 7 o'clock in the evening. We anticipate no roll calls after that time. After the morning hour it will be 12 o'clock before we return to the consideration of the farm bill, but I hope we can expedite consideration of the bill and confine our remarks to the bill tomorrow and conclude our work on it.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 13, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art always graciously guarding and guiding us, may we daily commit ourselves resolutely and gladly to the wise and beneficent dispensations of Thy divine providence.

We penitently confess that we are frequently so easily daunted and frightened in the search and struggle to make our way through the darkness and uncertainties of this mortal life.

Grant that it may be the goal of all our aspirations to give ourselves unrewarded to the glorious task of doing Thy will. Amen.

The House called the order of business.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 8, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2852. An act to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. Johnson of South Carolina and Mr. Carlson, members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disbursement of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56-8.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1956

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Holtzclaw], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Allen], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Dworkshak], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Slanders], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Miller], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Purtell], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Schoepfell], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Warrington] be added as co-sponsors of the bill (S. 3308) to revise the Federal elections laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, to permit deduction for Federal income tax purposes of certain political contributions, and for other purposes; the next time the bill is printed.

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