Ferdinand J. Ross, Jr.
Robert G. Ross
Edmund V. Rozycki
Frank H. Russell
Howard A. Ruud
James E. Ryan
William A. Saucier
David K. Schwinn
James P. Sedinger
Leon Serkin
Dwight W. Seymour
William T. Sharp
Paul E. Shea
Melvin W. Shellhorn
Joe D. Shirley
Ned S. Skinner
John W. Slagle
Joseph Sleger, Jr.
Hubert A. Smiley
Calhoun Smith
Hugh L. Smith
Hulon C. Smith
Patrick D. Smith
Robert E. Smith
Thomas Sparks, Jr.
Hugh S. Spears
Justin A. Spencer
George D. Spencer
Kenneth R. Stewart
Robert F. Stewart
Hugh A. Stiles
John Strahan
Commadore Stutts
Vincent C. Sullivan
Clarence R. Swann
Gilson A. Tallentire
Albert L. Tate
James D. Tate
King D. Thatenhurst, Sr.
Robert L. Thomas
Arthur J. Thyrring
James G. Tillis
Robert C. Tilton
James W. Tobias, Jr.
James A. Tootle
Willis S. Travis
Dudley J. Troutman
Clyde A. Trowbridge
Frank C. Trumble
Joe N. Tusa
Willard J. Vanliew
Wallace E. Vickery
Robert W. Virden
Warren G. Wall
Charles N. Warner
Robert T. Watson
Willard K. Webester
Lawrence E. Weitekamp
Wilbur E. West
Robert H. Westmoreland
Robert L. Whitney
Deronda A. Wilkinson
Henry E. Wilkinson
William E. Willett
Maxey A. Willis
Warren L. Wilson
James E. Winters
George D. Woods
William J. Wright
Ira L. Wright, Jr.
Joseph A. Wyzykowski
Otto L. Yeater
Walter A. Yoder
Russell W. Yost
Henry H. Young
Leonard R. Young
Frank S. Zam
John P. Zimba

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

Russell W. Adamczuk
William V. Bicknel
Joseph J. Bischoff
Frank H. Bruce, Jr.
George A. Candea
Robert L. Carlisle
Leroy R. Cates
Garrett L. Collins
William T. Evans
John G. Fifield
Donald R. Gerber
Clearence B. Grey
Donald P. Hill
Charles H. Houder, Jr.
Charles A. Markello
Andrew G. Marushok
James F. Newell
Robert P. O'Neal
John T. Rapp
Lawrence A. Schneider
Thomas H. Ullom
Harold E. Ultsch
Frank V. Weiler

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

Lynde D. Blair
George Clark
Joseph F. Cody, Jr.
Dempsey B. Crudup
John A. Dixon
Fred L. Edwards, Jr.
John A. Eskam
William C. Fischer
Ronald R. Glaser
Cyril E. Gonzales
Charles T. Hampton
Harry A. Hunt, Jr.
Theodore E. Hunt
Ralph S. Huston
Gunnar A. Johnson
Ronald G. Kropp
Henry Stevenson Livingston
Charles W. F. McKellar
Delbert M. Martin
William H. Meitzler
George V. Memmer
Ralph L. Reed
James K. Reilly
John E. Schoon
Jack T. Schultz
Harry R. Shortt
Richard J. Skelton
William P. Slider
Richard T. Spooner
George H. Taylor III
Richard B. Taylor
Robert B. Throm

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

Robert L. Anderson, Jr.
Thomas G. Beers
Edward Johns, Jr.
Francis J. Kelly
Robert B. Mason
Sherwood F. Prescott, Jr.
Charles B. Robinson
Marcus B. Rogers
Ivan L. Scott, Jr.
Thomas Mc. Wheeler

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:

William P. Addington
Edmond E. Arant
Walter C. Bell
George H. Bigelow
Mark W. Billing
Philip Blazer
Kenneth C. Boston
Harry F. Bullock, Jr.
Billy Burks
John J. Buron
George H. Butler
Jesse E. Campbell
Roy A. Chyba
William J. Cinotti
Robert A. Clement
Lonice E. Coburn
Richard B. Colglazier
Terrance A. Conner
Leon A. Cooper
Robert B. Cotham, Jr.
Thomas C. Crawford
Charles H. Darr
Robert L. Dryden
Edward H. Dupre, Jr.
Kenneth J. Fagan
Roger K. Fensler
Thomas V. Ferguson
Edward C. Finkbohner
William E. Fouch
Frederick E. Franks
James S. Gill
Henry K. Goeke
Frederick A. Gonzalez, Jr.
George F. Gould
Lillian M. Hartley
Elmer D. Hill
Howard Holden
Charles J. W. Holland
Larry McK. Hollingshead
James R. Hollingsworth
Max O. Horton
Walter L. Huber
William R. Huntley
Thomas W. Huston
Luther E. Hyder
Lauris W. Jackson
J. T. Jenkins
Anton M. Johner
Franklin F. Judson
William O. Koontz
Martin Lachow
Paul H. Leahy
Henry F. Lesem, Jr.
Wellington B. Long, Jr.
Robert W. Lucht
Clyde C. Lynn
Glenn M. Matthieu
Bingham A. McMaster
William P. McMullen
Emmett L. Meadows
William R. Mercer
Harmon V. Mills
Max M. Morgan
Joseph G. Navolanic
Randolph E. Pasley
Frank L. Pearman
Walter F. Pettley
Robert P. Pitts, Jr.
Felix A. Polakiewicz
James H. Pollock
Thomas W. Purvis
Leo E. Reynolds
Elza L. Rice
George T. Ruhberg
Charles W. Servis
Floyd D. Schaeffer
Stewart J. Shaw, Jr.
Fred J. Shisler
Victor Shul
Patrick L. Slavin
Olen E. Smith
Joe W. Sparling
Emery Speer
William H. Stanaland
Albert W. Sue
William J. Sullivan
Arthur F. Terry
Thomas C. Vanover
Edwin M. Walter
John C. Westenberg
Rex G. Williams, Jr.
David P. Wilson
Leonard S. Wolford
Ruth L. Wood
Merlin D. Woodard

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1956

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 6, 1956)

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

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

Almighty God, Thou hast made us in Thine image and likeness and hast implanted within us desires which the material world can never satisfy. We are conscious that Thou needest no sacrifice our hands can bring nor any offering our lips can frame; but because we live in Thy world and share Thy bounty, because we breathe Thine air and Thy power sustains us, because Thy goodness preserves us and Thy love blesses us continually, we praise and magnify Thy glorious name.

Create within us a clean heart. Renew within us a right spirit. Lead us, in the stress and strain of this new day and of this new week, to the sources of strength and victory, to the green pastures and still waters of Thine enabling grace, to the paths of righteousness: For Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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 on statements.

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 a 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.

SFC. HENRY F. FERRY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Sfc. Henry F. Ferry (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, RELATING TO NOTICES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subdivision e of section 58—notices—of the Bankruptcy Act as amended (with an accompanying paper); 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 or participation in Communist, Communist-front, fellow-traveling or subversive organizations or activities on the part of the following officials of the NAACP—the president, the chairman of the board, the honorary chairman, 11 of 28 vice presidents, the treasurer, 28 of 47 directors, the chairman of the national legal committee, the executive secretary, the special counsel, the assistant special counsel, the southeast regional secretary, the west coast secretary, the director of the Washington bureau, the director of public relations and 2 field secretaries; and

"Whereas of the NAACP's 28 vice presidents, the following 11 have records of un-American activities: John Haynes Holmes, 23 citations; A. Philip Randolph, 20 citations; the late Mary McLeod Bethune (who still is listed as a vice president) and William Lloyd Imes, 16 citations each: Oscar Hammerstein, II, the composer, and Bishop W. J. Walls, 7 citations each; Ira W. Jayne and L. Pearl Mitchell, 2 citations each; and Willard S. Townsend, T. G. Nutter and Grace B. Fenderson, 1 citation each; and

"Whereas of the 47 members comprising the association's board of directors, the following 28 have records of the un-American activities: Earl B. Dickerson, 25 citations; Algernon D. Black, 18 citations; Lewis Gannett, 15 citations; Roscoe Dunjee, 13 citations; S. Ralph Harlow and Chairman Channing H. Tobias, 10 citations each; William H. Hastie, 9 citations; Hubert T. Delaney, 8 citations; Benjamin E. Mays, president of Atlanta's Morehouse College, 6 citations; Robert G. Weaver, 5 citations; Buell G. Gallagher, 4 citations; President Arthur B. Spingarn, Earl G. Harrison, James J. McClendon, Ralph Bunche, Allen Knight Chalmers and W. Montague Cobb, 3 citations each; J. M. Tinsley, Wesley W. Law of Savannah, Ga., Norman Cousins, Z. Alexander Looby, Harry J. Greene and Alfred Baker Lewis, 2 citations each; and H. Claude Hudson, Carl R. Johnson, A. Maceo Smith, James Hinton and Theodore M. Berry, 1 citation each; and

"Whereas other officers of the NAACP with un-American activity records are: Lloyd Garrison, chairman, national legal committee, 5 citations; Treasurer Allan Knight Chalmers and Branch Department Director Gloster B. Current, 3 citations each; Southeast Regional Secretary Ruby Hurley, West Coast Regional Secretary Franklin H. Williams, Field Secretary Madison S. Jones and Assistant Special Counsel Robert L. Carter, 2 citations each; and Field Secretary Tarea Hall Pittman, 1 citation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina believes that for the reasons herein set forth that the NAACP should be classified as a subversive organization so that it may be kept under the proper surveillance and that all citizens of the United States may have ample warnings of the danger to our way of life which lurks in such an organization; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Attorney General, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 125

"Concurrent resolution condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States and declaring that its decisions of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, and all similar decisions are in violation of the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and are therefore unconstitutional and of no lawful effect within the territorial limits of the State of Mississippi; declaring that a contest of powers has arisen between the State of Mississippi and said Supreme Court, and invoking the historic doctrine of interposition to protect the sovereignty of this and the other States of the Union; and calling on our sister States and the Congress for redress of grievances as provided by law; and for other purposes

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Legislature of Mississippi unequivocally expresses a firm determination to maintain and defend 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 sovereignty of the States, in their proper spheres, have been long protected and guaranteed;

"That the Legislature of Mississippi explicitly and peremptorily declares and maintains that the powers of the Federal Government emanate solely from 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 Legislature 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, but only specific sovereign rights, 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 its schools, colleges, educational, and other public institutions and facilities, and to prescribe the rules, regulation, and conditions under which they shall be conducted;

"That the aggrandizement of powers by the Federal Government has grown far beyond that ever conceived by the authors of our Constitution, that the seizure and concentration therein of powers not granted by the compact under which the several States entered this Union, and particularly that by which Mississippi entered the Union on December 10, 1817, threaten to reduce these sovereign States to mere satellites, and to subject us to the tyranny of centralized government, so rightfully abhorred by the founders, and for the prevention of which they exercised their finest genius;

"That in late years the encroachment upon the reserved rights of the States and of the people has grown apace, and the proponents of the acts of encroachment have grown so emboldened that not one of the sister States and its people have escaped the oppressive hand thereof: In the destruction of their vested property rights; abridgements of their liberties; control of their institutions, habits, manners, and morals by centralized bureaucratic instrumentalities; and in fact by various wrongful and obtrusive acts, too numerous to be here documented, but so consistently characterized by an oppressive course of action so as to seriously threaten to completely destroy our constitutional processes and substitute in lieu thereof ideologies foreign to the soil of our beloved land;

"That one of the noblest characteristics of our people is the reverent respect for and obedience to the courts of law and justice, and that which more than any other has enobled our institutions of government, and ought to be challenged only with the most dreadful reluctance, still it should be solenmly and firmly declared that the hand of tyranny ought to be stayed from whatsoever source it might strike;

"That we profess an undying attachment to and a warm regard and respect for the sister States, and for this Union, which, through unwarranted and unconstitutional action of the Supreme Court, is fastly being dissolved by usurpation of powers reserved to the States and transferring them to an all-powerful centralized Government which, unless halted, will reduce the States to impotent vassals, sheared of all rights and powers except those received at the sufferance of the Federal Government;

"That a question of contested power has arisen; the Supreme Court of the United States asserts, for its part, that the States did in fact prohibit unto themselves the power to maintain racially separate public institutions, and the State of Mississippi, for its part, asserts that it and its sister States have never relegated such rights;

"That the flagrant assertion upon the part of the Supreme Court of the United States accompanied by the threats of coercion and compulsion against the sovereign States of this Union, constitutes a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt by the Court to usurp the exercise of powers not granted to it:

"That the Legislature of Mississippi asserts that whenever the Federal Governments attempts to engage in the deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of powers not granted to it, the States who are parties to the compact have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them;

"That failure on the part of this State thus to assert its clear rights would be construed as acquiescence in the surrender thereof, and that such submissive acquiescence to the seizure of one right would in the end lead to the surrender of all rights, and inevitably to the consolidation of the States into one sovereignty, contrary to the sacred compact by which this union of States was created;

"That the question of contested power asserted in this resolution is not within the

province of the court to determine because the court itself seeks to usurp the powers which have been reserved to the States, and, therefore, under these circumstances, the judgment of all of the parties to the compact must be sought to resolve the question; that the Supreme Court is not a party to this compact, but a creature of the compact, and the question of contested power cannot 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 whom ultimate sovereignty finally reposes; be it further

"*Resolved*, That:

"In order that relief be obtained and the wrongs and injuries inflicted be alleviated, we invite all of our sister States to join in taking such steps as are necessary to settle 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 past, curbed the attempted encroachment by the judiciary upon the legislative and executive branches of government, and it is the responsibility of the Congress likewise to 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 control their public schools, colleges, and other public institutions; therefore, when an attempt is made to usurp these powers, the people of Mississippi object and refuse to be so deprived, reminding 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 privilege of a State to object to the aforesaid invasion of its rights and does hereby interpose its sovereignty to protect these rights; it is the duty of the Congress to halt such practices and save these rights; and if such cannot be obtained other than by amendment to the Federal Constitution, we appeal to the Congress, in the exercise of the power granted under article 5 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 facilities to the Federal Government, or any department or agency thereof, but such powers are reserved to the States; and until such time as these wrongs are righted, we de hereby declare the decision and order of the Supreme Court of the United States of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, to be a usurpation of power reserved to the several States and do declare, as a matter of right, that said decisions are in violation of the Constitution of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and therefore, are considered unconstitutional, invalid, and of no lawful effect within the confines of the State of Mississippi;

"We declare further, our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably and 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 by the Federal Government, 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, the Governor of each of the other 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 SILLERS,
"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 recommended for adoption, 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 experience in the adopting 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 dependent: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia (the Senate concurring), That the* Congress of the United States is memorialized to 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, and to each member of the Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"E. GRIFFITH DODSON,
"Clerk of the House of Delegates."

Resolutions adopted by the Porterville Junior Chamber of Commerce, Porterville, and a mass meeting of the citizens of the Tule and Kaweah River area, County of Tulare, both in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds necessary for the construction of Success and Terminus Dams, in the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Kauai, T. H., favoring the appointment of Philip L. Rice as chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Associated Equipment Distributors, Chicago, Ill., relating to retail exemption in the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorial of Mrs. Quintin Daehler, of Mayview, Mo., remonstrating against the artificial fluoridation of the community water systems of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The memorial of Elizabeth H. Hagerty, and sundry other citizens of Whittier, Calif., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 2905) and the bill (H. R. 7535), relating to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the BMT division, Holy Name Society, New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; ordered to lie on the table.

WHEAT PRICES—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received 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 WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The Sheridan County Republican Convention was held March 6 in the courthouse in McClusky at which time a short resolution on wheat prices was adopted and as acting secretary, I was directed to transmit the resolution to you. The resolution is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Sheridan County Republican Convention shall go on record to support 90 percent of parity on quality 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.

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 two resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Fargo (N. Dak.) Chamber of Commerce, relating to a workable price support program and wheat production allotments.

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 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 LANGER and YOUNG and Representatives BURDICK and KRUEGER support Senate bill

3183, and do further urge that they support a workable price support program.

T. VICTOR DEFOREST,
Executive Vice President.

Whereas the national affairs committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo supports the legislation recently passed by the United States Senate, which provides that domestic producers shall receive at least 55 percent of the increased production allotments based on increased consumption; and

Whereas this legislation will provide increased income for North Dakota farmers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Fargo, N. Dak., do hereby commend Senators LANGER and YOUNG for their support of this legislation and do hereby respectfully urge the support of Representatives BURDICK and KRUEGER.

T. VICTOR DEFOREST,
Executive Vice President.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 1650).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3415. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Civil Rights and Privileges; to promote observance of the civil rights of all individuals; and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 3416. A bill relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3417. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interest in, and the appointment of, the waters of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries as they affect such States, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 3418. 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. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. DOUGLAS:)

S. 3419. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Committee on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 3420. A bill to authorize the appropriation 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 maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3421. A bill to permit persons who were reciving annuities prior to January 1, 1954, to continue to compute the portion of annuity payments excludable from gross income in the manner provided by the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BYRD (by request):

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.

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

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. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MCCLELLAN):

S. 3428. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Arkansas Post State Park as a national park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

RESOLUTION

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

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

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

FEDERAL COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the 83d Congress, I introduced a bill to establish a Federal 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 reference.

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 observance of the civil rights of all individuals; and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, 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 Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, 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 can schedule early hearings 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 (for himself, Mr. IVES, 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, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, 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 in this act referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall be composed of 24 members appointed

by the President, from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, one or more of the arts. Three of such members shall be representative of each of the following 7 major art fields: music, drama and dance; literature; architecture; painting, sculpture and graphic art; photography and motion pictures; and radio and television, and 3 members shall be persons with outstanding general interest in the arts. In making such appointments the President shall give due consideration to the recommendations for nomination submitted by the leading national organizations in these fields, and he shall determine at least every 6 years which of such organizations shall be invited to submit nominations. The term of office of each member of the Commission shall be 6 years; except that, of the 3 members first appointed to represent each of the 7 major art fields listed above, and general interest in the arts, 1 shall be appointed for a term of 2 years, 1 for a term of 4 years, and 1 for a term of 6 years. No member of the Commission shall be eligible for reappointment during the 2-year period following the expiration of his term.

The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), but not less often than twice each calendar year. The President shall from time to time, on the basis of the recommendations of the Commission, designate a member of the Commission to be Chairman.

(b) The Commission shall have an executive secretary who shall be appointed by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission. Within the limits of appropriations available therefor, the Secretary shall also provide the Commission, its executive secretary, and members of its special committees with necessary secretarial, clerical, and other staff assistance.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall undertake studies of, and make recommendations relating to, appropriate methods, consistent with the policy set forth in the first section of this act, for encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts and of participation in and appreciation of the arts. Such studies shall be conducted by special committees of persons, expert in the field of art involved, appointed by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission, which shall give due consideration to recommendations for nomination submitted by the leading national organizations in such field of art. After considering reports on these studies, the Commission shall make recommendations in writing to the Secretary. In the selection of subjects to be studied and in the formulation of recommendations, the Commission may obtain the advice of any interested and qualified persons and organizations. The advisory services of the Commission shall also be available upon request to the head of any Federal department or agency which has in operation or under consideration a program in any field of the arts; and after conducting its studies pursuant to any such request the Commission may make its recommendations in writing directly to the Federal official who made the request.

SEC. 4. Members of the Commission and members of special committees appointed pursuant to section 3, while attending meetings of the Commission or while engaged in the conduct of studies hereunder, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $50 per diem, and shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C., sec. 734–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 5. (a) Any member of the Commission or of a special committee, appointed under this act, and any other person appointed, employed, or utilized in an advisory or consultative capacity under this act is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, employment, or utilization, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, except as otherwise specified in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) (1) The exemption granted by subsection (a) of this section shall not extend to the following acts performed as an officer or employee of the United States by any person so appointed, employed, or utilized: (A) The negotiation or execution of, or (B) the making of any recommendation with respect to, or (C) the taking of any other action with respect to, any individual contract or other arrangement under this act with the private employer of such person or any corporation, joint stock company, association, firm, partnership, or other business entity in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which such person has any direct or indirect interest.

(2) The exemption granted by subsection (a) of this section shall not, during the period of such appointment, employment, or utilization and the further period of 2 years after the termination thereof, extend to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, employed, or utilized, of any claim against the Government involving any individual contract or other arrangement entered into pursuant to this act concerning which the appointee had any responsibility during the period of such appointment, employment, or utilization.

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 this act, including expenses of professional, clerical, and stenographic assistance. Such appropriations shall be available for services as 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 widening realization that the Federal Government of the United States gives less recognition to the role of the arts in our national life than any other major nation—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 farming will reduce the number of hours that man must spend in the factory or on the farm. This will leave more time for other pursuits, and an increasing number of our citizens will turn to the arts. It is also clear that the continuing and epoch-making discoveries of 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, and the appreciation of all of the arts is apt to become deeper with the richness of years.

Our artists have attained a very high level of accomplishment without the governmental support and promotion which they generally receive in other lands. They come from the plains, from mountain hamlets, from crowded cities. There is not a State which has not contributed to the flourishing of our arts. The foremost artists are the sons and daughters of our constituents. They are like the baseball heroes who develop on the sandlots and school playgrounds, who are later selected and trained on the ball farms of the professional leagues, until they are given the big chance before the grandstands of the world series. But the American people have not fully realized the international and enduring significance of the arts, and little attention has been paid to the development of the creative artist, and his rewards are few. The big collectors and patrons of the arts are rare. Recordings and reproductions have taken the place of live art in most American homes. Perfected mass communication has reduced attendance at concerts, symphonies, theaters, and operas. Live art 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 to turn 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 of history.

The arts provide the wellspring and the pipelines for our Nation's cultural growth. I am a stanch exponent of the protection of the natural resources of our country for the benefit of all our people. Likewise, I believe that our cultural resources should be fostered and developed for the enrichment of all. Are we in America going to continue to be as profligate or as blindly inconsiderate about our cultural resources as we were in the past about our great forests and deep rich soil? The long drought of economic insecurity for the arts in America has spread an aesthetic dust bowl across many of our States. For instance, the theater and its people in smaller cities and towns have become as rare as our vanishing prairies. Plans need to be developed by far-sighted statesmen, with the assistance of professional advice, for the protection and nurturing of 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 artist in certain fields, than in most European countries today. Congress has established permanent departments or agencies for practically all other vital aspects of our economy. It is high time that Congress should recognize that the arts are essential to the general welfare and the national interest. Encouragement of the arts is a long-term process and depends principally upon local and individual initiative. However, this local initiative can be greatly stimulated at comparatively modest expense to the Federal Government, provided the methods used are judiciously devised and vigorously implemented. The question before Congress is not whether it should take action on this subject now, but rather, what action would be the most effective and sound.

The present international situation underscores another reason why Congress should give immediate attention to the arts. The new look in the policy of the Soviet Union might be said to be a shift in the continuing cold war from the arena of armaments and potential armed aggression to penetration into other lands by economic and cultural campaigns accompanied by propaganda against the United States for its laissez faire attitude toward the arts. This challenge must be met. This does not for a moment mean that we can risk slackening our preparations for meeting any threat of destruction by superior forces. Quite the contrary. 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 an integral part of our foreign policy. My distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], have introduced two bills, S. 3116 and S. 3172, to the purposes of which I fully subscribe. They are for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals. The objective of the bill which I intend to place before the Senate for consideration is to strengthen and augment our cultural resources here at home. Unless this is done, by whatever means, unless the development of our arts is encouraged, the benefits we anticipate 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, may I remind the Senate that art legislation is and should always be kept beyond the pale of domestic and party politics. This same nonpartisan and nonpolitical approach applies equally to the implementation of art legislation and to the administering of any or all federally sponsored art programs.

President Eisenhower in his State of the Union message last year, before the extent 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 Commission 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. 7973 (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 it plans to encourage the performance, practice, and appreciation of the arts, and, upon request, to advise those Federal departments and agencies which have or may consider art programs in any field with the exception of those areas of responsibility of the present Commission of Fine Arts.

Permit me to call attention to a few features of this proposed legislation:

1. The present diversified system of federally sponsored art programs administered by many different Federal departments and agencies is retained as appropriate to our American desire for freedom and independence.

2. This proposed legislation is consequently not a step toward a department of art with concurrent danger of undesired bureaucratic or governmental control of the artist.

3. It does not propose any wholesale support of the arts or dole to the artist by the Federal Government. It recognizes that progress in the arts depends upon freedom, imagination, and individual initiative, and that support of the arts in America is primarily a matter of private and local action. Nevertheless, in certain art fields encouragement and temporary assistance by the Federal Government is urgently needed, but such undertakings as may be proposed would be considered separately on their own merits in due course by Congress.

4. This proposed legislation would provide a permanent reference agency with all the arts represented by the best professional knowledge, experience, and judgment in the various fields to which the administration and Congress may turn for impartial advice, and it would establish for the first time in our history the machinery whereby the many art programs sponsored by the Government may be assessed with professional competence as to their relative values in relation to the appropriations requested from Congress by different Federal departments and agencies.

The sponsors of this bill believe that it will stimulate artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation. It will serve the interests of the Nation as well as those of the arts it would promote. We are confident that this proposed legislation will have the broadest kind of support not only by cultural organizations and institutions throughout the country but also by the many thousands of Americans who are increasingly aware of the essential part of the arts in their pursuit of happiness.

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. This document describes, 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 most usefully undertake.

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

(Prepared 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 status of the performing musician seems to be greatly deteriorating. The cause of this may be sought partly, but not altogether, in the spread of mechanization of musical performances. Musical recordings and broadcasts over the radio and television have increased the scope of musical 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. The average age of the symphony orchestra musician is constantly growing older. The problem of keeping our great symphony orchestras alive becomes more acute with each season. As of now, they seem to arise, like the Phoenix, every year from their own ashes. Whether Government subsidy on a local, State, or Federal level is the answer to this dilemma is a question which remains to be solved.

OPERA

Opera in the United States is in a deplorable situation. There are now only 1 or 2 permanent opera companies with reasonably long seasons of activity. Practically all our larger cities are without opera houses and professional opera companies. This condition exists in hardly any other country of the Western World. There are about 50 opera companies in Germany today. Even our most gifted singers have to go abroad to acquire mature professional experience and the recognition from experts necessary for employment by our two opera companies. Conservatories of music and several universities have student opera workshops, but these do not provide professional experience or status. In the United States there is a great and growing appreciation for opera, but, here again, we come up against the economic problem of those who take part in operatic productions. Only a few outstanding singers can hope to make a livelihood through singing in opera on account of the very limited opportunities at present in the United States.

DRAMA

There are great stretches of the country which today do not have any professional theater. Distance and expense make such areas impractical for the commercial theater. The theaters and opera houses which once served traveling companies no longer exist. They have been torn down or converted to movie houses or other uses. The theater and its people in smaller cities and towns are now as remote and shadowy as the clipper ships that once sailed the seven seas. Yet the theater creates an emotional impact and depth of comment which motion pictures, television, and radio can never provide.

A special committee of the Commission could study and report on the following proposal which has been suggested as a partial solution.

Certain areas of our country have generally similar cultural standards, common attitudes on many problems, and speak a language whose accents and rhythms are understood by a majority of their people and to which they tend to respond. New England, the Deep South, the Midwest, and the Pacific coast are recognized as such and there are others. Each has an unofficial capital to which the region is bound by economic and cultural ties.

To bring the theater to people in these regions the Federal Government and the States in those regions should combine to set up competent professional companies in all or some of these regional capitals. These companies should be staffed, as far as possible, with playwrights, directors, and actors drawn from those regions. They should be charged with developing theaters concerned primarily with the problems, aspirations, and culture of their region, in language which its people use and understand. Each company should play a part of its season in its capital city. And then it should take to the road, playing in every city, town, and crossroads where an audience can be gotten together, at prices within reach of its audiences. That way a theater for the Nation would be brought to its people for a comparatively small outlay of money.

Almost every great civilized nation uses or has used such a system to provide theater for its people; to nourish its language at its best; to explain its audiences to themselves; to portray the history and ideals to its own people, its neighbors, and the world about it. Such programs have been fostered by countries far less wealthy and less culturally and spiritually alive than the United States, and they have felt that these programs were well worth what they cost. If the Congress of the United States can think of the theater only in terms of revenue or entertainment, it will fail in its duty to the people it represents,

deprive great sections of the country of a form of culture they once had, and continue a policy which has long since been abandoned by almost all civilized nations.

DANCE AND BALLET

There is not nearly enough activity on the professional stage (opera, theater, television, etc.) in the United States to give even part-time employment to the talented youth that is already prepared or is training for a career in the dance world. In New York City, when a choreographer needs from 4 to 15 dancers and holds an audition, anywhere from 200 to 400 dancers apply. Of this group, 75 or 80 percent may qualify when less than 10 percent may be needed.

Ballet companies are limited in number and they are forced to tour 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 over the Russian Ballet Co. While all these tours of dance groups from other countries are part of a desirable international cultural exchange, the United States has only two groups in this field suitable for such exchanges: the Ballet Theater and the City Center Ballet Co. And these two have only been sent on limited trips abroad. Of course, there are the other dance groups like the Martha Graham group which has most successfully toured South America and is now in the Far East. In any case, the recent influx of foreign dance groups satisfies some of the public demand for dance or ballet performances and consequently militates against the forming of new professional dance groups in our own country.

The Commission should assign to a special committee on the dance the investigation of the following suggestion.

In different regional areas of the United States smaller dance groups, primarily ballet, might be formed. These groups would give concert performances at local universities, colleges, civic centers, and theaters. These groups could arrange for exchange performances from time to time in other sections of the country. Eventually, several groups or selections from them might be joined into larger units to be sent abroad. These groups should probably be composed of different schools of the dance—modern, classical ballet (the most serious lack in the United States today), and even what might be called modern jazz, which is the type of work we have mostly in musical comedies and television and which might be considered abroad as peculiarly American. A complete cross section of contemporary dance in America—not just one type—is what would be desired. These dance groups might or might not be fittingly associated with the proposed regional theater companies. At any rate, such a project would not be possible unless initial aid were forthcoming from Federal, State, or private sources, or a combination of these. The Federal Government should at least give encouragement to such an enterprise. It is perfectly obvious that the American people are dance conscious. It seems almost shameful that so little opportunity exists for American dancers to perform.

LITERATURE

Writers in America, conscious that words are the major vehicle of propaganda, are especially aware of the danger inherent in any system of Federal sponsorship of the arts that the artist so employed or assisted may be subject to some form of governmental control and political dictation, or at least restriction of esthetic freedom, necessary for creative art. When a concerted effort is made to harness the arts to serve a nation's government, as instanced in the Soviet Union, life ebbs from the arts, unless they are basically too abstract (music) or formalized (ballet) to be subject to dogmatic controls. But the possibility exists and should be kept in mind and resisted by all members of the Commission and its special committees, by the administrators of any Federal art program, and by Members of Congress when judging the value of these programs. Reasonable administrative controls are of course necessary and expected.

There is a phase of Federal assistance to writers which seems worthy of considerable expansion—fellowships for American writers to be sent abroad for research and creative work. The most important aspect of this program is careful selection of persons who might thereby give greatest cultural return for the investment. While this activity is part of the international educational exchange program administered by the Department of State, the small advisory committee of 10 members which the Department intends to establish to cover all the arts represented in this program would not be expected or competent to offer expert advice about the crucial question of the qualifications of writer candidates for such fellowships. It is therefore suggested that the Department of State might request the Commission to establish a special committee for literature, one of the duties of which could be advice concerning American writers for such fellowships.

ARCHITECTURE AND SISTER ARTS

The United States has lagged far behind European countries in the use of art in conjunction with public buildings. The current official term "embellishment of Federal buildings" clearly indicates that the art is not an integral part but stuck in as an afterthought. Cooperation between architect and sculptor and muralist should begin at the planning stage, which is rarely done here. It is just as reasonable to call in the artists who will contribute to the esthetic 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 artist and the artist's designs are suitable for his building. Too often in the United States architects select subordinated examples of the sister arts, mere decoration which is not a work of art in its own right however accomplished the craftsmanship, and such embellishment adds nothing to mankind's need for spiritual nourishment.

Several governments abroad set aside by statute a proportion of the budget allocation for public buildings to be spent on murals, mosaic, sculpture, etc. They have regulations for open competitions, including protection of the artist's interests as well as the architect's. The municipalities make appropriations for statues in public parks. The plight of the sculptor in America today is the worst in these fields of art, additionally so due to the costs inherent in his art. A special committee of the Commission should study methods used abroad for closer cooperation between the architect and allied creative artists and recommend a system suitable for the United States which would not be under the dominance of any one art group. While federally sponsored art of this kind is almost exclusively the province of the Commission of Fine Arts, such a study would stimulate greater and more effective use of the sister arts with architecture by State, municipal, and private industry, and therefore this subject is a proper matter for the concern of the Commission.

PAINTING, SCULPTURE, AND GRAPHIC ART

The United States Information Agency is sponsoring a number of traveling exhibitions of American art which are sent abroad. The USIA has turned for advice and assistance to private art organizations or individuals concerning what kinds of exhibitions should be sent and the selection of the examples to be included. There should be a panel of experts to advise the USIA about such matters. It is suggested that the composition of such a panel should be subject to fairly frequent change and its members nominated by the leading national art organizations in the appropriate field. If the USIA so requested this could be a special committee established by the Commission.

It is also suggested that the Department of State might request the Commission to establish a special committee to advise it concerning the selection of artists from these fields who might be granted fellowships for study or creative work abroad—similar to the special committee suggested for writers.

One method by which the Federal Government can give more support and recognition to American artists in these fields is by providing suitable housing for the National Collection of Fine Arts and 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 consideration an ambitious outline of increased activities. The Smithsonian Institution, if so desired, could make use of the advisory services of the Commission for detail recommendations about aspects of these plans for the study of which the Smithsonian might not have the appropriate facilities.

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 always been made either in terms of "cold war" conflict or even in less dramatic terms of showing America as it really is to countries uncommitted in the "cold war." The Commission may very well be the agency to help to integrate Government activity with the productive genius of Hollywood to insure the proper use of the best films we make for the best interests of the country.

In the matter of international film festivals, for example, an impartial body such as this can be of service in the selection of films to be shown, thus removing the selection from the inevitable studio politics and commercial pressures that have forced such selections in the past. Also, it may be the proper agency to develop plans for an American film festival, which has long been talked about, but never put into effect because of these same politics and pressures.

As for educational and documentary films, the possibilities for their use both inside this country and abroad are so vast and 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 preparation for training films during World War II.

RADIO AND TELEVISION

In the fields of radio and television, the Commission can be of value in the general activity of raising programing standards, without in any way infringing on the basic commercial operation of networks and individual stations. It can cooperate with the Federal Communications Commission in the matter of public service programing, which the FCC requires of station licensees. In the matter of prize awards for fine programs, it may very well bring order out of the chaos in which the communication fields now find themselves. And in the development of educational broadcasting, which is both desirable and inevitable, it can bring the assistance and aptitude of professional talent into

an area which has already made remarkable strides, but which admittedly has a long way yet to go.

Certainly in the field of overseas activity the Commission could be of inestimable value. As foreign television stations and networks continue to expand, the best of American programing can be made available to them, as well as the best American talent and experience. The USIA recently announced the great popular acclaim and official interest aroused by the first demonstrations of television which it has conducted in the smaller countries of Europe and Asia. This field has almost unlimited possibilities. For instance, the use of closed-circuit telecasts in countries which face the problem of mass education with an appalling shortage 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 of America through this new 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 of Federal policy 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 desired sensitivity and imagination. 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 of the United States with those of other countries. The propaganda value of these exchanges is incalculable. They should be given official support and encouragement. The assembling of the drawings and paintings has generally been under the auspices of the Junior Red Cross. The National Art Education Association has attended to the arrangements for the tours in conjunction with the UNESCO Relations 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 undertake a survey of all art programs under Federal sponsorship (exclusive of those under the guidance of the Commission of Fine Arts) in relation to their achievements, budgetary needs, efficiency of administration on general lines, whether impartial expert advice is available, and the validity of their claims for expansion. In doing so the Commission members would become acquainted with this rather complex situation of varied programs and also be able to provide valuable information to the administration and Congress. It is suggested that these surveys, which should 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 a source for cultural information to the United States Information Agency and be used to counteract adverse propaganda by the Soviet Union.

3. Adjusting inequities 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 without injury or unfairness 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 permit the artist to apportion his earnings over a span of years. Another area for study is the amusement tax as applied to musical and theatrical performances. This tax, imposed as an emergency wartime measure, has not yet 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 value of the arts to our national welfare has been sadly lacking in America; that there is urgent need to establish such a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts; that there are many fields of art in a serious situation today in our country and that study should be made of ways to ameliorate these conditions; that the Commission could be of assistance to those agencies or departments charged with programs to make use of our arts to increase international understanding; that all these advisory services of the Commission would not in themselves be costly; and that this Commission would perform services of increasing usefulness both to the administration and to Congress.

The suggested immediate studies which might be undertaken by the Commission are only instances selected as examples and by no means a complete outline. The creation of this Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, if it receives adequate support from the administration and from Congress, will blaze the way toward greater achievements in and appreciation of the arts in America and will thus appreciably enrich the lives of a large and increasing number of our citizens.

TIMBER ACCESS ROADS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON], my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], 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. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the appropriation 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 maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes.

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

The bill (S. 3420) to authorize the appropriation 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 maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because of the fact that the Senate is now operating under a unanimous-consent agreement, I shall withhold until a later date a major speech which I intend to make in explanation of, and an argument in support of, the objectives of this bill.

Suffice it to say at this time, in my judgment the building of access roads happens to be absolutely essential if we are to have a sound conservation program in the handling of Federal timber.

I am a little at a loss to understand the point of view of some who seem to think that access roads might result in overcutting our timber. Apparently those people do not understand the meaning of cutting up to the allowable cut. It is necessary to have access roads into this timber so that we can conserve the timber, and avoid waste as a result of timber becoming overripe, diseased, wind-blown, or destroyed by the elements.

If this administration really means it when it talks about conservation, it will give support to my access roads bill.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO APPEALS BY THE UNITED STATES—ENFORCEMENT OF ANTITRUST PROVISIONS OF THE CODE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference three bills. The first is a bill to amend 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 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 "Antitrust 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 program of 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, as follows:

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.

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, for appropriate reference, a 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, executive secretary of the Arkansas History 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. 3428) to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability 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, which included 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 1686 on the north side of the Arkansas River, probably in section 20, Township 8 North, Range 2, West (Spanish Grant No. 2351), in the immediate vicinity of the Menard Mound. Overflows led to relocation of the fort several times.

In 1718 John Law's Compaigne 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 a commandant named Menard.

The first white child of record born in Arkansas was born at Arkansas Post on December 5, 1742. She was Catherine Landrony, daughter of Joseph and Marie Landrony. The earliest Arkansas vital records known to be in existence are those of the Post, the originals of which are now located in Ottawa, Canada. The oldest records in the custody of the Arkansas History Commission are likewise records of the Post, dating from 1797 to 1819.

In 1748 the French garrison numbered 30 men, having been reduced by desertion and disease. In 1752 the Post was rebuilt a few hundred yards to the northwest of the location of 1686 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'Ernville. 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 1768. During that year Captain Philip Pittman 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 about 180 feet, and one 3-pounder is mounted in the flanks and faces of each bastion. The buildings within the fort are: a barrack with three rooms for the soldiers, commanding officer's house, a powder magazine, and a magazine for provisions, and an apartment for 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 abandoned until in 1779 it was rebuilt at a site about one-half mile south of the present remains of the village of Arkansas Post. The Spanish were now in dominion and they named this fort Fort Carlos III. The village nearby retained its French name, Arkansas Post. In 1788 another rise came and tore away Fort Carlos III. The Spanish commandant ordered another built on higher ground, at the site of the present Arkansas Post State Park. This last of the European forts on the Arkansas River was completed in 1791. It was called by the Spanish "Fuerte San Estevan de Arkanzas." All that remains of this final bastion is a large brick-lined cistern, which must have been in the immediate vicinity of the fort.

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

On December 31, 1813, 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 donated to the county a square of land, on condition that the legislature of the newly established Territory of Arkansas (1819) would establish thereon the permanent seat of justice of Arkansas County. From the creation of Arkansas Territory in 1819 to 1821 the capital of the Territory was at Arkansas Post. The town continued to be the county seat until 1855, when the county seat was moved to Dewitt. Arkansas government began at Arkansas Post. The first legislature met there and the first court. The first newspaper in Arkansas, the Arkansas Gazette was started there by William E. Woodruff in 1819. In the cemetry adjacent to the post were buried several of the leading citizens of early Arkansas, including Henry W. Conway, Delegate to Congress. Conway's grave is marked only by some broken fragments of stone.

With removal of the capital to Little Rock a period of decline for Arkansas Post began. By 1830 the population had dwindled to 114 people. Steamboat traffic and the settlement of the country brought a brief rise in the fortunes of the town. A branch of the State Bank of Arkansas was established there in 1839, and the next year the Sisters of Charity of the Catholic Church established a school there.

One of the most important battles of the Civil War west of the Mississippi River was fought at Arkansas Post in January 1863, when a Union force consisting of gunboats and troops destroyed the fort and place of the town.

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

Maps continued to mark the spot where the post had flourished while briars and weeds spread over the streets. The site of the old Spanish fort was swallowed in a jungle. The place was all but forgotten when the Arkansas Legislature in 1929 set up the Arkansas Post State Park Commission. The bill establishing the park was introduced by Ballard Deane of Arkansas County. The act set up a commission consisting of J. W. Burnett of DeWitt, chairman, Dallas T. Herndon, Little Rock, secretary, and the following members: Mrs. J. F. Weinmann, Mrs. Charles Miller, Miss Janie Woodruff, Mrs. M. F. Sigmon, Mrs. J. L. Rosencrantz, Mrs. George C. Lewis, Mrs. C. J. Brain, Mrs. W. W. Lowe, Fletcher Chenault, and S. G. Callett. Under the leadership of this commission the site of the park was cleared of brush and fenced, a log house for the caretaker was built, and other improvements made. The work was paid for in part by a $5,000 appropriation made by the State and in part by contributions made to a park fund sponsored by the Arkansas Federation of Women's Clubs and the club women of Arkansas County. The civilian conservation corps of the Federal Government worked on the grounds. The commission, which acquired 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 with the money available but that amount was wholly inadequate to the job of making the site of Arkansas Post appear appropriate to its historical importance. No building was restored. Only dirt roads traverse the park. Small markers on the ground commemorate the following:

Establishment of the original French fort.

First capital of Arkansas Territory.

Battle of Arkansas Post, 1863.

First home of Arkansas Gazette.

Meeting place of the first Arkansas Legislature.

Site of the Arkansas Post branch of State bank.

The Arkansas Post State Park cannot be reached on hard-surfaced roads, although a hard-surfaced road does run within 3 miles of the site. The approach to the park must be made from Gillett over about 11 miles of gravel. 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.

Last Friday night, on an issue affecting the livelihood and welfare of millions of America's wheat farmers, a mistake was made in tallying a rollcall—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 22 to be exact—have availed themselves 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 "yea" or "nay," and to be so recorded—speedily and efficiently 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 hand 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. 228) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That 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. 3183) 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. IVES (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.

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

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

By Mr. 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 Amen 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. Bartlett, 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:

H. R. 2552. 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 bound to cause a deterioration in Greek-British relations, and 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 exclusively a domestic 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, in this case 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 weak legal and moral grounds for 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 potentialities.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished leader of the minority for his statement, and to be associated with him. I am 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 childlish legends and concentrate on the easily available proof that a free society can do more to make mankind 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 with 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 so reminded. The Soviet purpose has not changed. If for one reason or another—including our concentrated efforts to defend ourselves by retaliatory 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 the Russians. The Russians are taking advantage of a period of majestic and confusing change, but in spite of the revolutionary aroma with which they have sur-

rounded 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 trying to cease, to be colonially exploited; God made them brown or yellow or black or red rather than white; they are poor; they are not well fed or well housed; they don't 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 the Far Eastern countries which SEATO cultivates, where the Colombo Plan flourishes and where liberty appears in an unaccustomed and inexperienced guise. There is a 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. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev and their retinue, but he is there, lavashing sympathy, which does not cost anything in rubles, and offering steel mills or comparable tools which have to be paid back in fixed installments.

Wherever there is an unhealthful fly or a lethal type of mosquito or a flea hopping around with a disease in its little insides, wherever there is too little to eat, wherever there are too 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 prison camps. He tells them how things are or will be in a mythical 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 Russian words. It is deeds that count, and a real friendship behind the deeds. It will probably be necessary for us to work miracles in the underdeveloped 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 helping people who need help and making friends of people who need friends—and whom we need for friends.

Let us undertake this task clear-eyed. Russia did not devise the evils we are trying to cure. Russia is not responsible for the retarded economic growth, the high death rates, the unfathomable and curable misery from which more than half the human race suffers. Russia did not invent typhoid, ophthalmia, cholera, and other diseases—afflictions born and spread by insects in conditions of poverty and filth. Russia didn't invent flies.

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 more to make mankind well and happy than anything the children of Marx and Lenin have to offer.

POPE PIUS XII

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, regardless of religious affiliations, the American people are as one in their respect for leaders of thought and action in various parts of the world, especially when these individuals are striving to advance the cause of international accord and of enduring peace.

Such a leader is Pope Pius XII, who is now observing his 80th birthday and also his 17th anniversary in the papacy. Editorials commenting on these observances have appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun and in the Baltimore News-Post, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in 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 messages of rejoicing from points all over the world. These could be expected in any case; but, apart from his rank, the Pope is a man with such warmth of nature, nobility of character, and depth of 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 times so far met with in the Vatican's long history. This is true of matters both great and small—the pay raise, for example, today bestowed 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 against racism in all countries, including the United States.

The statistically minded will report that Pius XII's many fruitful years continue a trend of recent papal centuries, that Leo XIII died at 90 and Pius IX ruled 32 years. Other persons will simply join in the hope that Pius XII, a true world figure, 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 turn to Rome today to be with Pope Pius XII in observance of his 80th birthday and the 17th anniversary of his reign.

Far beyond the confines of the Roman Catholic Church of which he is the head on earth, this great "Pope of Peace," arch-foe of communism and of all forms of totalitarianism, is held in the deepest reverence.

The esteem and affection in which he is held as a person is in keeping with the admiration of him as a great religious leader and administrator.

That is partly because, although one of the world's most skilled diplomats, familiar with the inner workings of governments, a master of many languages, he ever remained a man of extraordinary gentleness, simplicity, friendliness, and piety. It has been evident to all that he "walked with God."

Born in the shadow of St. Peter's, his outstanding mentality and personality caused him to be named a monsignor at the early age of 28, an archbishop at 41, and a cardinal at 53.

He represented the Vatican at the coronation of King George V of Britain. He served as Papal Nuncio to Bavaria during part of World War I and narrowly escaped death during a "putsch" in Germany just after the war's end.

In 1917 he met the Kaiser and presented to him Pope Benedict XV's peace proposals.

After that conflict he was named Nuncio to Berlin and scored a great diplomatic victory with the concordat between Prussia and the Holy See.

He was made Vatican Secretary of State in 1930 and in 1936 visited the United States, met President Roosevelt, and made an 8,000-mile airplane tour to many cities.

Elected Pope on his 63d birthday, March 2, 1939, he labored with all his strength to avert World War II. After it broke out he built a vast mercy organization for its victims.

Pope Pius is a heroic figure in the struggle for lasting peace. He has been a champion of the well-being of the little man and of preservation of faith and freedom.

Cardinal Verdier of France once said that under modern world conditions, a Pope must be either a hero or a saint. Those familiar with the career of Pius XII consider him to be both.

THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this morning it was my great pleasure and privilege to present to a regional winner of the Voice of Democracy contest, a flag which has flown atop our Capitol. As you may recall, this contest is sponsored jointly by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce; the Radio, Electronics, Television Manufacturers Association; and the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. This winner, Gabriel G. Kajeckas, and his father, Joseph Kajeckas, both of Washington, D. C., made such wonderful statements of acceptance, that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY GABRIEL KAJECKAS

Senator BUTLER, I am greatly honored to receive this flag. I accept it with deep humility, being perfectly aware of its immense importance in that this flag stands for noble principles at a time when the world is starved for such principles. This flag flies over a free land—America, a land where today liberty is for everyone; for this reason, the American flag has become not just a sentinel of freedom, but a shining beacon of hope for all the enslaved and oppressed peoples of the world.

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 my native land, Lithuania, which has been overrun by men whose creed, principles, and flag stand for destruction. When the day comes, however, that Lithuania will again be free, the most fitting place for this flag will be beside the tomb of St. Casimir in Vilnius, the capital city of Lithuania. I feel especially gratified to receive this flag from you, Mr. BUTLER, as a Senator from the State of Maryland, since Lithuania is also, in a sense, Maryland. Her devotion to Mary the mother of God, is great indeed, and is exemplified in perhaps the most striking fashion by the famous shrine of Ausros Vartai, our lady of Vilnius.

A short time ago, Senator, I had the honor of being a national winner of the Voice of Democracy contest, in which I was proud to speak for the principles in which I believe. God grant that now I might cherish in my heart everything just, decent, and good that is symbolized by this banner, which all Americans proudly know as Old Glory.

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH KAJECKAS

Senator BUTLER, Mrs. Kajeckas and I feel extremely grateful to you for presenting to our son, Gabriel, this United States flag which flew over the Capitol on St. Casimir's day. We feel grateful still more because such a gesture has in all probability no precedents.

Only 2 weeks ago, Senator, you made public a very eloquent and forceful statement on Lithuania's independence day, stressing that America and the free world "will remain

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 gratified that the presentation of this flag has been made by you, a Senator from Maryland, in which State for about two decades now, Lithuania's independence day has been officially proclaimed each year as Republic of Lithuania Day.

Lithuanians in their homeland are forbidden by tyrannical forces to give honor to the Lithuanian flag and their patron saint, St. Casimir; whereas here, their 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 new-car dealers if the basic reason or primary cause of such threat or termination was the dealer's refusal or unwillingness to purchase unwanted merchandise from the manufacturer.

Thereafter I sent a copy 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 be filled out and returned 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, have written me concerning the many problems which arise out of their relations with the automobile manufacturers. Although I received many outstanding and memorable letters, one, 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 this dealer, it is with a real feeling 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 28, 1956, from Mr. Robert B. Livie, Jr.

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

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

The Honorable JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: Your bill S. 3110 hits closer to the mark than any of the actions of Congress to date as regards to correcting the unsound condition of automobile retailing that is so apparent today. As you implied, this bill is not completely definitive but it does represent a positive and concrete step in the right direction.

There are certain economic-philosophical premises which, if accepted as true, point out the necessity of Federal regulation of the commerce between the manufacturer and the franchised dealer. No new car dealer desires legislation designed to subsidize or guarantee a profit for his business. Just as the Securities and Exchange Commission was created in the recognition of the social responsibility to the entire Nation of the stock market, so should Federal legislation recognize that the automobile industry affects vitally the livelihood of a considerable segment of our Nation. If a farmer in Nebraska could be adversely affected by the financial manipulation of selfish interests in the Chicago grain market; if economically sound utilities in the Midwest could be bankrupted by Samuel Insull and his pyramiding actions in 1930; then I feel that the selfish activities of an automobile manufacturer can and will cause a progressive economic disintegration in every part of this country of substantial business investments.

The automobile dealer operates under the delusion that he is an independent businessman. This is only true when gauged against the competitive market for customer sales and I hope this situation will never change. However, this feeling of "the survival of the fittest" is totally inadequate when applied to the dealer's relationship to his sole source of supply—the manufacturer. He has been unable to realize the consequences of this one statement about the manufacturer: Labor is most effectively organized and capable of protecting its own interests; management is organized by the very hierarchy of a business organization; the stockholders are presented well by the board of directors (the record of dividends by General Motors since 1946 is proof of this). The only unorganized group that the corporations deal with are the dealers and they, by virtue of their own philosophy, can never effectively unionize. It stands to reason that each of the above are selfish interests in the sense that their actions have been defined primarily to their own particular benefit and any benefit accruing to the public or the dealer has been definitely secondary.

This situation can change in only one fashion. When the dealer on the open market is no longer capable of negotiating his merchandise at a profit, then he ceases to buy from the manufacturer. Then the stockholder, labor and management are forced to examine the reasons why this happened. At present Chrysler Corp. is operating on a 4-day week; soon the pocketbook of all these above elements will suffer. Only at that time will stop gap or minimum action be taken by the factories, not because they want to, but, rather because they have to. This situation need not have occurred if Chrysler, for example, had not built cars on a 6-day week with 2 shifts and overtime for the last 60 days in 1955. But for their selfish interest of year-end production and consequent maximum earnings, they chose to produce to the limits of their capability. By gosh, when supply exceeds demand, the price of anything must drop. And here I should like to define price as being that sum of money the public is actually willing to pay on a competitive market for an automobile at that very moment. Actual price changes from week to week in our business—for example, 1 week we can negotiate for a $100 profit and the next week $50, and so forth.

My point, though somewhat long-winded, is this: The new car business today demands large capital investment on the retail level as well as on the manufacturing level. Yet the completely irresponsible actions of the manufacturer have steadily made this business one of greater risk and smaller returns. The manufacturer himself consists of three components which by the records have proven to be incapable of enlighted self-interest. If we are ever again to have a depression, it will be hastened by 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 $150 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 we as dealers grub around for $50 and $100 gross profits per car, it should be recognized that broadly speaking the new-car dealer is approaching the economic point of no return.

That is why phantom freight, territory security, and bootlegging, are periphery phenomena, external symptoms of a far greater inequity that today exists. Your bill is at least aimed at a more vital spot—to place some value upon a man's lifelong endeavors to build his estate for the future—to encourage private venture capital in small business, the very heart of America's greatness.

The three evils mentioned above as of lesser importance can be corrected by the manufacturer as he is economically forced to do so. The basically weak and satellite nature of our relationship to the manufacturer never will be changed unless the Federal Government legislatively acknowledges the fact that the new-car franchise as it is presently constituted does not contribute to contained growth of the free-enterprise system.

The business ethics of automobile retailing are precisely what the manufacturer delineates. In the 1880's, the white man who sold liquor to the Indians had to share full moral responsibility for the nasty consequences that traditionally ensued. So let it be with General Motors—a billion in profit equals a billion in responsibility.

The cry of the manufacturer who bleats piously that the Government will penalize the efficient to the interests of the inefficeint is not in keeping with Federal legislation since the decade after the Civil War. The whole lesson of our Government has been to safeguard the right of existence to the less efficient. As the automobile manufacturer knows the UAW-CIO is not concerned with the most efficient worker, but rather, the less efficient. By effective organization, labor has forced the corporation to giving increasing recognition to this fact.

All we as dealers need can be gained through Federal legislation designed to remove the excess of power now held in Detroit. We can create our own future and solve our own problems that arise from year to year once an equitable franchise system is accepted, gracefully or otherwise, by the manufacturer.

I wish to congratulate you in your interest on our behalf. It is not the most popular as regards mass support; but it hits mighty close to the center of our continued national prosperity. You may be assured that I am most grateful and will tell anyone who listens what your help can mean to all of us.

Yours respectfully,

ROBERT B. LIVIE, Jr.

MORE THAN CORONETS—ARTICLE BY THE SENATE CHAPLAIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday there appeared in the Washington Sunday Star a very informative article written by our distinguished Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, entitled "More Than Coronets."

In view of 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. Brawling never makes for vision or judgment.

The article reads in part:

Courtesy, from its very derivation, is a royal word with the kingly grace of a coronet. Courtesy, according to 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 à Kempis:

Lord, let us be ever courteous and kind. Never let us fall into a peevish or contentious spirit, but follow peace with all men.

Such words make for the leadership that provides true direction and guidance.

Mr. President, as has been suggested many times on the floor of the Senate, the world is in a critical and serious situation. Calling names or indulging in personalities does not contribute to clarifying the issues or giving us the wisdom and direction we need in order that the constituency of this great Republic may be well informed.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD, following my remarks.

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

MORE THAN CORONETS

(By Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U. S. Senate)

In this convulsive day when thrones are falling, crowns and coronets still hold their fascination, even in lands where the people rule. A lovely American girl who becomes the princess of a tiny, pin-pointed realm, basks in the romantic interest of the world. In all parts of the Union, charming representatives of winsome young womanhood are crowned as princesses of this and that domain. Surrounded by their glittering attendants in royal ceremonies they are adorned with coronets as multitudes applaud. The coronation of another queen in some realm, civic, state, national, or commercial, is a frequent announcement. It is all a rather surprising phenomenon in a democracy whose founder defied a crown and spurned one for himself.

But such spectacles appeal to a universal liking for dramatic pageantry. That is partly the explanation as to why men whose daily environment in the discharge of their callings is often dull and drab and monotonous revel in organizations which clothe their devotees in striking costumes and address their officers with most flattering appellations. All this has its salutary side. Democracy tends, in its setting, to become painfully practical and commonplace, and to utterly disregard the visual trappings of splendor associated with an age that has vanished. It is well that once in a while even the dull ruts of routine be lined with sparkling silver and that heads lifted to some pedestal of eminence should wear a crown of distinction.

But this meditation has to do, not with any excited miss, who tomorrow is to be Queen of the May, or a princess reigning in any temporary realm which makes her the cynosure of unnumbered eyes as she is crowned, perhaps by some prominent official. This has to do with a crown without which any life is sadly deficient and poor indeed. Longfellow was pointing to it as he sang, "Kind hearts are more than coronets." America boasts that here, where every man is a king and every woman a queen, there are no crown jewels—there are no coronets—except those worn just as ornaments in some passing festival. But here, in the simple statement of a loved poet is a truth which, in this election year, desperately needs to be lifted higher than the Capitol's white dome. It is an inspiring sight to witness the mightiest nation on earth prepare to register its will in a genuine election such as the Kremlin's despotic manipulators cannot even understand. What they call an election we call coercion.

But because in our free land elections are so free, there is necessarily included the right to be unfair and unkind. The temptation is to find a use for everything but kindness in forging thunderbolts for the opposition. But kindness and fairness and courtesy are not virtues that cannot be afforded in a political campaign. They are the very signs and fruits of a mature people who have learned how to use and not abuse the weapons of freedom. If a man's convictions and the goals he seeks are high and honorable, he need never, in all his contending, take from the brow the coronet of kindness. With any who differ and who sincerely hold other opinions from those he advances, he can disagree without being disagreeable. This any man will do if he is not to degrade himself and if he is to be loyal to the royal in himself. Disraeli fought without the coronet of kindness when, in the heat of political strife, he declared of his great contemporary, Gladstone, "He is nothing but a sophisticated rhetorician inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity." That is in sharp contrast to Gladstone's courtly courtesy, as he exemplified the ideal lifted up in the lines:

"Fierce for the right he bore his part
In strife with many a valiant foe,
But laughter winged his polished dart
And kindness tempered every blow."

Courtesy, from its very derivation, is a royal word with the kingly grace of a coronet. Courtesy, according to 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. For, alas, the aggressive attitude toward political goals which one believes to represent the best interests of his country often tempts one to question the integrity of others and to hurl epithets which boomerang. Oliver Wendell Holmes was aware of the danger of turning a contest into a brawl when he said of a certain man, "His acrid words turn the sweet milk of kindness into curds." Tongues are, of course, legitimate weapons in the coming battle of the polls, but blessed is the contender in whose tongue is the law of kindness. Grace, gracefulness, and graciousness are intimately related and no defender of his party should seek a divorce from them as he sallies forth to the campaign or comments upon candidates.

Thomas à Kempis is holding up, this Lent, shining ideals which are more than coronets in his prayer so old, yet so new: "Lord let us be ever courteous and kind. Never let fall into a peevish or contentious spirit, but follow peace with all men." As, convinced of the rectitude of their own governmental theories, millions of Americans fare forth to the fray, the lines of Hilaire Belloc offer a suggestion more golden than coronets:

"Of courtesy it is much less
That courage of heart or holiness,
Yet in my walks it seems to me
That the grace of God is in courtesy."

FUNDS FOR THE GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to write to the Acting Chief of the United States Corps of Engineers urging prompt consideration of the request of supplemental funds for the purpose of deepening and improving the connecting channels west of Lake Erie. The occasion of my request is, of course, the welcome action on the part of the Senate, which, last Friday night, approved the connecting channel bill, H. R. 2552, sending it to the White House for signature.

The Senate's action in so speedily approving the bill came as a welcome index of the Senate's appreciation of the significance of the channels in terms of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

I send to the desk now the text of a letter which I was pleased to send on Saturday to Maj. Gen. Charles K. Holle, Acting Chief of the United States Corps of Engineers, on behalf of additional channel funds.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

MARCH 10, 1956.

Gen. CHARLES K. HOLLE,
Major General United States Army, Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: As you of course know, last night, March 9, there was written on the Senate floor, in effect, what amounts to the final chapter in the long 30-year legislation battle for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

At that time, the Senate wisely took up H. R. 2552 to modify the existing project for the Great Lakes channels above Lake Erie. The bill was passed by unanimous consent, thus being cleared to the White House for signature.

Needless to say, as the author of the Wiley law of 1954 authorizing the Great Lakes Seaway itself, I, for one, am particularly gratified that the final green light has been given. It is the full-speed-ahead signal to you of the Corps of Engineers for finishing this mightly 2,300-mile deep-water project, in conjunction with the work already underway by the Seaway Development Corporation.

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 $5 million, as recorded on page 651.

I would very much appreciate, General, if you, in consultation with your fellow officers and staff of the corps, would now review this channel subject, and determine how much additional funds should be immediately requested.

The $5 million request had of course been submitted by the executive branch prior to final action on the channel authorization bill. Now that such authorization has come, I think that the actual engineering work can be expedited by requesting supplemental funds over and above the $5 million.

As you know, it had been contemplated that the $5 million would be broken down in approximately the order of $1½ million for actual work. The latter figure can now be supplemented, so that commencing July 1, 1956, the start of the new fiscal year, more construction work can be commenced.

The reason I am in so much of a hurry is, of course, because of the serious lag which will occur between the time the seaway navigation work is completed and the time the upper channel work is completed. Thus, as you know, the seaway will be finished by the spring of 1959. On the other hand, the channel work above Lake Erie is still a 5-year project, and thus will not be ready until the spring of 1962.

To minimize this lag, we of the upper Midwest are most anxious to see all possible work inaugurated at the earliest possible date.

I am writing to Congressman FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota, chairman of the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, to bring to his attention this matter.

Meanwhile, however, I am hoping that the corps will be in a position to contact the United States Bureau of the Budget, and that the Bureau in turn will make the necessary supplemental request of the House Appropriations Committee.

I pledge my continued efforts all along the line toward speeding the necessary funds.

Looking forward to hearing from you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished minority leader, I should like to have him state his feelings regarding the session of the Senate today. I have discussed this matter with several Senators on this side of the aisle, and all of us are very hopeful that we can finish our action on the bill, if not today, at least on tomorrow or the next day.

We also hope that, aside from minor insertions during the morning hour, any 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 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 yea-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 think it desirable not 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 rugged schedule, not only for Senators, 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 other reasonable time, because 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 should conclude our action on it this week. I hope 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. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader shares every hope the minority leader has expressed that we conclude our action on the bill this week; in other words, that we dispose of the bill as quickly as possible.

Of course, every Member has other bills which he wishes to have brought up and passed. Of course, each Senator is aware of the number of 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. I have talked about the matter to various Senators; and they are of the opinion that at this point in the session, in the early part of March, it should not be necessary for the Senate to take votes late in the evening.

So I think the schedule I have indicated will be better for all of us. Let us try it for a day or two, and see whether we make satisfactory progress. If we do not, then perhaps we can arrange to meet later in the evening. Of course I would not wish to have any arrangement made unless it met with the pleasure of my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I am sorry that I could not discuss the matter with him before now. However, the morning hour is about over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me discuss the matter shortly with some of the minority members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and then the Senator from Texas and I can discuss it further a little later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that will be a very satisfactory solution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope all Senators will at least hold themselves prepared for the possibility of an evening session.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER], let me say to him that, of course, all of us have statements which we desire to make, and the best time to make them is during the morning hour, under the 2-minute rule. If it is not possible for them to be made under the 2-minute rule, the chairman has been very generous in agreeing to an extension of the time for 4 minutes or 8 minutes, or sometimes even longer. However, I now express the hope that during the further consideration of the pending 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 wonder whether my friend, 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 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, I believe it will be possible to do that.

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, and for as long as he wishes to discuss it.

I hope all Senators will cooperate in this respect with the leadership.

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 a proper standard for the allocation to the different States 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, Oreg., writes me that on the whole he prefers the Kelley 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 besides the number of school age children in a State which determine the financial burden assumed by a State for the education of its children. To summarize his argument he believes that a formula of Federal assistance 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 educational 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 actual 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,
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 9C, COOS COUNTY,
Coos Bay, Oreg., February 29, 1956.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR 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 great country should share on a national level in the cost of public education. The teaching profession has long recognized the importance of public education as the foundation for democratic Government. In a mobile population, ignorance knows no State boundary lines. The uneducated are susceptible to mob psychology and all kinds of damaging propaganda. We as citizens cannot afford to have weak spots in the support of public education.

You are in a strategic position to raise the standards of public education so necessary for the health, production, and happiness of all of the United States. We trust that you will do what you can to raise the standards of all of the United States by providing that we may all share in public education on the national level. The total amount that we shall share on the national level and the distribution of this fund to the several States is a significant problem. I, for one, believe the amount should be a sizable sum. We spend many dollars to improve roads and to remove some of the curves. This is important and highly desirable. More money is needed that the youth of America, our greatest national resource, should have a greater opportunity to grow straight.

I wish to make a suggestion in regard to distribution. In the first place I believe that the funds should be used to give equal opportunity to all for a basic education. This means that some States may get more money per pupil than other States. I do not believe that the school census is a sound basis for distributing funds to States for the following reasons:

1. Some States require only school attendance through the first 8 grades, or to age 16. Some States require attendance to 18 years, or through high-school graduation.

3. Some States have very lax attendance laws and poor enforcement of its attendance laws.

4. Some States have an effective attendance program.

5. Some States have a high percentage of private-school attendance.

6. Some States have few private or parochial schools.

7. Some States have a very short school year of 8½ months, while others may have a longer school year.

It is important that we should share on a national level in the support of 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 the public operated 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.

3. Greater attendance in the public schools.

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 100,000 the school attendance is approximately 8,000, or 1 in 12¼ in school. Here in the Coos Bay school district we have a population of approximately 22,500 with a school attendance of 4,200, or 1 in 5.4 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 believe that all should be given a high quality of adequate education.

On the basis of census Oregon may rank reasonably high in wealth per census child. However, on the basis of school days of 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 public-school attendance. States with lax attendance laws with large numbers of the school population attending private schools who thus carry a very light public-education program, would get Federal funds only on the basis of the actual public educational service given.

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 day attendance at a public school those States would receive funds only for the service given. I believe we should recognize the amount of public education actually given. $11.35 per school-census child in Oregon would be approximately 9½ cents per pupil-days attendance.

I believe the Kelley bill to be better for the Nation 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,

M. B. WINSLOW,
Superintendent, 9C.

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 a Senate 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 on the Senate floor that day. At the time that I did several Senators were trying to get the recognition of the Presiding Officer of the Senate to speak. 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 we went 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 very nice letter from 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 seafoods.

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 friend and a leading citizen of our State and 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 mill. Sanford had refused to die greatly 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 inevitable for Carl Broggi to become 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 record of 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 efforts. 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 tribute can be given a fallen friend than to speak this truth?

I ask unanimous consent to 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 industrialists. He was nearing the end of a series of community-area meetings to put over this idea to civic leaders when he was stricken with heart attacks at Lewiston Thursday.

Intense and dedicated to his job, Commissioner Broggi had toiled day and night, crisscrossing the State, to press the Broggi plan. 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 is devoted creator.

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

HE GAVE HIS LIFE FOR MAINE

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

When told that in his 6 months of organizing the new Department of Industry and Commerce for Maine he had impressed everyone, had made no noticeable mistakes, he quietly replied, "Well, we're trying, anyway."

That was Carl Broggi, the man who kept trying, anyway, even when he tackled an 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 middle of a school program that had attracted attention all over the Nation.

In 6 months Carl Broggi had done more than anyone dreamed he could do in that time, and did it 10 times better than we had any reason to expect. That's only one of the reasons we miss Carl Broggi. We miss 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.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of March 10, 1956]

MAINE HAS LOST A HUMBLE, EFFECTIVE SERVANT

Carl J. Broggi had not long been on the Maine government scene in a full-time capacity but in 6 short months he had become a commanding figure whose stature grew with each passing week.

He had set a new and vital state department on a sound and promising road and, what is more important, he had the people of Maine with him. No one, least of all the development commissioner himself, ever seriously entertained the notion that he would fail to make his department live up to its promise.

Carl Broggi was going someplace and he was going in a hurry, but a careful kind of hurry that made sure of foundations before building superstructures. And the construction he had in mind was sure to make a better Maine. His death Thursday was untimely in the largest sense of the word.

Nothing a newspaper can say will do much to bear up a bereaved family nor can it, of course, do more than hint at the sense of loss that now abides with the whole State. But it can try, which is why we say Carl Broggi was one of a special breed of whom there are not enough, in Maine or anywhere else.

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 Saturday issue for Secretary Douglas 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 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 such controversies.

Secretary McKay was an outstanding governor of Oregon, he has been an outstanding Secretary of the Interior, and it is my confident prediction that he will make an outstanding 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 areas of public 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 a part of my remarks.

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

POLICIES PRESERVE NATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES

(By Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay)

My attention has been called to a letter published February 25 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 commendable admonitions to other members of your calling that freedom of the press imposes a grave responsibility on the press not to mislead its readers prompts me to offer you this opportunity to set forth certain hard facts of record which refute the bald misstatement by Dr. Harris, the only reference in his letter which applies directly to the Department of the Interior.

As I have said, Dr. Harris fails to cite a single policy or action by the Eisenhower administration to support his allegation that the Republicans are not preserving natural resources for all the people. It is disappointing thus to discover the responsible 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 doubt" technique developed by the enemies of the Eisenhower administration to slander agencies and officials of that administration for lack of valid issues in this 1956 election year. I further suggest that a review of the actual record by any impartial authority would demonstrate the most significant advances in sound resource conservation and development by this administration in many years.

The giveaway slogan appears to have originated during the debate in the 83d Congress on legislation establishing the rights of the States to resources on offshore lands within their historic boundaries. Lately, we have heard little from Democratic sources about this matter for some rather obvious reasons.

First, of course, it was difficult for the Democratic leaders who promoted the submerged lands legislation over many years to join in a giveaway chorus on this issue and thus attack themselves.

Even more persuasive has been the fact that under the legislation which was supported by the Eisenhower administration the development of the outer Continental Shelf has proceeded in a manner which belies any suggestion of giveaway. Federal leasing to date of only a small fraction of the offshore lands on the shelf has already returned more than a quarter of a billion dollars to the Federal Treasury.

As leasing continues and royalty payments accrue, it can be estimated conservatively that development of the submerged lands will yield several billion dollars in additional revenue which will help ease the tax burden

of all our citizens. Title to the lands remains vested in the people.

The giveaway charge leveled at the administration of our national parks has also now been thoroughly discredited, again for some very excellent reasons. The fact is that the National Park System today is larger, more adequately staffed, and more efficiently administered than it ever has been.

Since January 1953 more than 400,000 acres have been added to the Park System, including an authorization to extend the boundaries of the Everglades National Park in Florida. The Park Service budget submitted to Congress this year more than doubles the amount appropriated 3 years ago.

I have said on many occasions that I am an ardent supporter of our national parks as 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 natural beauty of park areas.

These proposals have ranged from requests to build tramways in five national parks to efforts to modify the boundaries of Olympic National Park and 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 these proposals is never recognized, but the fact that the proposals have been made to the Department becomes in itself the basis for giveaway contentions.

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 the parks that was touched off by World War II and prolonged by the Korean conflict must be reversed.

Mission 66, a comprehensive 10-year plan for protection, improvement, and development of the Park System, faces this problem squarely. Designed to equip the parks to accommodate adequately the 80 million park visitors expected by 1966, mission 66 will bring the Park System up to the standards which the American people want and have a right to expect. The very gratifying support which this program is receiving in Congress and throughout the country now makes it certain that we are beginning a new era of progress in park development.

Another part of our great natural heritage that I have vigorously protected is our national wildlife refuges. The facts show that 9 new wildlife refuges have been established in the past 3 years, that tens of thousands of additional acres have been acquired for wildlife preservation, and that refuges are now receiving the largest allocation for acquisition, development, and maintenance in history. The giveaway charge is still made, nevertheless, not on the basis of what the Department has done, but of what it might do in disposing of refuge lands.

The political attacks which have been made recently in connection with the handling of our wildlife refuges have been highlighted by an amazing bit of mental legerdemain. New regulations which the Department issued last December governing oil leasing on wildlife refuges actually provide the greatest protection to wildlife values since such leasing was authorized by Congress in 1920 and again in 1946. Yet the giveaway school is now attempting to promote the idea that these new regulations, developed with the assistance of career specialists of the Fish and Wildlife Service to provide maximum protection of the refuges, somehow spell the doom of the refuges.

Nothing, of course, could be further from the truth. The giveaway sloganeers are striving desperately to create the impression that the regulations issued last December opened the refuges for the first time to oil leasing. The fact is that not only were the refuges first opened to such activity by a previous administration but it issued leases without, in my opinion, proper safeguards.

My first consideration was to correct the loose regulations in existence when I took office, thereby assuring adequate safeguards for wildlife values. In the summer of 1953, I suspended the regulations which had been issued in 1947 and asked the specialists of the Fish and Wildlife Service to develop regulations to which they could give full support.

Thus the new regulations issued last December were the result of a careful study by men who have the welfare of our wildlife sanctuaries close to their hearts. One of the noteworthy improvements in the new regulations is that they provide, as the previous regulations did not, for approval by the Service and its career technicians over where, how, and by whom drilling will be permitted on the refuges. Another significant revision makes absolutely inviolate, for the first time in history, those areas which provide habitat for rare and endangered species of wildlife.

No man, in or out of Government, is better qualified to assay the degree of protection our wildlife refuges will receive under the new regulations than is J. Clark Salyer, Chief of the Branch of Refugees of the Fish and Wildlife Service. He is a career civil servant who came to Washington 22 years ago with the late "Ding" Darling to help build the great wildlife refuge system we have today. When he appeared before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he was asked:

"Do you feel that, under your regulations and working and operating plans, the wildlife will be protected adequately where an oil lease is entered into?"

"I do," Mr. Salyer replied, "or I would be up here screaming bloody murder right now."

In the final analysis the proof of whether the refuges are better protected will not be found either in my contention as to excellence of the new regulations, or in the disclaimers of the political opponents of the administration. Rather the proof will lie in the record of oil-leasing activity under the new procedures. And in this area I am content to rely upon the integrity of dedicated conservationists such as Mr. Salyer and his associates in the career service.

The early months of the administration were marked by a series of bitter attacks on the partnership power program as a "giveaway." It is interesting now to compare the weight of the facts of record with the sound and fury which were generated in the early stages by the political sloganeers.

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 all-Federal upper Colorado project has been approved by both Houses of Congress and now awaits only final action on a conference 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. Projects such as Priest Rapids and John Day are making progress as partnership undertakings. At the same time, power rates of existing Federal projects have been held down wherever possible.

In the Pacific Northwest, for example, the rates of the Bonneville Power Administration have been kept at the same level for the past 3 years despite indications by the previous administration that the rates might have to be raised as much as 20 percent in 1954.

I suspect that this recital is already overly long, but since Dr. Harris did not mention any specifics in his allegation regarding natural resources conservation it has been necessary to cover at least the major publicized issues which may have led him to his sweeping and unfounded generalization.

Before concluding, however, I should like to mention the Al Sarena case, although charges surrounding this matter have also been exploded. The testimony of Under Secretary Clarence Davis made it indisputedly clear, I think, that the Department's action in the Al Sarena case was 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 directed against the law, rather than at the Department.

The fact that the Al Sarena case came into proper perspective only after the congressional committee permitted the responsible official involved to set forth all of the details should furnish a useful moral. It is important under our system of government that the people be given the facts necessary to reach sound decisions on public issues.

Before Mr. Davis testified, the only facts being publicized about the case were the sensational distortions and half-truths which comprised the bulk of the early testimony, plus the now admittedly false accusations of a syndicated propagandist for the New Deal Democrat Party.

Certainly, the honest reporting by the responsible press of Mr. Davis' testimony, which set at rest the misrepresentations that had been made in the Al Sarena case, could be emulated in the handling of the many other issues which we may expect to arise in the hectic emotionalism of this election year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning 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 order for the quorum call 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 have felt and now feel to be imperative.

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.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to have unanimous consent to proceed for more than a maximum of 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.

However, at an early and more convenient time, when proposed legislation now before the Senate is out of the way, and perhaps some other important legislative matters which may be immediately considered shall have been disposed of, I shall address myself to the declaration.

This declaration has not been hastily taken. It has been carefully considered by many Members of the Senate for some 4 or 5 weeks. I now present the statement to the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GEORGE. I present the declaration:

DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

The unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court in the public school cases is now bearing the fruit always produced when men substitute naked power for established law.

The Founding Fathers gave us a Constitution of checks and balances because they realized the inescapable lesson of history that no man or group of men can be safely entrusted with unlimited power. They framed this Constitution with its provisions for change by amendment in order to secure the fundamentals of government against the dangers of temporary popular passion or the personal predilections of public officeholders.

We regard the decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases as a clear abuse of judicial power. It climaxes a trend in the Federal Judiciary undertaking to legislate, in derogation of the authority of Congress, and to encroach upon the reserved rights of the States and the people.

The original Constitution does not mention education. Neither does the 14th amendment nor any other amendment. The debates preceding the submission of the 14th amendment clearly show that there was no intent that it should affect the system of education maintained by the States.

The very Congress which proposed the amendment subsequently provided for segregated schools in the District of Columbia.

When the amendment was adopted in 1868, there were 37 States of the Union. Every one of the 26 States that had any substantial racial differences among its people——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Georgia may have an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object, of course—I merely wish to ask that on the conclusion of the remarks of the disinguished Senator from Georgia the Senator from New York may be recognized for not more than 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have assured the Senator from New York twice, and I assure him the third time, that he will be recognized before the morning hour is over, insofar as I can assure him, and that he will be allowed to speak for as long as he may choose.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has received an additional request for recognition after the Senator from Georgia has concluded his remarks. Accordingly, the Chair will recognize the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

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, as I said to the Senator from New York, I am sure no Senator will object to any additional statements being made even if they should extend beyond 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator from New York on this 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 repeating a portion of the sentence I was reading when interrupted:

Every one of the 26 States that had any substantial racial differences among its people, either approved the operation of segregated schools already in existence or subsequently established such schools by action of the same law-making body 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, and it was followed not only in Massachusetts, but in Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, 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 under the 14th amendment no person was denied any of his rights if the States provided separate but equal public facilities. This decision has been followed in many other cases. It is notable that the Supreme Court, speaking through Chief Justice Taft, a former President of the United States, unanimously declared in 1927 in *Lum* v. *Rice* 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, restated time and again, became a part of the life of the people of many of the States and confirmed their habits, customs, traditions, and way of life. It is founded on elemental humanity and commonsense, for parents should not be deprived by Government of the right to direct the lives and education of their own children.

Though there has been no constitutional amendment or act of Congress changing this established legal principle almost a century old, the Supreme Court of the United States, with no legal basis for such action, undertook to exercise their naked judicial power and substituted their personal political and social ideas for the established law of the land.

This unwarranted exercise of power by the Court, contrary to the Constitution, is creating chaos and confusion in the States principally affected. It is destroying the amicable relations between the white and Negro races that have been created through 90 years of patient effort by the good people of both races. It has planted hatred and suspicion where there has been heretofore friendship and understanding.

Without regard to the consent of the governed, outside agitators are threatening immediate and revolutionary changes in our public-school systems. If done, this is certain to destroy the system of public education in some of the States.

With the gravest concern for the explosive and dangerous condition created by this decision and inflamed by outside meddlers:

We reaffirm our reliance on the Constitution as the fundamental law of the land.

We decry the Supreme Court's encroachments on rights reserved to the States and to the people, contrary to established law, and to the Constitution.

We commend the motives of those States which have declared the intention to resist forced integration by any lawful means.

We 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, on issues vital to them, may be the victims of judicial encroachment.

Even though we constitute a minority in the present Congress, we have full faith that a majority of the American people believe in the dual system of government which has enabled us to achieve our greatness and will in time demand that the reserved rights of the States and of the people be made secure against judicial usurpation.

We pledge ourselves to use 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 not to be provoked by the agitators and troublemakers invading our States and to scrupulously refrain from disorder and lawless acts.

Signed by:

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

WALTER F. GEORGE, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, JOHN STENNIS, SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., STROM THURMOND, HARRY F. BYRD, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, RUSSELL B. LONG, LISTER HILL, JAMES O. EASTLAND, W. KERR SCOTT, JOHN SPARKMAN, OLIN D. JOHNSTON, PRICE DANIEL, J. W. FULBRIGHT, GEORGE A. SMATHERS, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Alabama: FRANK W. BOYKIN, GEORGE M. GRANT, GEORGE W. ANDREWS, KENNETH A. ROBERTS, ALBERT RAINS, ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr., CARL ELLIOTT, ROBERT E. JONES, GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.

Arkansas: E. C. GATHINGS, WILBUR D. MILLS, JAMES W. TRIMBLE, OREN HARRIS, BROOKS HAYS, W. F. NORRELL.

Florida: CHARLES E. BENNETT, ROBERT L. F. SIKES, A. S. HERLONG, Jr., PAUL G. ROGERS, JAMES A. HALEY, D. R. MATTHEWS.

Georgia: PRINCE H. PRESTON, JOHN L. PILCHER, E. L. FORRESTER, JOHN JAMES FLYNT, Jr., JAMES C. DAVIS, CARL VINSON, HENDERSON LANHAM, IRIS F. BLITCH, PHIL M. LANDRUM, PAUL BROWN.

Louisiana: F. EDWARD HÉBERT, HALE BOGGS, EDWIN E. WILLIS, OVERTON BROOKS, OTTO E. PASSMAN, JAMES H. MORRISON, T. ASHTON THOMPSON, GEORGE S. LONG.

Mississippi: THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, JAMIE L. WHITTEN, FRANK E. SMITH, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, ARTHUR WINSTEAD, WILLIAM M. COLMER.

North Carolina: HERBERT C. BONNER, L. H. FOUNTAIN, GRAHAM A. BARDEN, CARL T. DURHAM, F. ERTEL CARLYLE, HUGH Q. ALEXANDER, WOODROW W. JONES, GEORGE A. SHUFORD.

South Carolina: L. MENDEL RIVERS, JOHN J. RILEY, W. J. BRYAN DORN, ROBERT T. ASHMORE, JAMES P. RICHARDS, JOHN L. MCMILLAN.

Tennessee: JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., TOM MURRAY, JERE COOPER, CLIFFORD DAVIS.

Texas: WRIGHT PATMAN, JOHN DOWDY, WALTER ROGERS, O. C. FISHER.

Virginia: EDWARD J. ROBESON, Jr., PORTER HARDY, Jr., J. VAUGHAN GARY, WATKINS M. ABBITT, WILLIAM M. TUCK, RICHARD H. POFF, BURR P. HARRISON, HOWARD W. SMITH, W. PAT JENNINGS, JOEL T. BROYHILL.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for approximately 10 minutes.

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

Mr. THURMOND. But, Mr. President, I yield, first, 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, indicates acceptance of 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 most significant. 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 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 the views 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 they would see in this instance the danger of other future encroachments by the Federal Government into fields reserved to the States and the people.

My 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 the public schools has made it difficult to sustain the long-time harmony.

These agitators employed professional racist lawyers with funds contributed by persons who were permitted to deduct the contributions from their taxes. The organization established to receive the funds also enjoys the status of freedom from taxation.

Except for these troublemakers, I believe our people of both races in South Carolina would have continued to progress harmoniously together. Educational progress in South Carolina has been marked by $200 million worth of fine 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 district where one of the segregation cases was 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 as well recognize that they cannot accomplish 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—also 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 constitional 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. Not 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 on the basis of the separate-but-equal doctrine. The United States Supreme Court rendered 11 opinions on that basis; the United States court of appeals 13; 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 to be wrong. Therefore, the decision handed down on May 17, 1954, was 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 undertake 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 funds.

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 as 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.

The propagandists have tried to convince the world that the States and the people should bow meekly to the decree of the Supreme Court. I say it would be the submission of cowardice if we failed to use every lawful means to protect the rights of the people.

For more than a half a century the 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. They want the South to accept the dictation of the Court without seeking recourse. We shall not do so.

I hope all the people of this Nation who believe in the Constitution—North, South, East, and West—will support every lawful effort to have the decision reversed. The Court followed textbooks instead of the Constitution in arriving at the decision.

We 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 provisions in 17 States and the District of Columbia. Thus, the Court attempted to legislate in a field 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 these 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 seeking to avoid responsibility. They want to meet all due

responsibility, but not under Court decrees which are not based on law.

I hope a greater understanding of the problem which has been thrust upon the South and the Nation will be sought by our colleagues who do not face the segregation problem at home. Other problems of other areas require consideration and understanding. I shall try to give full consideration to them.

All of us have heard a great deal of talk about the persecution of minority groups. The white people of the South are the greatest minority in this Nation. They deserve consideration and understanding instead of the persecution of twisted propaganda.

The people of the South love this country. In all the wars in which this Nation has engaged, no truer American patriots have been found than the people from the South.

I, for one, shall seek to present the views of my people on the floor of the Senate. I shall fight for them in whatever lawful way I can. My hope is that consideration of our views will lead to understanding and that understanding will lead to a rejection of practices contrary to the Constitution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. The hour is indeed historic. It has some of the characteristics of previous historic hours in the Senate, when there was before this body the great constitutional question as to whether or not there was to be equality of justice for all Americans, irrespective of race, color, or creed.

If we will check into American history at the time of Marbury against Madison, we will find a great similarity between the arguments then made and the arguments made on the floor of the Senate today. But in Marbury against Madison, decided in 1803, there was established the authority and the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to determine for all Americans, irrespective of color, race, and creed, equality of rights under the Constitution. The supremacy of the Supreme Court in passing on constitutional questions was determined by that decision.

A unanimous Supreme Court has handed down a decision that makes it perfectly clear that under the Constitution of the United States there cannot be discrimination between white men and black men, so far as the Constitution is concerned.

I say again today that the doctrine of interposition means nothing but nullification, and it means really a determination on the part of certain forces in this country to put themselves above the Supreme Court and above the Constitution. If the gentlemen from the South really want to take such action, let them propose a constitutional amendment that will deny to the colored people of the country equality of rights under the Constitution, and see how far they will get with the American people.

Mr. President, I recognize the problems of the South. Unfortunately, I respectfully say, I think too many of our southern colleagues want to take the position 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 our history when the great 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 you would 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 I think it is a correct decision, a 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 to make this adjustment. 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 with 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 our own individual judgments, 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.

While I do not profess 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 of the United States to encompass 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 and 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 in some 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? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

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 primarily 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 human beings rather than corporate beings, 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—Mr. President, which, since July 4, 1776, has been declared as the fundamental tenet of our Republic.

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 reemphasize to my colleagues that the issue of segregation and desegregation is within the jurisdiction and the responsibility 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 become the subject of passion, emotion, bitterness, and antagonism.

Frankly, Mr. President, the principle of federalism leaves no room for nullification; and, as the Senator from Oregon has said, it leaves no room for interposition. 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 disturbed for a long time over the difficult, heart-rending issues of discrimination and inequality so evident in the fields of economic, educational, and social rights for many of our people. I had hoped the Members of the Congress might restrain themselves on this isue of segregation. I had hoped that we would leave this to the courts and to the people of the country. The judiciary as a separate and equal branch of our Government has the segregation issue under its jurisdiction. If there is one plea that I make here today, it is that we 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 there was emphasis upon law and order, 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 importance that there be law and order. It is of the utmost importance to the safety of our Republic that there not be violence; and it is of the utmost importance that we, the elected representatives of the people, set a pattern of conduct that will yield the results of law and order, that will bring people together, rather than separate them.

Not only did the Supreme Court rule that segregation is unconstitutional, Mr. President; it also handed down an implementation order. That implementation order is based upon understanding of the various problems in the areas of our country. It is based upon proceeding as quickly as possible, however, with due consideration to the difficulties of the problems which are to be settled. It is a reasonable doctrine. It is an order based upon reason, knowledge, and understanding. 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 Republic 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, we in the North have problems that are difficult ones, too; and some of those problems relate, indeed, to discrimination. It is our duty—as has been said by others—to set those problems aright, to cure them, to correct them.

Mr. President, I am not here to admonish my colleagues. I am here to offer them the hand of friendship and of helpfulness. I only hope that the civic and political leaders throughout America will rally together to try to bring order, unity, and proper perspective to the solution of this grievous and difficult situation. Let us seek to comply with the law. Our duty is to lead toward fulfillment of the Court order.

Frankly, 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, except to arouse passions and encourage delay and obstruction.

The task is to plead for perservering patience to proceed to the fulfillment of human equality, to encourage compliance with the law. No man in his right mind wants violence or force. What we seek is orderly progress, systematic progress, in the spirit of friendship and helpfulness.

Mr. President, I know the thought has been expressed many times that some of us simply do not understand these problems. Perhaps we do not understand them in all their dimensions. 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 peoples and the races. The Supreme Court decision should be a stimulant for further orderly progress. It requires that people of good will continue working together day after day. Mr. President, if Governors, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives will take a stand for the fulfillment of equal rights under the law, progress will become orderly, steady, and certain. 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 shall be no denial to citizens of the United States of equal privileges and rights under the law. This is the law. Our constitutional system is fixed, and can be changed only by alteration of the Constitution.

Therefore, Mr. President, my plea today is not one of resistance, nor is it one that those of us from other areas of the country move in pellmell, to try to aggravate or agitate. Mr. President, I will have no part in that. My plea is that those of us who work together in this Chamber day after day set the example for how people can work together in other parts of the United States. In the House of Representatives, men and women of different races, religions, and backgrounds work together day after day. If that can be done there, it can be done in every State, county, and every school district in America. It requires, however, that all citizens be treated and regarded as equals.

Mr. President, if we persist in the course of denying people in America equal rights, we shall bring down upon our Nation the wrath of the world. In this world there are more people who are non-Caucasian and more people who are colored than those who are white. Frankly, we are talking about a matter which goes to the safety and security of our Republic. No amount of atom bombs or thermonuclear weapons can prevent the forward movement of the people. The people throughout the world want equal justice under the law; they want recognition and equal status. They want to be God's people as just people.

If America ever hopes to give world leadership, we must set the pattern here in America. We have to set it unmistakably in a firm belief in humane quality and equal justice under the law.

This is the very heart and core of an effective foreign policy, Mr. President. No amount of appropriations, no amount of armaments, can be as important today as being right and being moral and being just. Citizenship in America must be first-class citizenship. There can be no second-class citizenship.

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 future generations to terrible 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 out of this body will come voices and out of the statehouses will come voices that will call upon the people as I have heard our majority leader do many times, in the words of Isaiah: "Come now, and let us reason together."

Mr. President, I add: Come, let us plan for forward progress together; come let us build together and live together. That is the only choice we have, Mr. President.

We cannot live apart. We must be as one.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I cannot help but think how we must look today to the world. We live in a world most of whose people are of a different color than white. What are they thinking when Members of the highest American parliamentary body announce themselves as against judicial decisions granting equality to colored people in America? How fares the Soviet Union in the propaganda war as a result of these developments?

This is such a grave crisis, Mr. President, that I believe the highest political authority in the land, meaning the President of the United States, must exercise some role in what is taking place.

I think the President should call a White House conference of all the Governors, Senators, and Representatives of the States in which the Supreme Court ruling is being defied. He should confront them firmly but considerately with the fact that the Nation now is faced with a choice between anarchy and the rule of law. If the Constitution can be flouted in one realm, what of all other realms?

In my opinion, the President of the United States must intrude into this situation his great influence and authority.

White House conferences have been called on matters of far less importance than the preservation of our country's prestige abroad and its unity and solidarity at home.

I should like to add one further comment. I have seen it reported in the press—I do not know whether the report is accurate—that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the majority leader of the Senate, did not sign the document which has been read on the floor today. If that is true, Mr. President, it is one of the most courageous political acts of valor I have seen take place in my adult life.

It does not require any great amount of political courage for a person from the North—for example, from Oregon, New York, or Minnesota—to take the stand which has been taken on this floor by Senators from those States. But if the majority leader of the United States Senate did not sign the document which was read to the Senate, I think he deserves credit and commendation for a political act of the highest bravery and the highest courage.

THE SCHOOL MILK AND BRUCELLOSIS PROGRAMS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have the unhappy task of reporting to the Senate, and to the people of America, that congressional inaction is about to cripple two important programs: the special school milk program, for the health of our Nation's children; and the brucellosis eradication program, to complete the elimination of a dread disease from the dairy herds of the country.

It will be recalled that both the Senate and House have passed this legislation, H. R. 8320, in different version, earlier this year.

As yet, however—I am sad to report—the conferees have not even met to iron out the differences between the Senate and House bills, so that these programs—vital to the school children and the farmers of America—can continue uninterrupted, and at levels of peak effectiveness.

The conference committee's inaction to date is most regrettable, but it will, I trust, be remedied soon.

The proposed legislation authorizes supplemental funds to carry out vital programs, which—by fulfilling real, current needs—have expanded so rapidly that they require more money than was originally appropriated.

SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

The special school milk program, for example, increased almost 50 percent in the last 9½ months of 1955, bringing milk to over 16 million school children in more than 62,000 schools throughout America. Additional funds are urgently needed to avoid a slowdown in the distribution of milk to the schools.

Our whole Nation, of course, is deriving benefits from this program. The health of our school youngsters is vastly improved by the additional milk in their diet.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM DEPLETED SURPLUS STOCKPILES

In addition, the school milk program is a good, commonsense way to utilize our surplus milk—as well as other foods. As indicated by Senate votes on the farm bill last week, 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 no good reason why this 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 dairying cattle of our Nation will not only eliminate a health hazard from all of us, but will free the farmers from a great economic loss resulting from the condemning of infected cattle in their herds.

ACTION, PLEASE

I cannot too greatly stress the need for action on these fine programs. I am informed that, unless funds are available by March 31—only 19 days away—the progress—resulting from years of work and expense—will be seriously impaired.

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, before 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 was 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 recipients whom I join, and I trust I may continue to prove worthy of the honor you have bestowed on me.

In a few weeks I shall be retiring as Director of the Bureau of the Budget after 3 years of service in Washington. In considering what I might say to you tonight I have thought back over those years, as well as earlier years of service as consultant to congressional committees in Washington. In such retrospection, it has been strikingly apparent to me how much our way of life—indeed, our very lives—may depend upon the response which we, as citizens, and through us our Government, may make to two of the great challenges of our time.

The role of Government

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 trusted with freedom, and that governments have as a primary function the protection of that freedom and the defense of those things which insure personal dignity to the least of us and which permit each of us to believe himself important in the eyes of God. However, there have 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 spirited Federal 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 those of our children and of our children's children, I venture to say, Americans will find themselves 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 shall discover that an individual's answer will find its touchstone in one of these two broad philosophies of action, which tonight I would like to discuss in relation to our economy, to local government, and to our natural resources.

Economic policy

In opening these comments with a reference to the American economy, I find myself reminded of the character in David Copperfield named Mr. Dick, who passed most of his life in preparing a memorial address to the Lord Chancellor. He never finished the task, however, because he could not keep the head of King Charles I out of the memorial. Similarly, because I have devoted so much of my own life to economic matters, I must say I have them constantly in mind.

However, considering these contending 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 been particularly apparent during our own lifetime.

We have had, on the one hand, the philosophy which favors direct Government intervention and, if need be, inflation constantly to spur increasing economic activity; which accepts increases in the price level as a necessary concomitant of higher wages; 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 private initiative, rather than Government, should provide the basic stimulus for economic growth; which encourages stability in prices; and which rejects the opiate of passing today's bills on to succeeding generations to pay.

For 20 years beginning with 1933, in peace as in war, it was the policy of the Federal Government vigorously to project itself on the economic scene and to apply a forced draft to the economy, or, as it has been said, to encourage the country to run a slight fever as a means of staying well. During those two decades both our gross national product and our wage levels 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 contrary philosophy in action, with the Government seeking to reduce its precedessor'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 depreciation of the dollar. The overall result has been a stabilization of the cost of living and of the value of the dollar and, when coupled with the tax reductions in 1954, a very substantial increase in real wages.

Other actions during the past 3 years illustrative of this policy of reducing the impact of Government on our economy have included the removal of direct controls over prices and wages and the elimination of well over 250 Government commercial activities which could be better undertaken by private enterprise.

In reviewing the record of the last quarter of a century, therefore, I must say that I am personally convinced that we will progress fastest by relying on private initiative as the wellspring of economic development and a better life for all, and that, in encouraging economic growth, the Government should act on the basis of enabling private activity to expand and not on a basis of replacing private with public activity.

Lasting prosperity for our Nation as a whole would seem to depend far more on what individuals do for themselves than on what the Federal Government does, or can do, for them. Ten million centers of planning and decision, represented by our private businesses and farms, cannot help but contribute more energy, initiative, imagination, and creative force for economic growth than can a single center. The rate of our economic advance in the years ahead will depend largely on our ability as a people to preserve an environment that rewards individual initiative and encourages enterprise, innovation, and investment.

This point of view was extremely well expressed by President Eisenhower in his first budget message, when he said: "We are convinced that more progress and sounder progress will be made over the years as the largest possible share of our national income is left with individual citizens to make their own countless decisions as to what they will spend, what they will buy, and what they will save and invest. Government must play a vital role in maintaining economic growth and stability. But I believe that our development, since the early days of the Republic, has been based on the fact that we left a great share of our national income to be used by a provident people with a will to venture. Their actions have stimulated the American genius for creative initiative and thus multiplied our productivity."

Local government

A second broad area of concern to all of us must be the relationship between the Federal and other units of government. This, in turn, brings us to the problem of how much power should be concentrated in Washington. Some index of this problem is provided by the fact that in 1930 revenues and expenditures of all local governments were nearly three times those of the Federal Government. By 1953 the situation was precisely reversed; revenues and expenditures of the Federal Government were nearly three times those of all local governments.

Not long ago, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations completed a very thoughtful study of the evolution of the American Federal system and the appropriate roles of the National, State, and local governments—the first official effort to deal with these issues comprehensively since the Constitutional Convention of 1787. In developing its recommendations, the Commission was particularly conscious of the problem of undue reliance on the Federal Government. One warning in the Commission's fund report strikes me as remarkably cogent:

"If we are not willing," the Commission notes, "to leave some room for diversity of policy, to tolerate some lack of uniformity in standards, even in many matters which are of national concern, and about which we may feel strongly, the essence of federalism, even if not the legal fiction, will have been lost. We must also realize that it can be lost, or its vitality sapped, by nonuse of State and local initiative as well as by overuse of national authority. We have therefore as citizens a responsibility 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 efforts on those essential programs which only it can and must carry out.

My own conviction is that the interests of all our citizens are best advanced by encouraging State and local governments to strengthen themselves and thus keep as much government responsibility as possible in the States and communities, and that any national administration must have, as does the present one, a self-imposed caution against unnecessary and unwise interference in the private affairs of our people, of their communities, and of the several States.

Natural resources

Resource development is a third area in which, during our lifetime, we will continue to witness sharp divergences of opinion as to the appropriate 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 local and private initiative.

The administration's position is based on the conclusion that resource development is the responsibility of everyone. In many cases, State, local, and private groups can best carry out needed programs. In other cases, Federal participation is the necessary element in accomplishing broad 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 belief that to the greatest possible extent the responsibility for developmental projects should be borne by those who receive their benefits. Overall, this approach serves to multiply the effect of Federal expenditures in the stimulation of conservation and development. Furthermore, in all cases where the partnership principle applies there is automatically acquired a concern for economy and efficiency that is often 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 shall find that over the years the ultimate decisions will be made by reference to one or the other of these two philosophies: basic reliance on the Federal Government or basic reliance on private and local initiative. For myself, insofar as this challenge as to 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 expressed by President Lincoln, who concluded that the legitimate object of Government is to do for a community of people what they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well; but that in all a people can individually do so well for themselves, Government ought not to interfere.

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 and a half since Hitler and his totalitarian associates plunged us into a world war of unprecedented scope and violence. In that war, extending over 2 great oceans and their farthest shores, we and our allies achieved a tremendous victory. But the peace we sought has continued to elude 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 Europe and Asia. Opposed to us, cold and forbidding, is an ideological front which marshals every weapon in the arsenal of dictatorship.

How the relationship between the two great power systems will develop—the Iron Curtain countries on the one hand and the free nations of the world on the other—is undoubtedly the central issue of our times. The problem has been infinitely complicated in the last decade by the discovery of the awesome power of nuclear weapons, power such that today we are told that a single aircraft with a three-man crew can carry as much destructive energy as all the aircraft of all the nations of the world during the whole of World War II.

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 take every feasible step to avoid the valley of the shadow of nuclear death, since an arms race, pursued to the ultimate, could be practically race suicide. Here is the basis for the President's emphasis on safeguarded disarmament, designed to reduce bitter tensions and their resultant arms burden, to lift from the world its shroud of fear, and eventually to maximize availability for peaceful purposes of the infinite promise of the atom. 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 minds of men, the hopes of men, the souls of men everywhere, can move forward toward peace and happiness and well-being."

After reviewing the whole 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 which automatically can guarantee a permanent peace.

On the one hand, all the lessons of history tell us that a long-sustained competitive buildup of armaments, or an anxious arms race, carry within themselves the dangers of war. On the other hand, we are equally aware that if one nation lets down its guard it invites aggression from a powerfully armed adversary. Unilateral disarmament on our

part would be foolhardy. Disarmament, if it is possible at all, must be a joint matter.

Although the United States has always disavowed the classical arms race as a basis of national policy, we are determined to maintain and, if necessary, increase our armed strength for as long a period as is necessary to safeguard peace and to maintain our security. But we know that a mutually dependable system for reduced armaments on the part of all nations, which would also provide protection against a surprise attack, would be a better way to safeguard peace and to maintain our security.

It would ease the fears of war in the anxious hearts of people everywhere. It would lighten the burdens on their backs. And it would make it possible for every nation, great and small, to advance the standards of living of its people. The Government is, therefore, determined to continue 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 importance of a sound agreement cannot be overemphasized. All of our lessons show that an agreement that is not thoroughly supported by effective reciprocal inspection is worse than no agreement at all. Without thorough inspection and reporting, doubts and suspicions, rumors, charges and counter-charges arise, and soon the agreement itself becomes a source of discord and danger of war rather than an aid to peace. The agreement must be sound. It must be the kind of agreement in which the inspection itself can be trusted and not a matter of a word or treaty between nations.

In our own history, for example, the Rush-Bagot agreement between Great Britain and the United States after the War of 1812 was a conspicuous example of success in this field. In that agreement, in 1817, Great Britain and the United States agreed that each would keep just three war vessels on the Great Lakes and that the vessels would have certain limited characteristics. Each side could see visibly that the other was fulfilling the agreement.

Here was an agreement that was effective, and that agreement in 1817 proved the forerunner of our peaceful unarmed border with Canada, which for well over a century has been of such great benefit to both our countries.

As we are able to move from the crisis atmosphere of the past years we look forward to a time when it will be possible for the world as a whole to channel a much greater proportion of its resources into improvement of national living standards rather than into machines and devices for protection and destruction. Should we be successful in achieving a workable and mutually agreeable reduction in armaments, we will be enabled progressively to place more emphasis on programs such as "Atoms for Peace" designed, by calling on the constructive energy of the atom, to lift mankind to higher levels of well-being. We must reject the concept that mankind's greatest scientific achievement should be used primarily as a weapon. Our atomic hopes must be commensurate with the awful dimensions of our atomic fears. We must be determined, as the President has said, "to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death but consecrated to his life."

Here, to my mind, in our endeavors to persuade the nations of the world to join with us to achieve safeguarded disarmament and to turn the use of the atom to peaceful purposes, lies the great international challenge of our times, perhaps the last, best hope of earth. We must remain strong, both as a guaranty for our own security and as a deterrent to war. But the sum of our international effort, I am convinced, must be the waging of peace with as much resourcefulness, with as great a sense of dedication and urgency as we have ever mustered in defense of our country in time of war.

We have to find somehow the inspiration of new ideas, new approaches such as were exemplified by the program suggested by the President at Geneva. We must not forget to pray. There is no question about continuing to maintain at this stage of world affairs a suitably powerful posture of defense, but remembering that it needs to be based on the spiritual and moral strength of a nation of free people. With it we shall need to maintain an unswerving confidence and trust in 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 open our thought to new faith and inspiration and to the new ideas and new approaches we must find.

Conclusion

I have directed my remarks to these two great problems—1 domestic and 1 international—because of what appears to me to be their almost transcendental importance to each one of us. The actions of the American Government reflect the mood of the American people; the extent to which the Government can take vigorous and lasting actions is largely dependent upon a ground swell of public opinion which cannot be mistaken or denied. To the extent that any of us fail to clarify and express our judgments on these two great issues, to that extent will we fail to participate in decisions which will have the most profound effect on each of our lives.

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 atom could some day determine whether each of us will live or die.

ASSISTANCE TO THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I prepared pointing out a specific example of what can be done to assist the physically handicapped to become self-supporting members of the community.

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

As a member of the Senate Small Business Committee, it is gratifying for me to be able to pay tribute to the sagacity, foresight, and humanitarianism of the Bendix Aviation Corp. assisting the physically handicapped. This company, within a relatively short period of time has awarded $1,350,000 of subcontract work to a small organization which possessed no prior manufacturing experience in any industrial sphere. As if this fact, in itself, were not sufficiently significant, the contracts awarded by the Bendix Corp. require the manufacture of exceedingly complex, synchronous motor components used in radar, aircraft instruments, and in other electronic circuitry where the most exacting control of elctrical impulse and power supply is required. Permit me to relate the highly unusual and most inspiring story of the manner in which a large corporation created a small electronics manufacturing plant within the organizational framework of a rehabilitation agency.

The Federation of the Handicapped at 211 West 14th Street, New York City, is a nonprofit social welfare organization created for the purpose of aiding and rehabilitating physically handicapped individuals. This organization contacted the Bendix Aviation Corp. to solicit subcontract work which would permit them to employ and train disabled people for job placement in regular industry. The Bendix Corp. was advised by the Federation that it could offer adequate manufacturing space, although this consisted solely of four walls and bare floor. It possessed a meager amount of working capital which could be utilized for a manufacturing project and it could provide a hitherto unused source of manpower composed of physically disabled individuals endowed with enthusiasm, tenacity of purpose, and the ability to work diligently, but who lacked the skills, knowledge, and judgment which can come only with experience.

Because the federation lacked equipment, experience, adequate working capital, and the essential engineering and manufacturing knowledge, the awarding of a subcontract by Bendix to this organization presented what seemed to be a group of insurmountable problems. Under ordinary circumstances the perplexity of such a situation would prompt any concern to withhold any offer of subcontract work. The Bendix Aviation Corp., however, expended considerable time and effort in order to devise a plan by means of which the Federation of the Handicapped could be provided with an opportunity to obtain the subcontractual business it was seeking. The Federation of the Handicapped was notified by Bendix that it would be provided with an opportunity to obtain subcontract work from Bendix—but, because of the complexity of the type of work to be subcontracted, it would be necessary for Bendix to provide engineering and manufacturing "know-how," and, on a loan basis, certain types of equipment, tooling, and all required raw materials. The federation gratefully accepted this most unusual opportunity and a team of Bendix personnel immediately undertook the task of providing all that was needed to create a small manufacturing unit capable of producing intricate, component parts under close competent supervision.

The skeleton plant in 60 days delivered the first shipment of finished parts to the Bendix Corp. Bendix purchased, on a subcontract basis, each of these components at a cost which was identical to Bendix' own cost of manufacture. This made it possible for the federation to establish the same job standards and rates of bonus compensation as those utilized by Bendix for its own employees.

Through the close cooperation and masterful guidance of Bendix personnel the federation workers as a group, were able to rapidly accelerate their production rate and were able as individuals to acquire new skills, financial independence, necessary experience, and considerable engineering and manufacturing comprehension. The quality and quantity of the work produced by the federation workers and their ability to meet delivery schedules induced Bendix to increase substantially the volume of subcontract work. This, in turn, permitted rapid expansion within the small electronics plant that Bendix created. The original barren room has become a two-story, manufacturing plant accommodating a maze of complicated electronic equipment, 80 percent of which is now owned by the federation itself. Thousands of component parts are currently being produced and shipped each week by a staff of 135 physically handicapped employees who have now become taxpayers—not tax consumers.

The contracts awarded by Bendix and the income realized from them has meant a great deal to the federation in terms of helping the disabled to help themselves. A considerable number of physically handicapped individuals have received job training and job experience and have not only learned how to perform a skilled task under standard working conditions but have been able to obtain positions in regular industry. Hundreds of other physically handicapped

men and women have received the benefits to be derived from medical treatment, psychological therapy and professional counseling.

It is 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 managing its own operation and can successfully compete against other Bendix subcontractors for Bendix subcontract work. Outstanding among my experiences is this particular case history of what can be done to assist our physically handicapped to become self-supporting members of the community. I trust that many of us will follow this example thus making a great contribution to the welfare 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 report is found the following sentence:

At the same time, the present imbalance of sponsors and applicants 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.

This is not news. 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. Actually, the Refugee Relief Act never was a workable instrument for achieving the humanitarian 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 those charged with its administration to make it work.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. President, I would like to have appear an article from the New York Times of March 7, 1956, headlined "Refugees in United States Far Below Goal" and an editorial 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 7, 1956]

REFUGEES IN UNITED STATES FAR BELOW GOAL—ONLY 68,000 OF AUTHORIZED 3-YEAR TOTAL OF 209,000 HAD BEEN SETTLED FEBRUARY 1

WASHINGTON, March 6.—Despite significant progress since mid-1955, the State Department reported today that the Refugee Relief Act was likely to fall considerably short of providing a haven for 209,000 immigrants as authorized by Congress.

As the second year of the 3-year program ended on December 31, 73,331 visas had been issued and 77,193 applications were still under consideration.

Since then, an additional 13,000 visas have been issued. About 68,000 refugees, including those who had escaped or been expelled, their relatives and orphans, actually had been admitted as of February 1.

The status of the program was reviewed by Pierce J. Gerety, Deputy Administrator, in his semiannual report to Congress.

Mr. Gerety said 49 percent of the entire 2-year total of 73,331 visas was issued in the last 6 months of 1955. He called this an encouraging stepup but added:

"It is evident that under existing circumstances and barring unforeseen changes, considerably less than the authorized 209,000 nonquota immigration visas will be issued by the termination of the refugee relief program on December 31, 1956."

He listed a shortage of United States sponsors as one of the greatest obstacles to success of the undertaking. He estimated that sponsors for 55,000 applicants would have to be obtained by July or August if the 209,000 authorizations were to be filled.

The 1953 act requires sponsor assurances of housing, support and employment for eligible applicants. President Eisenhower has urged Congress to relax that requirement, among others, to facilitate administration of the program.

Mr. Gerety said sponsors were needed for regugees in Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands, non-Asians stranded in the Far East and orphans. Assurances to cover as many as 39,500 applicants may be needed if the 90,000 German-Austrian allocations is to be filled, he reported.

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

Despite a pressing over-population problem, "hundreds of hopeful visa aspirants in Italy will be disappointed because the demand 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 particularly successful" he commented. "A certain amount of redefection has taken place among the thousands of refugees from Eastern Europe but not in alarming numbers despite glowing promises."

Some of these, he added, have applied for admission to the United States under the Refugee Relief Act. Mr. Gerety said the campaign extended to persons who had arrived in this and other countries of the free world under emergency migration programs.

"Most of these persons who have fled from their countries of origin are bitter anti-Communists," he asserted, "and fully aware of the tragic situation in their homelands.

"However, many are discouraged and dissatisfied because of long delays in resettlement and may be unable to continue to resist pressures applied by the Communists."

[From the New York Times of March 8, 1856]

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 it will achieve its alleged goal of admitting 209,000 nonquota immigrants to the United States by the end of this year.

Indeed, 2 months ago we noted on this page that the question was no longer whether the act would be fully effective, but rather by how much it would fail. Statements of both Scott McLeod, administrator of the law, and his deputy, Pierce J. Gerety, indicate that the deficiency will be in the neighborhood of 20 percent, quite a percentage considering that the period of operation covers the better part of 3 years. Only 68,000 refugees, most of them relatives of American citizens rather than refugees in the strict sense, had been admitted under this law as of February 1, and to date visas have been issued for some 18,000 additional individuals.

The program has been speeded up, but speed is relative. The fact is that during the first year or so of the law's operation it was bogged down so badly that it had become hardly better than a cruel delusion for thousands upon thousands of genuine refugees, many of them victims of Communist persecution, patiently waiting for admission to the United States. Much of the fault lay, and still lies, in the law itself. Congressional enemies of real relief legislation wrote into this law such difficult and complex requirements 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 administration only made matters worse, whether because of lack of sympathy with the professed purposes of the law, fear of the extreme anti-immigration bloc in Congress, ineptness or some other reason. Most nongovernmental experts seem to agree with the criticisms of the administration of the act as expressed in a letter on this page yesterday from the executive director of one of the voluntary agencies concerned with refugee resettlement in the United States. There is little doubt that the situation has improved in recent months, but the improvement has probably come too late to redeem the program as a humanitarian gesture of first-rate importance in the eyes of the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, time is running out. We cannot allow this humanitarian program to fall so far short of its purpose that more than one-fifth of the visas authorized are wasted. Much needs to be done by Congress to improve the act in a legislative way. Legislation is pending in the appropriate committees to make these changes. We should certainly do our part. We should take action as soon as possible to make those changes which experience has proved to be necessary to make the Refugee Relief Act workable.

But something more immediate can be done and needs to be done. The President of the United States has it within his power to act now to prevent the refugee relief program from suffering a disastrous failure. What is needed now is leadership, rather than pious messages and good hope. I suggest that if this administration is not to stand charged with having deliberately failed in achieving the goal of the Refugee Relief Act, President Eisenhower must take those measures necessary to expedite the program.

The President of the United States and the Secretary of State have it within their power, now, administratively, to make changes that will eliminate some of the handicaps under which this program is laboring. I do not say this solely on my own authority. This is the considered judgment of a number of church and civic groups that have been working in face of serious obstacles in an attempt to make the refugee relief program work.

These groups joined in a plea to the President recently to take the administrative action necessary so that the full goals of the program may be achieved. There are probably no people who have a better acquaintance with the way this program has been functioning and the way in which it is being administered than those who have made these recommendations to President Eisenhower.

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 up against not 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 a success. That is my own charge, Mr. President. I do not speak for these groups.

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 to make it clear that the recommendations come from organizations with close experience in the way the refugee relief program has been functioning. Signers include: American Federation of International Institutes, Inc., American Fund 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 Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc., United Hias Service, Inc., United Ukrainian American Relief Committee, Inc.

In their letter to President Eisenhower these groups said:

May we respectfully call to your attention the present situation with reference to the refugee relief program? The present rate of security clearance and of visa issuance in some countries is not now sufficient to complete the processing of the registered applicants who now have assurances nor of those applicants who, we believe, will receive assurances through our agencies during 1956. In Germany, for example, the visa rate of 265 vias per week for the last 10 weeks needs to be increased immediately to more than 373 visas per week through December 31, 1956, to cover all refugees now in processing.

Among the proposals submitted to the President by these groups were the following:

First. Concerning the transportation of refugees: Under the Refugee Relief Act the Secretary of State is authorized to make arrangements for transporting refugees to this country by ship or plane. This has been done in Europe, but similar provisions have not been made for refugees coming from the Near and Far East. Let me read the recommendation of the committee on the refugee relief program of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service:

The same provisions for ocean transportation which have been made for 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 serious discrimination against such persons, causing difficult problems for agencies and sponsors of persons already visaed but for whom no Refugee Relief Act transportation arrangements are available. Fortunately, the law authorized the Secretary of State to make such arrangements (see sec. 8). The estimates of the number of persons who may need such transportation have been in the Department of State since August. The number of visa-ready cases awaiting the transportation arrangements as authorized in section 8 is growing daily; at this moment at least 125 orphans are in this most unfortunate position. We hope this increasingly urgent matter can be arranged without further delay. Several Government agencies have funds and interests which surely can be associated under the specific authorization given the Secretary of State. Transportation provisions for all persons qualifying under the Refugee Relief Act should and can be made uniform under section 8 of Public Law 203.

Here is one way in which the President and the Secretary of State could act, now, without any need for legislative changes, to expedite the flow of refugees to this country under the refugee relief program.

Second. Concerning the security measures that have been taken under the Refugee Relief Act, the Committee on the Refugee Relief program made two recommendations to President Eisenhower. The first one is as follows:

About section 11 (a) of Public Law 203:

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, and that such investigations in each case shall be conducted in a manner and in such time as the investigative agency or agencies shall determine to be necessary. The President has designated the Department of State as the agency of the Government which shall make the investigations and written reports in cooperation with the Department of the Army and any other agencies of the Government which the Department of State may request. We believe that the Administrator of the program has it within his authority, according to the wording of section 11 (a), to conduct these operations in a less cumbersome manner and in a much shorter time. As a matter of fact, in keeping with our recommendations on legislative amendments, we feel that these requirements, which are over and beyond the security and investigating requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act, are not necessary.

Third. The other security recommendation made to the President concerned section 11 (d) of Public Law 203:

This section of the law calls for complete information regarding the history of applicants covering a period of at least 2 years immediately preceding their application for a visa. This section has worked a great hardship on the more recent escapees who have not been out from behind the Iron Curtain for 2 years. In such cases the Department of State has indicated that it is difficult to obtain the 2-year histories and it is attempting to reconstruct them. The latest report on completion of such reconstructed histories, however, is discouraging and indicates that out of a total of over 900 such cases in the processing pipeline, only 68 have completed security clearance. We believe that the Administrator has the authority to overcome this problem, on the basis of the clause in the section which reads: *"Provided,* That this provision may be waived on the recommendation of the Secretaries of State and Defense when determined by them to be in the national interest." We, therefore, recommend that a procedure be initiated whereby the right to waive this requirement is utilized.

It is not here suggested—nor would I suggest—that there should not be proper security procedures followed before permitting entrance of any person into the United States. The fact is, however, that applicants seeking admission under the Refugee Relief Act are already subject to the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. I do not believe that there is anyone who would contend that the McCarran-Walter Act does not contain adequate provision for screening out any immigrant who might pose a threat as a subversive to this country. What has happened in the case of the Refugee Relief Act is that a whole additional apparatus of security trappings has been erected on top of the already adequate provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Those who have worked closely with this program know that the administration of its security procedures has raised one of the greatest obstacles to expediting the processing of applications for admission under the refugee-relief program.

The voluntary agencies most familiar with this program have indicated in their letter to the President the way in which this obstacle can, in part, be overcome by administrative changes. I think the President and Secretary of State should act immediately to accomplish these changes so that no additional time is lost in stepping up the number of applications processed between now and December 31.

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 they will be called to the attention of the appropriate committees of both Houses. However, as they are worthy of the consideration of all my colleagues, I would like to have appear at this point in my 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:

FEBRUARY 16, 1956.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: As national voluntary agencies accredited by the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act who represent a large segment of the American population concerned with the implementation of the refugee relief program, we wish to thank you for your repeatedly expressed interest in this program and to solicit your further help in making it fully effective. We look upon the program as a desirable expression of our American foreign policy and of our humanitarian desire to assist the homeless and oppressed, and believe it is to the best interest of our country as well as to the best interests of the home-

less of the world that the terms of the act be fulfilled.

May we respectfully call to your attention the present situation with reference to the refugee relief program? The present rate of security clearance and of visa issuance in some countries is not now sufficient to complete the processing of the registered applicants who now have assurances nor of those applicants who, we believe, will receive assurances through our agencies during 1956. In Germany, for example, the visa rate of 265 visas per week for the last 10 weeks needs to be increased immediately to more than 373 visas per week through December 31, 1956, to cover all refugees now in processing. 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 recommending as necessary to the leaders of both parties in Congress certain reasonable amendments, that the Refugee Relief Act can be fully implemented and its important objectives made possible.

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.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Chairman, Committee on Refugee Relief Program.

(Members of the committee on refugee relief program of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service: American Federation of International Institutes, Inc.; American Fund 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 Displaced People of Yugoslavia, Inc.; United Hias Service, Inc.; United Ukrainian American Relief Committee, Inc.)

SOME PROPOSALS BY AMERICAN VOLUNTARY AGENCIES TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR FACILITATING THE REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM

I. 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 through diligence and hard work 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 read "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 escapees are available be expanded to include Spain, North Africa, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, and Jordan. Under the present provisions of the law, only those escapees residing in NATO countries, Turkey, Sweden, Iran, or Trieste are presently eligible. The additional number of escapees who would 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 other investigations

Section 15 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 of 1952.

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

4. Certificate of readmission

Although the majority of applicants for special nonquota visas under the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, are able to obtain certificates of readmission as required by 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 the only bar to the admission of persons otherwise eligible under the Refugee Relief Act.

5. Utilization of unused visas

Developments since the enactment of Public Law 203 indicate that the visa 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 eligible applicants from Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands. For practical purposes it is recommended that a partial reallocation of 30,000 be made immediately and that further allocations 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 termination 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 limit for 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 provision should be made for the admission of siblings of such principal applicant up to the age of 16. The number of admissions under this special section should be increased by 1,000.

7. Admission of persons having tuberculosis to provide for reunion of refugee families

In view of the great desirability of maintaining or restoring family unity, it is recommended that under proper safeguards for care and medical treatment after arrival in the United States members of family groups who are excludable because of tuberculosis in any form but who otherwise qualify under the Refugee Relief Act be allowed to accompany or follow their families to the United States.

8. Adjustment of status

The words "lawfully entered" should be deleted under section 6 of Public Law 203, 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.

9. 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 of some new provision for those among the refugees who are the so-called hard core—those thousands for whom no employment-centered resettlement is possible. These are the aged, the infirm, the amputees, the blind, and others for whom humanitarian care is the only answer. Through the United Nations Office of High Commissioner for Refugees and the United States escapee program, our Government is helping to provide for these people today. France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland are offering generous opportunities for some of them and for their families. It is our hope that Congress will make provision whereby a Government-sponsored plan can be achieved to bring 1,000 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 believe we in the United States of America should help on this problem not by money only, but by offering homes in our own country to a fair share of the victims of oppression.

10. Mortgaging 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 NEEDED

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

1. Transportation: A refugee relief program responsibility

The same provisions for ocean transportation which have been made for 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 serious discrimination against such persons, causing difficult problems for agencies and sponsors of persons already visaed but for whom no Refugee Relief Act transportation arrangements are available. Fortunately, the law authorized

the Secretary of State to make such arrangements (see sec. 8). The estimates of the number of persons who may need such transportation have been in the Department of State since August. The number of visa-ready cases awaiting the transportation arrangements as authorized in section 8 is growing daily; at this moment at least 125 orphans are in this most unfortunate position. We hope this increasingly urgent matter can be arranged without further delay. Several Government agencies have funds and interests which surely can be associated under the specific authorization given the Secretary of State. Transportation provisions for all persons qualifying under the Refugee Relief Act should and can be made uniform under section 8 of Public Law 203.

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, and that such investigations in each case shall be conducted in a manner and in such time as the investigative agency or agencies shall determine to be necessary. The President has designated the Department of State as the agency of the Government which shall make the investigations and written reports in cooperation with the Department of the Army and any other agencies of the Government which the Department of State may request.

We believe that the Administrator of the program has it within his authority, according to the wording of section 11 (a), to conduct these operations in a less cumbersome manner and in a much shorter time. As a matter of fact, in keeping with our recommendations on legislative amendments, we feel that these requirements, which are over and beyond the security and investigating requirement of the Immigration and Nationality Act, are not necessary.

3. Section 11 (d)

This section of the law calls for complete information regarding the history of applicants covering a period of at least 2 years immediately preceding their application for a visa. This section has worked a great hardship on the more recent escapees who have not been out from behind the Iron Curtain for 2 years. In such cases the Department of State has indicated that it is difficult to obtain the 2-year histories and it is attempting to reconstruct them. The latest report on completion of such reconstructed histories, however, is discouraging and indicates that out of a total of over 900 such cases in the processing pipeline, only 68 have completed security clearance.

We believe that the Administrator has the authority to overcome this problem, on the basis of a clause in the section which reads: "Provided, That this provision may be waived on the recommendation of the Secretaries of State and Defense when determined by them to be in the national interest." We therefore recommend that a procedure be initiated whereby the right to waive this requirement is utilized.

COMMITTEE ON REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM, AMERICAN COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE, INC.
FEBRUARY 16, 1956.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier, on January 24, similar recommendations were made to the Deputy Administrator of the refugee relief program, Mr. Pierce Gerety. Mr. Roland Elliott, director of immigration services for the Church World Service of the National Council of Churches of Christ, sent a letter to Mr. Gerety proposing both administrative changes as well as certain simple legislative changes. I understand that the more than 30 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox churches which make up this organization are spending over a half-million dollars a year on the refugee program. Mr. Elliott, as director of immigration services for the National Council of Churches has staff members throughout the world in countries in which the refugee relief program is operating. He is, therefore, 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. I believe his recommendations on the changes that are needed in the program deserve our closest attention. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter from Mr. Elliott to Mr. Gerety of January 20, 1956.

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

JANUARY 20, 1956.

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

DEAR PIERCE: I am glad to act on your suggestion, following the advisory group meeting 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 remiss 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 on behalf of Church World Service, which represents the refugee service of over 30 Protestant and Eastern Orthodox 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 certain simple legislative amendments, in line with experience in the program to date, are equally essential—and possible.

No one knows better than yourself that your present problem as administrator of this refugee-relief program has been occasioned by the following factors:

1. Certain difficulties inherent in the original legislation.

2. Serious delays in beginning the program in certain countries in Europe, and 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 provide an efficient integrated operation including investigations, visa issuance, transportation, work of voluntary agencies, etc.

5. Disappointment and discouragement of applicants overseas and assurers in the United States of America due to length and uncertainties of the processing period.

6. Consequent slowness of assurance procurement by voluntary agencies.

7. Economic and political developments in Germany and Austria.

8. The earlier lack of clarity regarding the administrative intent for this program; was it permissive legislation only or was it a program to bring relief to refugees and others?

Since your own appointment as deputy administrator, there has been substantial progress in this important program as a result of your administrative and procedural improvements. Some further administrative changes can be effected and urgently need to be effected 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 upon assurances already verified by the State Department. In the Netherlands, the program is just now beginning so there, as elsewhere, the processing schedule requires early acceleration by your office. Otherwise assurances produced at great cost by agencies like our own will never produce visas for people who are fully eligible under the Refugee Relief Act.

While in some countries, as in Germany and Austria, the refugee problem has diminished 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 imperative value of making the Refugee Relief Act the positive and quickly effective instrument it was designed to be. The answer to redefection is not protracted, 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 falter now in bringing this program to fullest effectiveness surely would be against our own self-interest and our democratic and humanitarian role in the world. Let me stress again the importance of closer coordination of the United States escapee program which is our welcoming service to those who defect to the West with the procedures of RRP. In this same connection you will want to note that with the suspension of the adjustment of status provision, there is now 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 in the refugee relief program should be considered apart from the basic immigration law. While it is our view that, in future legislation, provision for emergency immigration might well be made an integral part of our Immigration and Nationality law, it seems to us to be imperative that separate and immediate consideration be given by the Congress to the relatively few changes in Public Law 203 which experience has proved sound, feasible and wholly 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 for changes like the following. Some of these can and should be made by

utilizing authorizations already in Public Law 203. Some may require legislative changes:

1. Who is eligible? The Administrator, with the help of voluntary agencies if requested, could quickly suggest changes in certain sections regarding eligibility where persons, clearly belonging within this program are excluded from it because of a fortuitous wording of the law.

For example: (1) An escapee from Communist China who moved from Hong Kong to Germany; because he did not escape from a Communist area of Europe he is not eligible under RRA.

(2) A Rumanian woman married to an Italian residing in Rumania escaped with her daughter to Italy when the Communists came into power in Rumania. Once back in Italy the husband deserted them. Now the mother is ineligible because of her Italian citizenship as spouse of an Italian citizen. Her daughter is RRA eligible, but mother and daughter wish to migrate together. Yet the husband could be eligible as a refugee, of Italian ethnic origin.

(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 company operating in a French overseas territory.

(4) Iron Curtain refugees now in Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, Egypt, and Jordan are not eligible; if they were in Iran or Turkey they could be eligible. These true refugees should be made eligible.

(5) Iron Curtain refugees in Spain and North Africa comprise only a relatively small number; they should be included in our refugee program and could be by expanding the section 4 (a) (3) of the act.

While, in the light of experience to date, certain amendments to eligibility requirements now can be made, it is our experience that no precise definition of eligibiltiy can be expected to cover all cases of merit which emerge in the course of a program to help people; therefore, we strongly urge that permissive authority be granted to the Secretary of State to authorize admissions to that limited number of refugees who clearly are within the intent of the Refugee Act but are excluded by the inflexibility of eligibility definitions.

2. Reallocate quotas: Since the law was enacted unforeseen developments have proved the original allocations of visas were, in some cases too high, in others too low; consequently we recommend that the German and Austria quota be reduced to provide for the reallocation of 10,000 visas for earthquake, flood, and guerrilla victims in Greece already registered under the RRA, for 10,000 more visas for refugees in Italy, 5,000 more visas for escapees in NATO and other countries and their overseas territories and, if needed, 5,000 more visas for Chinese refugees now waiting in Hong Kong. If these quotas are now increased it would be wise to give the Secretary of State authorization to extend the effective period of the act by 6 to 8 months for these specific categories if, before December 31, 1956, this should prove to be necessary. Also authorization should be given the Deputy Administrator to further reallocate quotas before December 31, 1956, as necessary in order to cover the maximum number of refugee applicants. It may be a wise provision also to authorize the Secretary of State to extend the terminal date of the act for cases covered by assurances still in process of investigation on December 31, 1956, providing such assurances had been verified by the State Department prior to a cutoff date established by the Deputy Administrator.

3. Transportation an RRP responsibility: The practical implementation of the provision for ocean transportation for cases visaed under RRA has resulted in serious discrimination against refugees including orphans—from the Near East and the Far East and present serious problems for agencies and sponsors with visas already granted but no RRA transportation arrangements are available. Fortunately, the law authorizes the Secretary of State to make such arrangements (see sec. 8). The estimates of the number of persons involved have been in the State Department since August. The number of visa-ready cases, awaiting the transportation arrangements authorized in section 8, is growing daily; at this moment at least 125 orphans are in this most unfortunate position. We hope this increasingly urgent matter can be arranged without further delay. Several Government agencies have funds and interests which surely can be associated under the specific authorization given the secretary. These provisions should and can be made uniform under section 8 of Public Law 203.

4. Keep families together: The high incidence of tuberculosis among refugees because of their long years of malnutrition and inadequate living conditions means that many families refuse to migrate because one family member is excluded. With modern methods of care and cure of tuberculosis in this country, a safe provision for such families to migrate as a unit is feasible providing there are proper safeguards under the control of the United States, State and local health authorities. The total number involved is not great; but the humanitarian service is beyond calculation. We believe that the United States Public Health Service could quickly draft the conditions under which such admissions might be permitted with full health safeguards to the families and communities in which such persons would live in the United States of America.

5. Make security procedures efficient: It now is clear that the security provisions under section 11, including 2-year history requirement is not resulting in better security screening than that already required under the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 which is more specific, is equally thorough, is more expeditious, and is not limited to 2 years. The present RRA regulations for security screening are costly, time-consuming and at the present time constitute one of the most serious blocks to the program. In our experience they add no safeguard to United States security not already provided more specifically by Public Law 414. Furthermore, they are one major and correctable cause of redefection among those who escape to the West only to find that after their welcome they are subject to prolonged and multiple security screening. We, of course, make no request for relaxed screening requirements; we do earnestly propose that the President utilize the power specifically given him under Public Law 203, section 11, to provide for efficient security screening by qualified American personnel but to eliminate the present purely regulatory provisions which make for useless delay and cost. In the case of areas like Hong Kong, the 2-year history requirement almost completely nullifies the purpose of the act in a situation of most urgent need.

6. Discretion regarding readmission: In several areas (e. g., France, Sweden, Canada, and Hong Kong) which are carrying a very heavy responsibility for refugees—both stateless and refugee persons from Iron Curtain countries—the presently required certificate of readmission has proved to work against our own best interests. Since the number of possible deportations ever involved for the United States of America is so small, we recommend that the certificate of readmission be not required or that the Secretary of State be authorized to waive it as a requirement in cases where it is the only bar to the admission of a person otherwise eligible under RRA.

7. RRA consultation a way to good relations and results: From our own intimate experience in countries like Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, it is clear that administrative approaches to the responsible offices in the governments concerned will greatly expedite the completion phase of this program. (For example: Such consultation in Germany initiated by the Administrator might well facilitate the application of additional qualified escapees and expellees—chiefly among farm families. Up to now there has been no such direct consultation.)

8. United States of America and hard-core: As an additional factor in resolving the refugee problem we wish to bring most strongly to your attention for possible inclusion in the RRA program the urgent need of some new provision for those among the refugees who are the so-called hard core—those thousands for whom no employment-centered resettlement is possible. These are the aged, the infirm, the amputees, the blind, for whom humanitarian care is the only answer. Our Government has helped these people. Through the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the United States escapee program we are helping other countries to take these people today. France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland are offering generous opportunities for these people and for their families, many of whom are employable. It is our hope that Congress, soon, may make provision whereby the families of these people now in the United States of America and agencies like our own, together with Federal, State, or private institutions, may cooperate in a Government implemented plan to bring 1,000 such persons to this country for permanent care in their declining years. Refugees may make good labor, good citizens, good Americans. They also may be hard core. We believe we in the United States of America should help on this problem, not by its money only but by making homes for a fair share of these victims of oppression in our own country.

We believe we have a prior responsibility for making those practical adjustments in the administrations of the Refugee Relief Act which experience to date has proved essential if the real spirit and intent of the 1953 legislation is to be achieved.

In this present statement we are not seeking to deal with other long-range immigration questions which are indeed important; rather we stress the importance, and the feasibility, of making immediately such simple changes as the above which will enable the Administrator of the RRA—and all of us in the voluntary agencies to make this program effective in providing the maximum number of distressed people who apply and are eligible under this law. Permit me to emphasize the fact that we are not interested in soliciting immigration; however, we do want to see the act made effective fully before it expires.

At this late stage in the program, it, of course, is apparent that the quick action essential both administratively and legislatively will be possible only as there is the broadest nonpolitical initiative and backing in support of what is needed. I believe our own concern to make this program fully effective is representative of the voting public's desire to see the program succeed. I feel confident that if the President can invite Senator Langer, chairman of the Committee on Refugees and Escapees; Senator Kilgore and Congressman Walter as chairmen of the Immigration Subcommittees, together with a similar group of administration leaders in the House and Senate, and request them to prepare the essential minimum legislation required to complete the RRP, there will be complete cooperation. This is not political naivete; it is practical political realism in undergirding the improvements so urgently needed and earnestly desired in an election year. Any administration bill, however enlightened, is bound to be regarded as political; similarly any bill prepared by the majority. The time for nonpartisan action is in the actual preparation of the bill.

Church World Service is urgently concerned for some 30,000 people with assurances now being processed under the RRA; our churches are securing more assurances daily; we pledge our continued cooperation with you in working for the acceleration of this program under existing law and in bringing to the attention of the Congress the few, reasonable and practical recommendations for legislative changes which experience now indicates are essential to make the refugee-relief program the real success it deserves to be.

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, 1956.

I believe you will take my suggestions as the friendly evidence of my regard for you which they are intended to be.

Ever cordially yours,

ROLAND 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 significance the refugee-relief program has for United States foreign policy. Mr. Elliott wrote to Mr. Gerety:

While in some countries, as in Germany and Austria, the refugee problem has diminished 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 imperative value of making the Refugee Relief Act the positive and quickly effective instrument it was designed to be. The answer to redefection is not protracted, 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 program for the world's refugees—our allies in the struggle for a free world—should be given new momentum. To falter now in bringing this program to fullest effectiveness surely would be against our own self-interest and our democratic and humanitarian role in the world. Let me stress again the importance of closer coordination of the United States escapee program which is our welcoming service to those who defect to the West with procedures of R. R. P. In this same connection you will want to note that with the suspension of the adjustment of status provision, there is now 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.

I think most of us are familar with the redefection campaign about which Mr. Elliott warns. In recent month especially, the Communists have stepped up their campaign to woo and win back people who have escaped from countries behind the Iron Curtain. They have done this by declaring amnesties for such defectors. They have also resorted to uglier methods. Recently, for example, there were pictures in the news showing an Eastern German mother and her son—who had defected to West Berlin with the husband and daughter—being kidnapped and carried back into East Berlin. Fortunately the mother escaped and anti-Communists then succeeded in effecting the escape of the small boy. But the purpose of the Communists in this kidnapping was to use the mother and son in forcing the father and daughter to return. Another, and more frequent tactic of the Communists, has been a letter-writing campaign. They have had friends and relatives in the satellite countries write letters to the refugee or escapee urging him to return. While the good life that awaits him if he returns may be the outward content of the letters, the hidden implication is there that something might happen to the loved ones left behind if he does not return. This is not a new form of black-mail, but the Communists have stepped up its use in their redefection campaign.

Now, the principal purpose of this redefection campaign is obvious. Whenever the Communists can entice or intimidate an escapee to return to his country of origin, they achieve a real victory. The Communist propaganda machine goes to work exploiting this redefection. Pictures and news stories are circulated throughout the Soviet Union and the satellite countries showing how happy the redefector is to be back and describing how horrible conditions are on the other side of the Iron Curtain—our side. Cut off as they are from most other sources of information, the people in these captive countries are apt to be convinced by this propaganda. What better proof if there that things are not so bad in their own country and must be worse outside the Communist world? Why else would these escapees return? You can well understand that every success the Communists score in this redefection campaign serves a twofold purpose: First, it cuts down the desire of others in the satellite countries to take the dangerous course of attempting to escape to the West; second, it makes those living in the satellite countries less dissatisfied with their lot, since they come to believe that living conditions are not very enviable elsewhere either.

There are other purposes of this redefection campaign. The Communists succeed in causing a sense of insecurity among refugees and exile governments by having letters reach them from behind the Iron Curtain just when they think they have successfully escaped from Communist control and taken up new lives. The mere fact that the Communist conspiracy has followed their movements and knows of their new address is disconcerting. But I think the main purpose of this campaign is the one I have described—of getting a few defectors to return for propaganda purposes.

The significance of this campaign for our foreign policy is clear. An editorial in the New York Times of January 25 stated this quite well. The Times said, in part:

Some 220,000 refugees from Eastern Europe are now living in camps in West Germany. The problem of providing for their needs, of integrating as many of them as possible into a free society as productive members of that society, is a serious one. It is a challenge to the conscience of the free world. It is also a political problem, since the Soviet Union and its Eastern European satellites have chosen to make it one. They are now and have for over a year been conducting an intensive campaign to induce these refugees to return to their native lands. The objective of this campaign, of course, is to use these refugees as "proof" that the Soviet way of life is preferable to that in the free world. Any large-scale success for this Communist effort would be a propaganda defeat for us, as well as a sign that our implicit obligation to these people had not been fulfilled.

So, Mr. President, the importance of our programs to aid refugees and escapees is not merely humanitarian. The humanitarian purpose is sufficient for me and I am sure for most other people. We feel that we should help these uprooted people to find new homes and establish new lives. But for anyone who needs a further reason, I am sure he has it in this Communist redefection campaign. Liberating the satellite countries can be talked about and debated, but there is not apt to be much spark of hope left in the peoples of the satellite countries once they see those who have escaped to the West coming back again.

We must be concerned that the refugees presently waiting in refugee camps do not become so disheartened that they fall easy prey to the Communist campaign and redefect. Our refugee relief program is not just a gesture to be administered in a halfhearted manner until its time has expired at the end of this year. The spirit in which we try to aid these people who have sought asylum in the West will help determine how successful or unsuccessful the Communists are with their redefection campaign. Those who have the responsibility for administering this program must not lose sight of this larger implication of the effects of the refugee relief program.

To indicate just how far short the refugee relief program is presently failing of being carried out properly, I wish to read portions of a letter I have recently received. It is from a friend and is a personal letter. As the friend is in a position to state quite clearly just to what extent the program is failing to achieve its goals. I wish to withhold his name to avoid causing him any embarrassment. But I assure the Senate that he is well qualified by experience with the refugee relief program to pass judgment on it. On January 28 he wrote me:

Two years have elapsed and still only some 75,000 of the authorized 209,000 have been issued. * * * 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 tagged 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 relatives also qualified as refugees due to the guerrilla war and earthquakes. Yet less than half of the 11,000 visas issued have been to real Greek refugees, thanks again to the Graham amendment.

These are the areas on which the administration will base its contention that the act has been a success. However, this will bear up only in terms of visas issued and not in terms of helping to solve the refugee problem. You see, the refugees did not have contacts in the United States of America. Assurances for jobs and housing had to come through voluntary agencies and it has taken time and money to build the machinery nec-

essary for this work. Now that these assurances are beginning to come in we find that the refugees have lost out to the relatives.

The agencies feel that the answer to this problem is to reallocate some of the unused numbers in Germany and Austria to Italy and Greece. As it now appears only 35,000 (Germany) and 15,000 (Austria) will be used of the 90,000 authorized. To reallocate the 40,000 unused visas and to extend this portion of the act to December 1957, is the agency proposition and I believe that it makes sense.

The situation in Germany is difficult to assess. The easy answer is that the German economy is so good that the people do not wish to migrate * * * as in Italy and Greece, it takes time to get assurances for strangers. Many, many of the recent east zone refugees would like to get to the States but the 2-year history requirement of the act prevents them. The security (officers) have set up a reconstruction procedure but it just doesn't work. So as it stands now hundreds of these people will see the act expire before their residence requirement is met.

I believe that the agencies have a good point when they support the need for a special quota for escapee cases. Five thousand visas put at the disposal of the United States escapee program people would be a great help. Personally I think that the 10,000 visas authorized under section 4 (a) (3) for NATO countries will be filled and will just about serve the needs but some agencies feel that another 5,000 will completely resolve the old DP problem. (That and a liberalizing of the TB formula which I wrote you about some time ago.)

Those agencies involved in the orphan program feel that the 4,000 visas will be issued although just less than half had been issued up to December 1955. Another 4,000 might be the answer to this very humanitarian aspect of the program.

Those were only portions of a letter I received from a friend who is in an excellent position to know how the Refugee Relief Act is operating. Some of the points he raises are crucial—such as the need to reallocate the unused quotas from Germany and Austria to Italy and Greece which are oversubscribed.

As his letter is a few weeks old, I would like to bring the figures of the refugee relief program up to date. As of February 17, the number of visas issued totaled 84,607. However, I wish to point out that the fact that visas have been issued does not mean that the refugee has actually entered and been resettled in the United States as is the purpose of the act. For 32,361 of those who are ready to come do not have assurances.

In all, on February 17, there had been 208,104 applications filed for admission under the Refugee Relief Act. But, if we take the rate at which applications are presently being processed, it is soon seen that Mr. Gerety was right when he estimated that the program would fall 44,000 short of its goal of 209,000 entries by the end of this year, unless something drastic is done to step up the processing.

When Mr. Gerety made that announcement, Mr. President, I wrote to the able chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I was concerned that if the goal of the refugee relief program could not be achieved by the cutoff date, December 31, 1956, it might be necessary to extend the time of the act. I would like to include at this point in my remarks my letter of January 4 to Chairman LANGER, of the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees, Escapees, and Expellees.

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

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR BILL: I am sure you share 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 about 44,000 refugees will be denied admission 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. 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 help of this program—it seems clear that we should be concerned that every single person authorized may obtain the relief intended under the act.

As you know, one of the amendments contained in S. 1794, introduced by Senators LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, KEFAUVER, and myself would extend the expiration date of the refugee relief program to December 31, 1960. Under this amendment any visas not issued by the end of this year would be redistributed among those categories under section 4 of the act that have been filled but still have requests pending for visas. This reallocation 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 would, 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 Mr. Gerety's admission that the administration will not be able to meet its obligation of issuing all visas authorized under the Refugee Relief Act, I hope that at the very least the committee will recommend an extension of the termination date of the act beyond December 31, 1956. I cannot know precisely how much additional time 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 would be a callous disregard of the misery in which many of these refugees have been living for long, weary years if we were to let more than one-fifth of the visas authorized by the Refugee Relief Act be wasted. That the administration could have administered the act in such a way that it now must threaten to close the door on the hopes of many of these suffering people is a shocking disregard of the humanitarian intent of the Congress in passing this act.

I trust that the subcommittee will take prompt action to insure that sufficient time will be allowed for the issuance of all visas authorized under the refugee relief program.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the news stories which carried an account of this letter indicated only that I had asked for an extension of the Refugee Relief Act. Some of those who have been working hard to help bring refugees to this country were concerned that I sought only this simple extension of time without any other changes in the program. Of course, I do not believe that the program can achieve its goals merely by extending the time for processing the applications. As I have indicated in the foregoing remarks, I think it is essential that measures be taken as soon as possible—both administratively and legislatively—to make this program workable. I would not settle for a mere extension of time. It might be misinterpreted as tacit approval of the way the program has been administered and is being administered. I hope I have made myself perfectly clear that I do not think the program has been or is being administered in a way that deserves any commendation. In fact, it took the unfortunate Corsi incident in the State Department last year to reveal the extent to which Secretary of State Dulles and the administrator of the program, Scott McLeod, were failing in any attempt to make this program succeed.

So that I will not be misunderstood, I wish to make quite clear the way in which I think this whole refugee relief program needs overhauling. There need be no surprise if a program drawn up to meet an unusual situation—such as the refugee situation—does not meet the need. But now that it has failed to meet the test of experience, we can take legislative action to modify the act so that it can work more expeditiously.

Mr. President, I would like to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the recommendations I made last June 1955 in testimony prepared for the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees, Escapees, and Expellees. My recommendations are directed primarily to Senate bill 1794, introduced by Senators LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, KEFAUVER, and myself, and to the Senate bill 2113, which includes the proposals recommended by the administration.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REFUGEES, ESCAPEES, AND EXPELLEES ON S. 1794, CONTAINING AMENDMENTS TO THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to testify before your committee in support of S. 1794, a bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The bill was introduced by Senators LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, KEFAUVER, and myself and contains amendments presently being considered by your subcommittee. I understand you are also considering S. 2113, the bill introduced by Senator WATKINS and others which includes proposals made by President Eisenhower, and S. 2149, which the chairman introduced this week. I will direct my remarks today primarily to the bill before the committee which I have cosponsored, S. 1794, but will also make some comparison of its amendments with those of the other two pending bills.

We all are gravely concerned by the situation that has brought about the need for these amendments. Our intention in passing the Refugee Relief Act 2 years ago was

to give new life to those people—displaced by war and in flight from oppression—who had no homes and little hope. Many of them had spent years in refugee camps. Others had fled from behind the Iron Curtain in hope of finding freedom and new lives. America stood as a symbol of hope to them, for they knew that we had always welcomed refugees from oppression.

It was in this humanitarian spirit that the refugee relief program was proposed to the Congress. We wished to give hope for a new life to some of these uprooted people. And we knew from our own experience that people could come to this country and, in building new lives, would help build the United States.

But the bill as it was finally passed had written into it many restrictions 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 history of this act, we cannot help but wonder whether a certain reluctance to make it work has not compounded the difficulties.

The unfortunate failure of the refugee program is a matter of record. The distinguished chairman of this subcommittee presented to the Senate last Monday the most recent figures of accomplishment under this act. In the nearly 2 years since its enactment, 31,919 visas have been issued. When we compare this to the number of 209,000 refugees and escapees that we finally authorized to be admitted we see just how badly the act and its administrators have failed in carrying out its humanitarian purpose.

I would like to point out that this failure does not only mean heartbreak and embitterment to the 209,000 who might have been admitted under this program and to the millions of others who had hoped that they might be among the 209,000. It has serious consequences for the position and prestige of the United States in the world. Here again—as in the Immigration and Naturalization Act—the United States presents itself to the world as a nation that holds itself above other peoples, that does not welcome people from other nations to our country even when they are displaced and homeless and in need of our assistance. Most of us do not feel that this is the true spirit of America. Quite the contrary. But such iniquitous restrictions as those written into the Immigration Act and the Refugee Act speak louder than any of our protestations of good will and good faith. We cannot convince others in the world that we, in our hearts, are friends and equals of all people, everywhere, when our legislation embodies xenophobia and racist discrimination that proclaim the opposite. I will not labor this point. But I think that this consequence of our immigration and relief programs is of such gravity for us in our relations with other peoples and other countries that it is of vital importance in any consideration of the Refugee Relief Act.

This failure of the Refugee Relief Act was taken with much complacency by the administration until the recent unpleasantness in the State Department. But we have at last gotten an admission from the President that all has not been going as it should with this program. I welcome those proposals that President Eisenhower sent to Congress on May 27 and am glad to see that he agrees with many of the recommendations made in the Lehman-Humphrey-Douglas-Kefauver amendments introduced more than a month earlier.

At this time, I would like to go over the amendments proposed in Senate bill 1794, and indicate how they would improve the Refugee Relief Act.

First, the administration of this program would be placed in an office within the Department of State to be known as the Office of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. This Administrator would be responsible directly to the Secretary of State. Surely this program is sufficiently important and certainly complex enough that it requires the attention of a full-time Administrator. If we are to achieve the humanitarian goal intended by the Refugee Relief Act it must be administered with greater vigor than has so far been the case. Continuing its administration as a part-time function of the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs will not allow such administration. There is no reason why the refugee-relief program should be administered as one function of an Administrator who has many other duties. To make the Refugee Relief Act a vigorous, effective means of bringing deserving people to our country it should receive the full attention of an Administrator responsible solely to the Secretary of State. The recent 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. 1794.

The attitude of some of those who have been administering this law seems to be that the number of admission authorized under this act is merely a permissive figure—that they can issue visas up to that number but it is not necessary to try to attain the goal of 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 help of this program—it seems clear that we should be striving to permit entry into the United States of every single person authorized under the act. Partly what is needed here is a change of attitude on the part of those dealing with this program—its administrators and the consular officials abroad charged with carrying out some of its functions. They should strive to achieve the maximum number of admissions allowable under this program and look to that number as a humanitarian goal to be sought and attained.

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 by December 31, 1956. Even if we accept the present Administrator's analogy to an "assembly line"—and I do not care for the comparison of refugees to automobiles—it does not appear that the assembly line is going to pick up sufficient speed, now that the initial period of tooling is 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 program 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 provides that any visas not issued by December 31, 1956, shall be redistributed among those categories under section 4 of the act that have been filled but still have requests pending for visas. Under this provision, the termination date would be extended to December 31, 1960, to allow time for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time will 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 strongly urge the subcommittee that it adopt this proposal as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

There are additional countries that should be added to the act since its passage in 1953. Refugees now residing in Spain and North Africa should be eligible for admission under the refugee relief program. There are refugees residing in both of these places, and to permit them entry under the act our bill would increase the quota for refugees now residing in North Atlantic Treaty countries by 15,000 so as to include these people. This additional number would raise the overall authorization from 209,000 to 224,000 refugees eligible for admission. But I point out that this is still considerably fewer than the number of 240,000 that the President proposed when he originally made recommendations for this program to the Congress.

Some of the requirements of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 have made it difficult and even impossible for otherwise highly qualified people to be admitted to this country under the program. One such requirement is the assurance that must be given by a citizen or citizens of the United States that the refugee will have employment and be able to support himself once he arrives in this country. The regulation provides that each such assurance shall be the personal obligation of the individual citizen or citizens making it. There is a further requirement that the employment and housing be listed with the Government so as to show that employment and housing is available to the refugee being considered for admission under the program. As negotiations for admission have nearly always been protracted, such a requirement has placed an impossible burden on those citizens who have sought to assist refugees in coming to this country. It is not surprising that this discouraging aspect of the program has become a real roadblock to its operation. I feel that it is asking entirely too much of our citizens to expect them to hold employment and housing open a year or longer while waiting for a refugee to be cleared and submitted under this act. Voluntary agencies—with whose fine work we are all familiar—have been ready and anxious to assist in helping people qualify under the program in coming to the United States. But the restrictions in the act that these assurances must be given by individual citizens has prevented the agencies from taking part. There is no reason why these groups should not help refugees find suitable employment and housing so they can qualify for admission under the Refugee Relief Act. They did just such work in connection with the displaced persons program and performed a most useful and humanitarian service. The amendment contained in our bill would permit them to participate in the present program in a similar way. These voluntary agencies should certainly be allowed to give assurances of employment and housing—as they are willing to do—and so assist refugees in qualifying under the refugee relief program.

There is a similar provision in the Watkins proposal, S. 2113, but I do not think it is spelled out quite so clearly as in S. 1794. I am glad to see that the bill of the chairman, Senator LANGER, Senate bill 2149, makes another recommendation along these lines. As I understand it, the chairman's bill would permit other responsible persons who have resided in the United States for at least 2 years to give such assurances. The amendment would also extend this act to include dependent parents, stepparents, and adoptive parents, I believe, and this is an equally worthy proposal that merits the consideration of the subcommittee. But I am sure the chairman is not unaware of the virtues of his own bill, so I shall not dwell on them at length.

To return to the Lehman-Humphrey-Douglas-Kefauver amendments, there are further requirements of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 that have made it difficult or impossible for some people to qualify for admission though their character and skills are such that we would surely be grateful to have

them as new citizens. The stipulation that a completely documented history of the past 2 years of the refugee's life must be supplied before issuance of a visa has proved a particularly onerous requirement. For those who somehow succeed in escaping from behind the Iron Curtain this regulation usually means that they must sit for 2 years in a refugee camp in order to provide themselves with a 2-year history.

Such a procedure defeats the purpose of the Refugee Relief Act and should be done away with. The present security requirements of the act, as well as of the Immigration Act which must also be met, are more than enough to insure that visas will not be granted any persons whose purpose in seeking admission might not be to the best interests of the United States. I note that the amendments proposed by Senator WATKINS, S. 2113, would also repeal this requirement of a 2-year history. I trust that the subcommittee will concur that this regulation should be removed from the law.

A similar requirement that has been almost impossible to fulfill for many of the refugees and especially those who have fled from behind the Iron Curtain is that of a valid, unexpired passport. The inclusion of such a requirement in a bill to aid refugees, many of whom are stateless, would be farcical, if it were not so tragic. Both the Watkins bill and our bill would relax this requirement.

A certificate guaranteeing readmission to the country in which the visa is obtained is coupled with this passport requirement. This is often impossible to obtain; some countries just do not give such certificates. Such an unrealistic provision should be eliminated from the law. The requirements of the Immigration Act covering necessary travel documents and clearances are more than sufficient to protect the interests of the United States.

There are some other changes that should be made in the Refugee Relief Act to make it more workable. As President Eisenhower said in his message to Congress urging many of these same changes in the law:

"The act limits the term refugee to those who have been firmly resettled. Experience has shown that this provision tends to exclude the hard working and the adjustable, the very people we want most as new citizens."

All three bills before the subcommittee attempt to improve upon this definition so as not to exclude those very emigrants we would welcome. Our bill would include both refugees and escapees under this term and avoid a distinction made in the present bill that has led to confusion in interpretation and delay.

Another simple change in terminology recommended in our bill, S. 1794, is the dropping of the modifying word "ethnic" wherever it appears in the bill, except where it is clearly needed—in the case of German expellees. There seems to be no purpose for its inclusion at other places in the bill and it has connotations that are not in keeping with our traditions.

The priorities set up under section 12 of the Refugee Relief Act turned out to be unworkable and have led to delay and confusion in the administration of the act. Apparently just what was intended by these priorities has never been clarified. Our bill would repeal the entire section 12, and I think that by so doing administration of the act would be accelerated.

The provision of the Refugee Relief Act permitting the admission of 4,000 orphans restricts this quota to orphans under 10 years of age. There does not seem to be any good reason why orphans older than 10 should not be admitted under this program. Senator LANGER'S bill, Senator WATKINS' bill, and our bill would all raise this age limit. Senator LEHMAN in his testimony before this committee a few days ago suggested that 13 might be the oldest age limit that could be fixed for eligibility without necessitating full security clearance. I am sure that the committee will give every consideration to the desirability of raising the age limit to whatever age seems most feasible for best admitting orphans qualifying under this section of the program.

Under the Adjustment of Status section of the act, for persons already in the United States, both bills would amend the act to relax the present requirement that a person otherwise eligible must also have entered the country legally. President Eisenhower said in his message:

"I recommend to the Congress that the section be amended to permit the Attorney General to waive this requirement in meritorious cases where the person is otherwise qualified under this act. It is estimated that this would not involve more than a few hundred cases, but in the case of each individual human being such an amendment would satisfy the beneficent purposes of the Congress."

An additional liberalization of this section is suggested in the Watkins bill—that the number of people who might so have their status in this country adjusted be raised from 5,000 to 10,000. This is a most worthwhile proposal which I wish to support, though it is not in our original bill.

There are three other amendments in the Watkins bill not contained in S. 1794 that I consider worthy of adoption to improve the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. One would authorize admission of 1,000 persons who would otherwise be excluded as suffering from tuberculosis. These would be persons who are members of families and whose inability to be admitted to the United States might otherwise break up the family or prevent them from taking advantage of the act. As President Eisenhower said in making this same recommendation:

"We in the United States no longer regard tuberculosis with dread. Our treatment standards are high and modern treatment is increasingly effective. The United States, to its own benefit, could permit many of these families, within the existing numerical limitations, to enter under safeguards provided by the Attorney General and the Surgeon General of the United States assuring protection of the public health and adequate treatment of the afflicted individual and also assuring that such individual will not become a public charge. I urge that the Congress give consideration to amendments that would enable this to be done."

May I join with the President in support of this measure that might prevent the tragic separation of families that have already undergone the trials of being broken apart from relatives and friends. This is a proposal in keeping with the finest spirit in which the refugee relief program was originally conceived and suggest that we can still return to that spirit in carrying it out, though the time is late.

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 granted admission under the refugee relief program. Under the statute as it now reads, wives, children, and others eligible to enter the country accompanying someone entering on a refugee relief visa, must all come together, accompanying the senior member of the family. The proposal contained in the Watkins bill, which simply adds the words "or following to join them," would allow members of a family to follow later when for one reason or another they could not yet accompany the head of the family being admitted under this program. I urge that this provision be included in any amendments that the subcommittee sees fit to recommend to improve the Refugee Relief Act. It is a most worthy modification.

There is one final proposal in the Watkins bill in support of which I wish to join. That is the addition made in subsection (c) of section 11, which provides that "* * * eligibility of an applicant under this act shall be the exclusive responsibility of the consular office." Presently this eligibility is subject to the review of the immigration officer whose responsibility should rest solely in the application of the Immigration Act to the applicant. This authority of review by the immigration officer has resulted in conflicting rulings by the separate officers charged with this responsibility and has been one of the sources of delay in administering the Refugee Relief Act. By so clarifying the act that the responsibility for administering the Refugee Relief Act resides solely in the consular officer, much of this confusion and delay should 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 a part of any recommendations for amending the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

May I come back again to a proposal which I just mentioned in passing, but which I wish to support as it embodies the humanitarian spirit of the Refugee Relief Act. I refer to the amendments of the chairman, contained in S. 2149, that would extend eligibility under this program to dependent parents, stepparents, and adoptive parents, as well as those who would be presently eligible for admission by 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 some dreary refugee camp or makeshift home in order to avoid parting from a loved member of the family.

These seem minor 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 amendments being considered by this subcommittee give new hope for the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and those who should be 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 hampered and almost blocked by those who do not wish to see it work. I would like to reiterate, however, that the success of this program is important not only for what it means to the lives of those many thousand we hope to assist by it, but 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 amending the Refugee Relief Act, we can present a better face to the world, our true face. Let us show the world the spirit that truly moves our people. Let us extend the hand of welcome to those whose lives have been disrupted and whose homes have been lost. I trust that the subcommittee will give careful 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 refugee-relief program has a great 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 redefection campaign of the Communists. Our failure to our responsibility under the Refugee Relief Act could have unfortunate consequence for us in providing a Communist victory in this redefection 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 spelled out with the recommendations of those groups best qualified to criticize administration of the program, the President and the Secretary of State have it within their means 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 from political oppression and a 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 Eisenhower to take action now. The President should instruct the Secretary of State and the administrator of the refugee-relief program to make those administrative changes that are so urgently needed. The refugee-relief program must not fail 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. JOHNSTON 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 a record of accomplishments 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 constant 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. It was imbued with a patriotism born in the crucible of service to God and country.

In its child welfare activities, junior baseball programs, 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 us all give us more of such pressure organizations like the American Legion.

Someday, when more time is at our disposal, I shall recount for you the many blessings America has received from the organization which has honored me and for which I have such great respect and affection.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Morning business has been concluded.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 3183.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, for the purpose of the RECORD, I should like to state that, because of illness in my family, I was unable to be present on Friday when the vote was taken on the Aiken amendment to strike from the farm bill the 90 percent of parity provision on wheat. If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of the amendment, and against the 90 percent provision.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to call the request I am about to make to the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I should like to request that the quorum call be had without the time being charged to either side, because I understand several Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle desired to have some indication given when the Senate resumed the consideration of the farm bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I had risen to suggest that that be done.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for the moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to withhold it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to call this matter particularly to the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the committee. Under the order, I understand that the amendments of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are now the order of business before the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Last week at my request action was deferred on an amendment which I had submitted, its consideration being made subject to whatever the pending business was, and with the understanding that it would become the next order of business after the pending amendment had been disposed of. If there is no objection, I should like to ask unanimous consent that action on my amendment be further deferred, and that its place be taken by the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], which 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 order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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. I noticed that 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 bill. 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-

pensation paid any producer for participating in the acreage reserve program with respect to land in any one State in any year shall not exceed $25,000."

On page 15, line 5, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "No annual payment to any person with respect to land in any one State shall exceed $7,500."

On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

"SEC. 107. The Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 421. 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 Commodity Credit Corporation from such person, shall not exceed $25,000. The term "person" shall mean any individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or agency of a State. In the event 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 on the amount of price support made available to any person shall not apply if price support is extended by purchases of a product of an agricultural commodity from processors and the Secretary determines that it is impracticable to apply such limitations.' "

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendments being considered en bloc?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, do I not have the right to modify my own amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not heard objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I reserved the right to object.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, would amend several portions of the bill. That is why it is necessary to get unanimous consent in order to consider the amendments en bloc.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But is it not true that I may modify my amendment as offered without unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator could modify one particular part of his amendment; but when he has asked for the consideration of the amendment of several parts of the bill in several places, it is necessary to have unanimous consent to consider the amendments en bloc.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Delaware that I called up last Friday, prior to the time the Senator from Delaware gained the floor, an amendment which relates to the limitation on price supports. In order to accommodate one of my colleagues, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] after there had been objection to his presenting several amendments, I temporarily withdrew my amendment. So I desire to present the amendment today. A part of the proposal of the Senator from Delaware is identical with my amendment. I intend to present the amendment in my own right.

I must say in all candor that it appears rather unusual that this has happened. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chairs hears objection to the consideration en bloc of the amendments offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, does that mean that I will have to offer the amendments 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 Senator 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 parliamentary 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 consecutive order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot guarantee that the Senator from Delaware will be recognized to offer his next amendment in order. The Chair can only guarantee that the Senator now has an opportunity 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 propose. Is this the amendment designated "2–22–56–B"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the amendment which was called up on 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 "3–5–56–B"?

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

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it seems unusual that I cannot consolidate the amendments. That practice has been followed before in the Senate. Nevertheless, in the event that that cannot be done, as I understand, I may modify my amendment by offering a substitute for it, may I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may do that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the amendment which is now pending. The amendment in the nature of a substitute is the last part of the modification which I just submitted, which would amend section 107 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 107. The Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 421. 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 Commodity Credit Corporation from such person, shall not exceed $25,000. The term 'person' shall mean any individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or agency of a State. In the event 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 on the amount of price support made available to any person shall not apply if price support is extended by purchases of a product of an agricultural commodity from processors and the Secretary determines that it is impracticable to apply such limitations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to that particular section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from Delaware has the floor, and the Senate is considering his amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. At the expiration of the time of the Senator from Delaware, may I offer an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from Minnesota may be offered only after the time allotted on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware has been exhausted or yielded back by both sides.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand. I shall offer an amendment at such time.

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to know what will become of the amendment previously pending if the amendment now offered to that amendment shall be adopted. The amendments deal with different subjects entirely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware is not before the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the amendment designated "3–5–56–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 "3–5–56–B."

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

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 just outside the Senate Chamber, has raised a question that the first amendment offered may contain language which, as at present written, may cause undue hardship on a small farmer who is dependent 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 bfore 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 so as 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 Friday?

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 subject.

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

As I pointed 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 necessary changes in verbiage could be prepared. The changes have not as yet been made available. I thought the Senate could vote at one time on all three phrases of this other question. 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 $7,500. The third phase would limit loans under the price support program to $25,000. The same principle is involved in all. I think the amendments could be considered en bloc, in order to conserve time. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to join as a cosponsor, I shall be only too glad to have him do so. No question of pride of authorship is involved. The amendments have been pending several days.

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, the Senator from Delaware proposes 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 withdrawn the amendment only 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 bring out another 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 less than 2,000 of them received loans in excess of $25,000. 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 man in this country, whether he be a farmer or in business, to grow and make progress; but we certainly should not use a subsidy or assistance afforded by the United States Government to help him to make the 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 program. It was not intended to use the taxpayers' money to assist such large farm operations.

Why should the American taxpayers underwrite these million-dollar operations?

My amendment proposes to limit the amounts to $25,000. The principle was recommended, although not the exact figure, by the President of the United States when he recommended that some action be taken on that question for the purpose of keeping the benefits of our farm program for the bona fide families.

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 limitation of $25,000? In some types of farming that 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.

If 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 equipment and make larger investments. 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 $24,000 under the Brannan plan. But times have changed somewhat.

Frankly, I should think that if the figure were doubled, it would be more nearly applicable to farmers generally, and would at the same time have 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 $40,000 or $50,000. It 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 my amendment. The principle involved is that the amount of the payments should stop at a point where corporate-type farming would not 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 $3,000.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. That amount 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 $25,000 should not preclude 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 am not sure that even then it would cover some of our farm families. I am not talking about corporate wheat farmers but family wheat farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I certainly would not want to restrict the program so 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—suggestions were made that perhaps the amount was not sufficient. I said at that time that if Senators in areas which were affected felt that the amount should be higher, 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 raise it if it be decided that such action be necessary.

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 $50,000 rather than $25,000.

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, then I would have no objection to that figure, because 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 commend 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. NEUBERGER 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 control 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 amendmnt 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 we are talking about now is, is it not, a limitation on the amount which any one farmer can borrow—as the support price—on the agricultural commodities he raises?

Mr. WILLIAMS Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then I wish to ask another question. Of course, as the Senator from Delaware understands, no farmer can borrow at the support price unless he has paid the penalty by reducing his production.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. If he does not reduce his production or his acreage, he does not have a right to borrow at the support price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. He must be in compliance to receive supports.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then does the farmer, in order to be able to borrow up to $25,000 on the grain he has grown—or up to $50,000, if the amendment is modified to that extent—have to comply with the acreage controls only to that amount, or does he have to comply with acreage controls in respect to his entire farm?

For example, suppose a farmer has 1,000 acres of corn, and suppose he would like to plant all those acres to corn. Suppose that under the acreage controls, in order to comply with the loan provisions of the act, he is allowed to plant only 800 acres. In that event, he can do nothing with the remaining 200 acres.

Then let us suppose that on the 800 acres he grows corn, and produces 60 bushels of corn to the acre—which in that event would be 48,000 bushels. At an average price of $1.50, which he might obtain as a loan under the existing policy, that would be approximately $80,000. I understand that the original amendment of the Senator from Delaware proposed a limit of $25,000, but I understand that now he proposes to increase the limit to $50,000. If it is to be limited to $50,000, and if the support price is going to be $1.50, that farmer would be able to receive the support price for only approximately 30,000 bushels. If he obtained an average of 60 bushels to the acre, under the circumstances he could obtain the price support for the production from only 500 acres. In other words, does the amendment limit him, in that case, to obtaining the support price for the production from only 500 of his 800 acres? In that event, what will be the situation as regards to the remaining 300 acres.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under the amendment the farmer can grow crops on the full amount of his allotment; but he will be able to obtain support prices only up to the amount we specify.

Mr. CAPEHART. He still may grow crops on as many acres as he wants to farm?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. It is not possible to stop him from producing. But the Government will not support the excess production.

Mr. CAPEHART. Oh, yes; that can be provided in the bill. He cannot obtain a price-support loan unless he has complied with the acreage controls.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true. But if he complies with the acreage allotments, and assuming that he has enough production to obtain a $300,000 loan, the point is that under the amendment he can obtain from the Government only the amount of the loan for which we now provide. He could sell the rest of it on the free market.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am in accord with the purpose of the Senator's amendment, but I think we should make very clear 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 50 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, and then we would prevent 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 if the amendment is to operate the way the Senator from Delaware has just explained—although I do not think it should operate that way; I think we should change the amendment—any farmer whose production amounted to more than $50,000 would not participate in the acreage reduction. If that happens there will be an increased production of corn and wheat, because the large farmers, who produce 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 the farmer has to comply with 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 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 60,00 bushels, from the 1,000 acres. At the $1.40 support price, that would amount to $84,000, 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 yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is difficult for me to see that this proposal would penalize very many farmers. 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 January 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 104 with respect to which the total ran over $25,000.

Of approximately 600,000 wheat 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 25 were over $25,000.

Of approximately 60,000 soybean loans, only 5 were over $25,000.

Of approximately 58,000 flaxseed loans, only 18 were over $25,000.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator is 100 percent correct in principle. The situation he has outlined is the reason why we have surpluses today. That is the reason we have low farm prices. The farmers 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, and the prices of all those products would be 50 or 75 percent higher than they are today. What we are trying to do is to find a method of reducing production, so that prices 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 producer must reduce his acreage by 25 percent—and that is about what it amounts to for corn this year—he cannot possibly afford to comply. He cannot comply with acreage control on anything. The result will be that there will be more production instead of less.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out to the Senator the impossibility of doing as he proposes, that is, allowing them to plant any amount, and to borrow up to $50,000. 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 complied?

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. What 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 998,000 farmers who could grow all they wished, up to $50,000 worth. That would be impossible.

Mr. CAPEHART. All 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 Department left that more or less to 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 farm prices in the market place will be 100 percent of parity or more. We should not become confused as between the little farmer and the big farmer, and thereby defeat the 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 what governs the price. Let us not 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 higher price in the market place, 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 a matter 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 objective.

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I submitted an amendment to strike from the amendment of the Senator from Delaware the 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 parliamentary standpoint, 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, the $50,000 be applicable to multiple loans. A producer may be getting loans on more than one commodity. In the light of the table, if a small loan is being made for a single crop, the figure of $25,000 has merit. But if it is to apply to multiple loans, loans on more than one crop, the amount might better be $50,000.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does this amendment cover multiple loans?

Mr. WILLIAMS. A farmer can borrow up to the $25,000 or $50,000 amount agreed upon.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it limited to loans upon a single grain?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It could be all on one single crop but if the farmer has several supported crops then it would act as a ceiling on all.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

We have not been proceeding in too orderly a manner. I presume that all the time which has been consumed so far in this question-and-answer period has been charged to the proponent of the amendment. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to advise the Senate that the committee gave much study to the problem of limiting the amount which might be borrowed by a producer of a commodity under the price support program, or sold to the Government under a purchase agreement. As I recall during our executive sessions a very prominent representative of the Department of Agriculture specifically stated that the Department, too, had given much study to this problem, and that, up to that moment no conclusion had been reached.

Mr. President, the limitation contained in the amendment—$25,000—not only is unrealistic, but I believe my good friend 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 an opportunity 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 the storable nonbasics. 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, redeem 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 had 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 a better 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, the price support program would be rendered ineffective.

I wish to emphasize again that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry gave considerable study 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 apply to the production of only 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 was proposed to lower the support level as the production per farm increased.

After studying that proposal, the committee decided that it would be impractical—that the Government would end up by taking into its possession practically all of the production from the smaller farms. We felt that, in practice, as the support price lowered, market prices would stabilize 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 warehouses, since the support level, 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 correct 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 wheat or 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 Senator from Louisiana has put the

matter in a logical light so far as the purpose of the provision is concerned. However, I believe there is one phase 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 accomplish 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 number of acres, 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 operations.

Mr. ELLENDER. The mere fact that a small farmer knows he can borrow up to almost any amount 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 operations. The small farmer 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 corporation operator.

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

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

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 quantites of wheat, if he could secure a loan of $100,000 or $200,000 or $300,000?

Mr. ELLENDER. The total lands he can plant to the basics is limited by quota of allotted acres. If he had no acreage-allotment program, the argument of the Senator from North Dakota might apply. Let us 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 their 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 enough volume to justify 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, and continued for some years after I came to the Senate. Among other crops I planted sugarcane. My sugarcane operation was not large enough to justify my purchasing a mechanical caneloader or mechanical canecutter which, with two men, would eliminate the need for the services of 75 men. When I found that my brother, who had a fairly large sugarcane operation, could by use of a mechanical caneloader and canecutter, harvest sugarcane and deliver it to the factory at about 95 cents a ton, compared to my cost of $2 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 had to say, "I cannot afford to mechanize; I do not have enough funds for that purpose, and my operations are not large enough." Such farmers have had to lease their farms or sell them. I do not think price supports have had 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 there is a good deal of misunderstanding 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 it free; he has to make 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 in the past. If every farmer had 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. I am glad 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 corngrower, 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 reduced to 43 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 within his allotted acreage. That is it, in a nutshell. If that provision is stricken from the RECORD I think we shall do violence to the whole farm program.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana 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 $25,000.

As I 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 my friend from South Dakota will correct me. But I think that is the purpose of his question.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will not work that way, as I suggested to my good friend from South Dakota. The large wheat grower for example, cannot buy land tomorrow and plant it to wheat the next day and obtain price support on his new production. If 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, if a farmer 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. We 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.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator will remember 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. ELLENDER. I know but as I said to my good friend, there is a basic difference between the types of programs involved. The price-support operation is not a subsidy, it is not in the same category as the ACP program.

Mr. LANGER. It would stop a man from farming 50,000, or 60,000, or 70,000 acres of land.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is useless to argue further. My eloquence 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. WILLIAMS] will yield me 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I had agreed to yield a few 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 operations of the big 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 blossomed 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 applied to the little farmer who had not been able to expand as much as had the big farmer, and the little farmer was the one who was penalized. The able Senator from 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 some land in Kansas; 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 wheat acreage. We took acreage which 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.

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, get enough return to take care of the investment they have in their machinery and equipment. They are the ones who are having difficulties as the result of the expansions by the large operators.

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 allotment.

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 farmer.

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 finally squeezed out, and the big operator comes along with a full fleet of combines. He can perhaps rent his equipment to other farmers and march up through the Wheat Belt according to the seasons.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. 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 the surpluses and further depressing prices.

What we are trying to do in the bill—if we are not, then certainly we ought not to be considering a soil bank—is 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, in my opinion, 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. Over the years 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, which means that he 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 that subject; it 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 Senator 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. If 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 farmer, but I am sure that, in doing 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 is to make added production and 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 75 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 cash 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 nonfarm workers. The 1950 Census of Agriculture, published, for the first time, complete information on farm income received 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 worth, but less than $25,000 worth.

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

Class IV: Those farms which produce more than $2,500 worth, 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 $6,585; nearly 2½ times the average of all farm families.

Third. The average per capita income of people living on these farms was $1,594; 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 corporation, not family, type farms. For example, in 1953 the largest wheat 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 $348,646.

I should also like to point out that 1,468 loans of over $25,000, with a total loan value of $63,437,759 were made on the 1953 wheat crop. Their average loan value was $43,214.

At the other end of the price support ladder, 554,058 loans under $5,000, but totaling $713,517,921 with an average loan value of $1,288 were made by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

With respect to corn, the largest loans on the 1953 crop went to—

First. Adams Bros. & Co., of Odebolt, Iowa, which placed 124,800 bushels of corn under loan at a face value of $190,944.

Second. Emil Sovich, of Rensselaer, Ind., who placed 102,648 bushels under loan in the amount of $166,289.76.

On this corn crop, the Commodity Credit Corporation made 104 loans of over $25,000, with a total loan value of $3,575,440. The average value of these 104 loans was $34,379. At the other end of the subsidy ladder, 283,605 loans under $5,000 in value, but totaling $503,449,500, were made. These loans average $1,775.

So that the Senate may see the magnitude of the subsidy program to large operators, I ask unanimous consent that table 3 of the United States Department of Agriculture's January 1956 publication, Summary of Sample Survey of Size of Major 1953 Crop-Grain Loans, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

TABLE 3.—*Number of loans, total loan value and average loan value, 7 major 1953 grain crops*

Grain crop	Under $5,000	$5,000 to $10,000	$10,000 to $25,000	Over $25,000
Wheat:				
Number of loans	554,058	26,184	9,496	1,468
Total loan value	713,517,921	171,245,681	130,731,400	63,437,759
Average loan value	1,288	6,540	13,767	43,214
Corn:				
Number of loans	283,605	10,842	957	104
Total loan value	503,449,500	69,913,395	12,357,165	3,575,440
Average loan value	1,775	6,448	12,912	34,379
Oats:				
Number of loans	42,845	408	59	10
Total loan value	32,307,931	2,763,937	814,485	271,984
Average loan value	754	6,774	13,805	27,198
Barley:				
Number of loans	33,185	518	183	66
Total loan value	29,817,683	3,559,516	2,772,665	6,364,144
Average loan value	899	6,872	15,153	96,424
Sorghum:				
Number of loans	30,753	1,643	401	25
Total loan value	38,910,506	11,863,572	5,783,510	1,002,869
Average loan value	1,265	7,221	14,423	40,115
Soybeans:				
Number of loans	59,717	746	56	5
Total loan value	71,089,904	5,108,484	976,860	189,982
Average loan value	1,190	6,848	17,444	37,996
Flaxseed:				
Number of loans	56,907	562	56	18
Total loan value	52,781,564	3,362,395	762,966	520,361
Average loan value	928	5,983	13,624	28,909

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the lack of a limit upon the amount of price-support assistance a farmer can receive gives, in my opinion, unnecessary financial assistance to a great many of the 103,231 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 with that particular size of farm.

The American people are getting tired of seeing $350,000, $500,000, and $1,000,000 loans made to the farmers who already are the best off financially. My amendment, Mr. President, is designed to give full protection to efficiently operated family-type farms by setting the maximum limit at $50,000 with respect to the products of any one farm. On the other hand, it will stop unlimited assistance to those corporation farms which simply do not need it.

My reason for setting the maximum limit at $50,000 is that any lesser amount—$35,000 or $25,000, for example—would serve to force from the program too many of the large operators producing such a large volume of many commodities. Should such producers forego price support, due to such a low limitation, and throw their whole production upon the market, the result might well be to lower the market price and, thereby, operate directly against the purpose of price support, which is to raise the market price.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I submit that the figure $50,000 is realistic. It fits the situation, and will not tempt too many farmers to ignore the entire price-support program and produce unlimitedly, as they have a right to do; but will keep in the program practically all the production, and at the same time will place the emphasis where it is needed, namely, upon the small farmer.

That is why I prepared my amendment with the figure $50,000. It takes care of the average family-sized farm, it works no hardship on any one farmer, and does not give a premium to those who can make a profit even though they have no price supports.

At the proper time, when the parliamentary situation will make it possible to do so, I think the Senator from Delaware may accept the amendment I have offered as an amendment to his amendment. I think it is the general feeling that the figure should be placed at around $50,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. 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 it.

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 level of 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 farmers came out from under the controls 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 resources that he cannot hope to have price supports, he will proceed to move his products just under the prices at which another farmer may move his. Therefore the support level will 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 tend to divide farms artificially. The amendment provides that a farmer cannot get more than $25,000. If the farmer lives 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, he may decide that his son 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 is easy to have their farms in $25,000 sizes. We have seen that happen in the subdivision business, where companies have 20 corporations handling their matters, because they have found circumstances to 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 $7½ million. It was a cash transaction. Does anybody believe that the corporation which bought it for $7½ million cannot get all the 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 within your acres, and then you cannot 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 got in 1 year a cotton loan 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 that way. 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 into the law a limitation of $25,000 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 limitation. It will not be blocked by it at all. The only result of such a limitation would be that that company would put all its product into the market at just below the loan price.

I say 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 concede that 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 "went to town."

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 are not 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 wrong for us to consider that the farmer gets a subsidy. When the farmer puts his product on the market, we should have an agricultural program which will make his 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 position taken by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and 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 carefully considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was voted down by the committee. I hope the Senate as a whole will reject the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. 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, I say there is not a Member of the Senate for whom I have greater respect; and his knowledge of the agricultural problem is such that none of us ever expects to equal. But I happen to 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

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 the $7,500,000 to $10 million corporate-types 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 rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah desire to have time yielded to him?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I told the Senator from Utah that I would later modify my amendment so as to have it provide a $50,000 limitation. However, I understand that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] wishes to offer an amendment first. Or, Mr. President, if it is preferred that I do so, I shall modify my amendment now, so as to have it provide a limitation of $50,000.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, at this time I desire to submit an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, so as to strike out the $25,000 limitation set forth in the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, and provide for a $50,000 limitation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Delaware has modified his amendment to that extent?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Minnesota has said he desires to speak before I modify my amendment. That is why I have not yet modified it. If the Senator from Minnesota has no objection, I shall modify my amendment now, or we can modify it later.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since my amendment includes that provision, as well as others, I should like to submit my amendment at this time; and then we can return to the other amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware has been yielded back.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. My amendment is offered to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair inquire whether the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is offered as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, or as a substitute for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Either as an amendment to it or as a substitute for all of it—whichever is in accordance with the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Senator from Minnesota knows, a substitute would take the place of the other amendment.

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 vote taken on it. The clerks at the desk undoubtedly can determine exactly where the amendment should be written in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to cooperate in connection with this matter. Will the Senator from Minnesota state the section to which the amendment is offered?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is offered to 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, 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 to 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 23, 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:

"SEC. 421. (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 $5,000.

"(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, estate, or agency of a State. In the event 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 on the amount of price support made available to any person shall not apply if price support is extended by purchase of a product of an agricultural commodity from processors and the Secretary determines 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 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 to any 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 $50,000 limitation is designed to get away from having a Government price support program encourage 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 more 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 nothing 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 manager, with supervisors and straw bosses, and Russianize American agriculture.

Lest anyone have any doubts on the question, I am against State 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 I charge 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 large 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 90 percent provisions 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 my 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.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was brought to my attention the other day that in the 79th Congress the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business issued an extraordinarily fine report concerning the family farm unit. In particular, it made a study in the Central Valley of California on effects of scale of farm operations. The report is dated December 23, 1946, 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 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 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 rendering service. The whole soil was unreclaimed 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 the 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 basis, most certainly, of popular government."

The study goes on to show:

> The advances in technology during the past century have greatly benefited the farmers who, with their families, work the land. The industrial revolution has eased the burden of the farmer and rendered his labors more productive. Yet these technological advances have, at the same time, brought a threat to the very institutions to whose personnel they have brought so much aid. 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 benefit 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.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the report from which I have read be placed in the RECORD at this point. I refer to pages 3 and 4 of the report, and the summary of findings on pages 5 and 6.

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

INTRODUCTION

> The family farm is the classic example of 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 casual relation 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 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 rendering service. The whole soil was unreclaimed 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 the 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 basis, most certainly, of popular government."
>
> The advances in technology during the past century have greatly benefited farmers who, with their families, work the land. The industrial revolution has eased the burden of the farmer and rendered his labors more productive. Yet these technological advances have at the same time, brought a threat to the very institution to whose personnel they have brought so much aid. 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 students of American agriculture. A committee of the United States Senate has pointed out that within the decade of the thirties the percentage of all farms in California which produce just over one-half the total agricultural production of that State fell from 10 to 6.8 percent, marking a growth in concentration of nearly one-third. It 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 that of family farmers and in the direction of becoming industrialists that it has found itself indicted for violation of the antitrust laws of the Nation.

The development of large-scale farming has been foremost in California. The influence of Spanish land policy, the monopolization of large areas by early comers after American statehood, the soil and climate favorable to the production of specialty crops, and congeries of other historic and economic circumstances have made California particularly amendable to industrialized agricultural production. But development of this pattern of agriculture, often operated like industry 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 not only to the family farm, but also to the rural society founded upon the family farm, is the specific subject of the present report. The purpose of this study is to test by contemporary field research the historic hypothesis that the institution of small independent farmers is indeed the agent which creates the homogeneous community, both socially and economically democratic.

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 great 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 doubtless 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 scale of the farm enterprises which surround them. Controls as perfect as are possible in the chemist's laboratory are not found in social organizations. Yet the approximation to complete control achieved by selection of the communities of Arvin and Dinuba is surprisingly high. Other factors, besides the difference in scale of farming, which might have produced or contributed to the striking contrasts of Arvin and Dinuba have been carefully examined. On this basis the conclusion has been reached that the primary, and by all odds the factor of greatest weight in producing the essential differences in these two communities, was the characteristic difference in the scale of farming—large or small—upon which each was founded. There is every reason to believe that the results obtained by this study are generally applicable wherever like economic conditions prevail.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Certain conclusions are particularly significant to the small-business man, and to an understanding of the importance of his place in a community. Not only does the small farm itself constitute small business, but it supports flourishing small commercial business.

Analysis of the business conditions in the communities of Arvin and Dinuba shows that—

(1) The small-farm community supported 62 separate business establishments, to but 35 in the large-farm community; a ratio in favor of the small-farm community of nearly 2 to 1.

(2) The volume of retail trade in the small-farm community during the 12-month period analyzed was $4,383,000 as against only $2,535,000 in the large-farm community. Retail trade in the small-farm community was greater by 61 percent. (See fig. and table, pp. 83–84.)

(3) The expenditure for household supplies and building equipment was over three times as great in the small-farm community as it was in the large-farm community.

The investigation disclosed other vast differences in the economic and social life of the two communities, and affords strong support for the belief that small farms provide the basis for a richer community life and a greater sum of those values for which America stands, than do industrialized farms of the usual type.

It was found that—

(4) The small farm supports in the local community a larger number of people per dollar volume of agricultural production than an area devoted to larger scale enterprises, a difference in its favor of about 20 percent.

(5) Notwithstanding their greater numbers, people in the small-farm community have a better average standard of living than those living in the community of large-scale farms.

(6) Over one-half the breadwinners in the small-farm community are independently employed businessmen, persons in white-collar employment, or farmers; in the large-farm community the proportion is less than one-fifth.

(7) Less than one-third of the breadwinners in the small-farm community are agricultural wage laborers—characteristically landless, and with low and insecure income—while the proportion of persons in this position reaches the astonishing figure of nearly two-thirds of all persons gainfully employed in the large-farm community.

(8) 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 industrial-farm community some of these facilities are entirely wanting.

(9) Schools are more plentiful and offer broader services in the small-farm community, which is provided with 4 elementary schools and 1 high school; the large-farm community has but a single elementary school.

(10) The small-farm community is provided with three parks for recreation; the large-farm community has a single playground, loaned by a corporation.

(11) The small-farm town has more than twice the number of organizations for civic improvement and social recreation than its large-farm counterpart.

(12) Provision for public recreation centers, Boy Scout troops, and similar facilities for enriching the lives of the inhabitants is proportioned in the two communities in the same general way, favoring the small-farm community.

(13) The small-farm community supports two newspapers, each with many times the news space carried in the single paper of the industrialized-farm community.

(14) Churches bear the ratio of 2 to 1 between the communities, with the greater number of churches and churchgoers in the small-farm community.

(15) Facilities for making decisions on community welfare through local popular elections are available to people in the small-farm community; in the large-farm community such decisions are in the hands of officials of the country.

These differences are sufficiently great in number and degree to affirm the thesis that small farms bear a very important relation to the character of American rural society. It must be realized that the two communities of Arvin and Dmuba were carefully selected to reflect the different in size of enterprise, and not extraneous factors. The agricultural production in the two communities was virtually the same in volume—$2½ million per annum in each—so that the resource base was strictly comparable. Both communities produced specialized crops of high value and high cost of production, utilizing irrigation and large bodies of special harvest labor. The two communities are in the same climate zone, about equidistant from small cities and major urban centers, similarly served by highways and railroads, and without any significant advantages from nonagricultural resources or from manufacturing or processing. The reported differences in the communities may properly be assigned confidently and overwhelmingly to the scale-of-farming factor.

The reasons seem clear. The small-farm community is a population of middle-class persons with a high degree of stability in income and tenure, and a strong economic and social interest in their community. 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 frequently are absentees; and if they do live in Arvin, they as often seek their recreation in the nearby city. Their interest in the social life of the community is hardly greater than that of the laborer whose tenure is transitory. Even the businessmen of the large-farm community frequently express their own feelings of impermanence; and their financial investment in the community, kept usually at a minimum, reflects the same view. Attitudes such as these are not conducive to stability and the rich kind of rural community life which is properly associated with the traditional family farm.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the report submits the result of a special inquiry made into two communities in the fertile southern San Joaquin Valley of the great Central Valley of California. The two communities studied vary in degree with respect to proportions of surrounding lands, but the most important part of the study relates to the kind of civil activities which took place with respect to the corporate farm, on the one hand, and the number of small farmers, on the other. I believe it is very highly significant that the analysis showed the following:

The smaller farm community supported 62 separate business establishments, to but 35 in the large-farm community; a ratio in favor of the small-farm community of nearly 2 to 1.

The volume of retail trade in the small-farm community during the 12 months' period analyzed was $4,383,000 as against only $2,535,000 in the large-farm community. Retail trade in the small-farm community was greater by 61 percent.

The expenditure for household supplies and building equipment was over three times as great in the small-farm community as it was in the large-farm community.

The investigation disclosed other vast differences in the economic and social life of the two communities, and affords strong support for the belief that small farms provide the basis for a richer community life and a greater sum of those values for which America stands, than do industrialized farms of the usual type.

There was a much higher standard of living in the farm homes of the small-farm community, as compared with

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 industrial-farm community some of these facilities are entirely wanting.

Schools are more plentiful and offer broader services in the small-farm community, which is provided with 4 elementary schools and 1 high school; 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 businessman in town. The family-size farm community, with 62 farms, provided for a high school and four elementary schools and other good community facilities. The corporate-size farm community provided for one elementary school, 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 those who work in the field of social welfare. It goes to the base of the problem we are facing today. I believe every Senator must ask himself whether he will apply to agriculture the principles of big business or the principles of social equality, social welfare, and economic opportunity.

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 in America is 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 yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator compare his amendment with 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, for, I believe we ought to put a limitation on how much the Government should offer in terms of loans for commodities under the loan program. However, my amendment permits a loan of up to $50,000, because I believe $50,000 is a more reasonable figure in light of the high cost of farm operations today. 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 has pointed out, which is used time and time again in legislation.

We do not offer unlimited guaranties on housing, but have a cutoff point. We do not offer unlimited loan guaranties 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 their crop, and that is proper. 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 working with a program which is not only a loan program, but also a program which is designed to do something for the economic and social pattern of the United States.

Some of the large farms do not need any price supports. All they do is to hire Mexican labor and pay 50 cents an hour, or Jamaican labor, and pay it 50 cents an hour, and take their profit right out of the backs of such labor. If they did that they would not need more than 60 percent of parity. If that is the kind of country anyone wishes to live it, we ought to let the people know about it.

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 that kind of America we must design a legislative policy which will protect it. I might say that there would not be any small business today except for the Robinson-Patman Act, a Clayton Act, and a Sherman Antitrust Act. We have already by law designed the kind of economy we would like to have in America, so far as business is concerned. The weakness has been in enforcement and that possibly we have not kept up to date with new developments in the corporate structure.

I see on the floor of the Senate the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. Those two Senators have worked diligently in the field of small business and in combating the menace of huge conglomerations of economic power throughout the corporate structure. I submit to these two able Senators that the same thing is happening in agriculture—huge plants, huge farms running to thousands of acres, hired workers—instead of small farms and little communities, where people live in dignity and self-respect, and where workers are not hired by the hundreds and used as common labor, and then sent away.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the able Senator from Minnesota happened to see an article in yesterday's Washington Post by the Alsop brothers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did.

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. He is here, and 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 of some concern to me, and I should 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. May I 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 our production actually 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 or the ability of a farmer to utilize 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 worked out, and 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 $25,000 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 about

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 296,000 corn loans only 104, less than 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 on 2 hands.

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 or 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 reduction and production controls is true, whether we have a $50,000 limitation or not. We would not have 100 percent compliance under the farm program. The program last year had slightly more than 50 percent compliance, and it has been getting worse every year, since 1952. One of the reasons why it is getting worse is that it is so poorly administered and because the farm people no longer trust the Department of Agriculture. So, if we provide a $50,000 limitation we are going to place under that ceiling more than 95 percent of all the farm operations in the United States. The overwhelming bulk of them will be under that ceiling. Then we will not see in the editorial columns a continuous statement about some farmer getting $350,000, and the production all going into Government warehouses.

I am tired of that kind of publicity, and I am tired of the way the press and the periodicals have reacted to the program. If they were half as much concerned over what is happening to agriculture as they are concerning a national park or a gas well, we would not have this trouble.

I fought hard for our national parks and I voted against the gas bill. It is a crying shame that the press has not taken sufficient interest in what is happening to the American farmer. Apparently, he has not been pushed down low enough for some persons to become righteously indignant about it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was very much impressed by what the Senator quoted from a speech of Daniel Webster in which he described our country as one in which the basis of liberty and progress was the absence of great landed estates and opportunity afforded the small and penniless settler to take up land from the 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 what is happening in 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 now creating 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, rearing children, attending their 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 ones who say, "What we need today is 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, but it will not produce good people, happy people, or a happy society. The Russian system is organized wrong.

The present policies of this administration are leading to a breakdown in American agriculture. It is necessary to put a halt to them, just as we shall have to put a halt to the growth of any great monopoly or any great combine of economic forces. The time to call a halt is before it gets too big. The time to stop it is before it gets out of hand.

I noticed a headline the other day. It is one headline I intend to use a great deal. It says, "Ike Wins Senate Farm Fight." Whenever anybody wins, it is Ike who wins. Whenever anyone loses, it is Benson who loses.

But the headline reads "Ike Wins." Whom do you think Ike won over, Mr. President? He did not win over me. Ike won the fight over the farmers. If that is the kind of fight the President wants to win, let him win it. I am here to fight for the farm families.

I submit that the flexible price support program as now administered for the small family farmer spells his doom. Not only that, but the Department of Agriculture has admitted it will. The Secretary of Agriculture, his assistants, and his Under Secretary have said that farming today is big business. If a man cannot make good on the farm, let him go into the town; let him go to the city.

The administration talks about the so-called marginal farmer as if he were 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 be housed? 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?

The Senators 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 bigness; with wealth, with big men, 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 administrators always intrigue me. They worship the IBM machine. To them, it is more important than the Statue of Liberty. They are fascinated by the UNIVAC. In fact, 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 and does things to them.

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 he will not find 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 to be efficient—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—very efficient. Mussolini even got the trains to run on time. Stalin claimed a certain amount of efficiency. Khrushchev says he can be even more efficient. Even the Russians are beginning to buy 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 want a society that is not all metropolitan, if we want to have tilling the

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.

There is no doubt 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 bigger 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 not 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 that up to $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 a 90-percent loan. Above $5,000, they will have to go on the Bensonized formula. They will be the victims of slide and flex.

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. Above $5,000, they will not receive 90-percent price support. Let them have a chance to operate under the standards they want.

The Humphrey amendment provides one new thing which the Senator from Delaware did not offer. It provides, in its first subsection, that up to $5,000 they will be 90-percent price supports. That will take care of the vast majority of the small producers of American agriculture. They will be able to obtain loans. They will be getting loans on the crop they have produced.

I heard an argument a while ago—I could not help chuckling as I heard it—that the Government will have to buy everything from the farmers who get 90-percent price supports.

Mr. President, if that is a valid argument, then we are admitting on the floor of the Senate that the farmer is doomed to less than 90 percent of parity in the market place. If it is being said that the Government will have to buy everything which the small farmer produces under a 90-percent price-support schedule, we are frankly saying that every farmer, from here on out, will always receive in the cash market less than 90 percent of parity, although this administration said it was for 100 percent of parity in the market place.

I am for 100 percent of parity in the market place. Nor do I think that 90-percent crop loans will mean that the Government will have to buy everything. If the administration does not believe the farmer is going to get 100 percent of parity in the market place, why does it not say so? Why does it not give the public the truth? Why does it not tell the public that the farmer is not going to get anything more than 75 percent? Why does it not tell the public that the farmer is doomed?

Are we telling the farmer today by official policy of the Government, "You are supposed to be poor; you are supposed to have mortgages. You are supposed to have trouble; you are supposed to be losing your farm."

Are we saying, "If you are young, you are not supposed to stay on the farm. If you are old, we hope you will be able to live long enough to last it out."

Is this what we are saying? I hope not.

Mr. President, I am for the independent hardware store, the independent drugstore, the independent factory. I am for a Government policy which makes it possible for them to survive. I do not always like someone telling me what I have to do every 15 minutes, such as is done under the corporate structure. Mr. President, if corporate big-business farming is to be the new pattern, then one of these days the workers on such farms are going to be organized into a union and when that day comes, when we are debating a bill like this in the Congress, they are going to say, "If we don't get paid, you don't eat."

I have said repeatedly the 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 30 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, "Those fellows in the city 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 wetbacks, 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 probable amendments to the pending bill which would protect the family-sized farm, guaranteeing, through the 90-percent support program, the marketability of the farmer's crop, through the loan process, 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 we could offer 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 an objective, which seems to me to be almost identical with the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota now offers.

If I am correct in this interpretation of the President's language, as 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 its 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 farm 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 less wholesome and constitutes a threat to the traditional family farm.
>
> Under the price support machinery as it has been functioning, price-support loans of tremendous size have occasionally occurred. It is not sound Government policy to underwrite at public expense such formidable competition with family-operated farms, which are the bulwark of our agriculture.
>
> I ask 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 they will not produce a surplus 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 loans.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I made my statement only in the hope that the Senator may get more support.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I wish to say, however, that a year ago the Junior Senator from Minnesota introduced a bill making the proposal I am now discussing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the report was adverse.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee sent the bill to the department of Agriculture to get a report as to whether or not the department agreed 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 several governments operating 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 problem. 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 farm program. He can have full 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 wheat program.

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. Instead, I want it preserved, 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 got licked, 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 from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I rise to hasten to say that the letter read by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming seems to me to be a complete reversal of 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, too, the other evening.

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 only last week 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—receives for what he does less than one-half of the national income or national "take" per capita, or the average income per capita of all other classes of our working people.

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 able to pay for natural gas than the farmer is able to assist himself, under present prices. I was opposed to the natural gas bill, which is another one of the attempts to obtain privileges for special groups. And I am against the so-called flexible-price-support bill, because it does not work except to the advantage of those who already are at the top of the heap.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have said that under these circumstances I can see no advantage for the American farmers of the next generation unless they work for big corporations—and I mean really big—or for cooperatives or for the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Washington is correct.

Mr. President, I now read a part of the article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, to which I have just referred:

> The warnings of history need to be remembered, at the moment, for the rather simple reason that there would be no really grave American farm problem if it were not for the plight of the family-sized farms. Not all the big farms are prosperous, of course. But almost all of them can take care of themselves, and a great many of them are still enormously prosperous, like the industrialized rice growers recently described in this space.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The people who are not prosperous are the folk on the family-sized farms. They are so unprosperous, in fact, that this Nation is virtually beginning to be divided into two nations. A single statistic tells the story. Per capita farm income has now declined to the level of $860 a year, whereas the per capita income of Americans off the farm now stands at the level of $1,922. Farm folk are much less than half as well off as other folk in America.

Mr. President, I emphasize the part of the article which states:

> The people who are not prosperous are the folk on the family-sized farms. They are so unprosperous, in fact, that this Nation is virtually beginning to be divided into two nations.

Mr. President, the great question before us is whether we want any people left on the farms, or whether we want the farms in Minnesota operated from Minneapolis, from the Foshay Tower, as the Twin City ordinances are operated, or whether we want the farms in New York State operated from the Chrysler Building or the Empire State Building. That could happen, Mr. President; workers could be hired to drive the tractors and perform the other mechanized farm operations. The farms could be operated in that way. But in that case, God help the people who now produce the food and fiber for our Nation. If such a development occurred, the farms would be operated like the feudal estates were operated in ancient days. Under such a principle, it would make little difference whether the ones in charge were called industrial managers or barons or dukes; the idea would be the same.

Mr. President, I want to see social justice done. I do not base my request solely on economics, even though the parity price-support program worked very well for 22 years.

The 90 percent of parity program worked all right, too, until those who got in charge of it did not believe in it. Surely, Mr. President, one does not put a fox in charge of a chicken coop, or an arsonist in charge of the police department; and 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-

gressing healthy American agricultural economy. The only way out is to try to enact legislation which will be in the interest of the farm families.

Mr. President, I shall yield the floor after saying that the proposed limitation to $50,000 has been generally supported in this body. If my amendment is not adopted, it is my intention to support the $50,000 limitation as provided in another amendment.

I want no more articles impugning the self-reliance and moral fiber of our farm families, because of a few large loans to a handful of big operators. The vast majority of our farmers—95 percent—can get by under less than a $50,000 limitation; but the $50,000 limitation may be a reasonable one in the case of the mechanized farm operations of today.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that this administration stands guilty before the American people of permitting a cleavage in our society—as the Alsop brothers have said, a Nation divided—a Nation with one group composed of the poor and another group composed of those who are bordering on being well to do. Mr. President, it is not right. It is shameful for the Congress to dilly-dally regarding these great issues, when we see that today the per capita farm income is only $860 a year, as compared with a per capita income of $1,922 of Americans who are not on the farms.

This is not right. It is morally wrong. It is economically wrong. It is politically wrong. I am prepared to take whatever insults are hurled my way. When certain people run out of facts on which to debate the issues, they use attack, bluster, and propaganda. Mr. President, I shall stick to the facts. There are no facts available to prove that this administration has any program in mind whatever except a program to try to bail itself out for 1 year from its surpluses, which have been growing by leaps and bounds.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes in opposition to the pending amendment.

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. Since that 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 moving backward.

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 come forward with another substitute for that amendment which would provide for a modified 90 percent of parity price-support program.

For the past 3 weeks 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 position. 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 applying to small farmers, whose production is not greater than $5,000, and the sliding scale applying to the rest of the farmers. All of this, according to 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 could not have foreseen 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 mechanize made their operations larger and larger through outright acquisition, as well as through leasing of smaller areas.

In order to accomplish what some Senators now advocate, we 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 they have 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 the 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 we have considered and passed upon only 4 or 5 of the 80-odd amendments pending before us. There seems to be no end to the process of considering amendments, for amendments seem to spawn more amendments.

It is my hope that we shall make an effort to stick to the issues; let us leave politics out for a little while, Mr. President, and the 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 soil bank plan, 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 be supporting every farmer 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 cotton farmer in my State, 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. The proposal 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 Vermont, 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

object to amendments being offered, but every new amendment seems to spawn similar ones. As I said, every day there are brought before us issues on which we have previously voted. We discussed the subject of 90 percent of parity price supports many times. I am in favor of them. I have said many times on the floor that it was the only provision of the bill which would have given immediate relief to the farmer. I am still of that opinion.

However, to bring up the question again and again means that every Senator will want to be heard anew on it, and the first thing we know we will be debating all the controversial questions over and over again. If we do that, we might as well let our farmers know that it will be next year before we pass a farm bill.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for expressing the hope that we will not go over and over the same ground.

Almost every time an amendment is before the Senate, it becomes necessary to vote again on the 90 percent of parity provision. I commend the Senator for his insistence that we pass along to other subjects. He knows that he and I differ about the level of the price support. We also recognize the fact that unless a bill is passed, the only one who will really suffer will be the farmer. I join the Senator in the hope that we may not have to debate the same question over and over again, but may pass on to a new subject.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. ELLENDER. If no Senator desires to be heard against the amendment, I yield back the remainder of my time. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official business.

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 Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—36

Barkley	Jackson	Morse
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Daniel	Kennedy	Neely
Douglas	Kerr	Neuberger
Ervin	Langer	O'Mahoney
Frear	Lehman	Russell
George	Magnuson	Scott
Gore	Mansfield	Sparkman
Hennings	McCarthy	Symington
Hill	McNamara	Thurmond
Humphrey	Monroney	Young

NAYS—56

Aiken	Duff	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Dworshak	McClellan
Anderson	Eastland	Millikin
Barrett	Ellender	Pastore
Beall	Flanders	Payne
Bender	Fulbright	Potter
Bennett	Goldwater	Purtell
Bible	Green	Robertson
Bricker	Hayden	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Bush	Holland	Smith, Maine
Butler	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Ives	Stennis
Capehart	Jenner	Thye
Carlson	Knowland	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Welker
Case, S. Dak.	Long	Wiley
Curtis	Malone	Williams
Dirksen	Martin, Iowa	

NOT VOTING—3

Cotton	Kefauver	Saltonstall

So Mr. HUMPHREY'S amendment to Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in accordance with a previous agreement with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and other Senators, I should like to modify my amendment at the desk by striking out "$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to 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 Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Compensation paid any producer for participating in the acreage-reserve program with respect to land in any one State in any year shall not exceed $25,000.

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. ELLENDER. 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. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, the time on each side has been exhausted.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana seek recognition on his amendment?

Mr. JENNER. I do; and I yield 10 minutes of my time to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. 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 "2–22–56–B." I am wholeheartedly in favor of its adoption.

The purpose of the amendment is to place a limitation of $25,000 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 50 percent of his allotted acre-

age into the reserve program or the so-called soil-bank program.

Let me cite an extreme case. Let us consider an individual in the Montana area who has 340,000 acres allotment of wheat. Without some limitation, he could put one-half, or 170,000 acres, of his allotted acreage 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 cultivation.

I do not 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 underwrite 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 any 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 restriction 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 acreage-reserve program. The main purpose of the acreage-reserve provision in 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 relieving our markets of 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 try to have 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 acreage-reserve program is 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.

It strikes me, Mr. President, if we start tying the hands of the Secretary, 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 supply 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 large wheat acreages, such as the Senator from Delaware has suggested, 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 in 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. If the farmer has tenants, the tenants 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 of the soil bank program is to get farmers who have acreage allotments for the production of basic commodities, to refrain from planting some of their allotted acres and thus bring about a reduction of production.

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 crop insurance plus an incentive for a 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 does not have to 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. GORE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware to strike out the last paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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. 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 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 made 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 am concerned about 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 that as 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 nonbasic 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JENNER. 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. It has no relation to the acreage reserve payments. In other words, if both proposals are adopted, a farmer would be able to draw up to $25,000 under the acreage-reserve program, which in effect is for nonplanting, and on the land which was 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. RUSSELL. 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 $25,000, which I regard as 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 man who raises $50,000 worth of commodities may not be earning more than $1,200 or $1,500 a year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There will be an opportunity to change the first figure. It could not be done now, however, since the yeas and nays have been ordered. Such an amendment would not be in order until after the disposition of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am aware of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Putting the two proposals together was not done with any idea of trapping the Senator from Georgia or anyone else, but it was done for the purpose of saving time. I think if the Senate could vote on the proposal offered by the Senator from Indiana, which I think has much merit and as to which we are very much in agreement, certainly the Senator from Georgia would be in a position to offer his amendment later.

While I will not support his amendment I will say that its adoption would not destroy the principle which we are trying to establish here, namely writing in some restriction on these payments.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to inquire what it is the Senate is being asked to vote on. It is my understanding that the Senator from Delaware could not modify his amendment by accepting the amendment of the Senator from Indiana without unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was objection to the unanimous consent. Consequently, the amendment could not be modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I presume the Senate shall vote on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana as an entirely separate amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is a separate proposition in that it is separate now, but it has to be inseparable if it is adopted and added to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. I understand the situation perfectly. I shall vote for the $25,000 limitation. But I wish it definitely understood that if that 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 voted on, there will be an opportunity for him to offer an amendment providing the other figure.

Mr. RUSSELL. 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 that purpose, I shall support it. I have no intention of depriving the Senator from Georgia of the right to submit his proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JENNER. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have already yielded back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have not yielded back all the time available to the opposition. There may be some other Senators who desire to speak against this amendment to the Williams amendment.

I simply wish to repeat, for the benefit of Senators who may not have been in the Chamber earlier, that insofar as the acreage reserve is concerned, if we impose any payment limitation, it may be entirely possible that the Secretary will fail to obtain the number of acres necessary in order to prevent the piling up of surpluses, as intended by the provision for the soil bank.

I am very hopeful that the Senate will reject this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield back the remainder of the time available to his side?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of the time available to our side, Mr. President.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. In voting on the pending question, which is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], which would add a separate figure at the end of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], if the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to that amendment is agreed to, and if the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, as thus amended, thereafter is rejected, what will be the result?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senate adopts the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, so that it is added to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, and if the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, as thus amended, 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. JENNER] to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. On this question, all time has been yielded back.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official business.

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. COTTON] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—84

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

NAYS—9

Eastland	Hayden	McClellan
Ellender	Kerr	Smathers
Fulbright	Long	Stennis

NOT VOTING—2

Cotton Kefauver

So Mr. JENNER'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 moneys 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 completely different subject in 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 $50,000 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 $50,000 limitation will catch a great many small farmers and many men who need this support program if it is to operate at all.

I hope 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 appropriation bill, we got it back to $2,500. 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 some limitation whereby the large farmer would not be eligible for price supports under this program. We debated the issue at length earlier this afternoon.

It is more or less a question as to whether the figure should be $50,000 or $100,000. I will admit that we are moving into a field into which we have had no previous experience when we place ceilings on these loans. If it is the judgment of 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. JENNER] 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 still urge the Senate 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 table 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 in the past 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 in the RECORD, if it is agreeable 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 some ceiling on the amount of crop supports a farmer can receive. At the same time, it is very important that we place a ceiling on the amount of payments under the acreage reserve program.

Mr. CAPEHART. 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 surpluses. 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 we adopt this proposal 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. KENNEDY 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 a short time ago in opposition to 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 person, it will mean that the large 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. That 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 large farmers who might be willing to underplant their acreage allotment, 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 wheatgrower who has 100,000 acres, or from 1 who has 10,000 acres, or from 1 who has 5,000 acres or 5 acres. Likewise, it will contribute just as much to our objective of reducing surpluses. The objective of the acreage reserve is to get production down, so as not to further aggravate our surpluses. That is the whole purpose of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. We would simply be tying the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, and possibly prevent him from obtaining full participation in the acreage-reserve program. We considered this subject in committee. There was only one limitation in the bill that was before the committee, and that was with

regard to the conservation reserve. My recollection is that the Senator from Florida objected to it. He made a motion to eliminate the limitation, and it was adopted by a vote of 10 to 2. The committee felt that it should not tie the hands of the Secretary in the operation of the two programs.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let us consider corn. Any farmer to be eligible for the support price on corn must this year reduce planted acreage by 21 percent, whether he has a big farm or a small farm. What we want is a reduction in the number of acres planted, so as to reduce production, and in that way have the farmer get a higher price. We would hurt the little farmer if we did what is proposed to be done. We would not hurt the big farmer, but only the little one, because we would be encouraging the big farmer to overproduce and thereby create surpluses, which will press down on the little farmer. Therefore, I cannot vote for the amendment, because I am trying to get rid of the surpluses, and I am trying to make certain that the surpluses do not accumulate again. I want to see the farmer get 100 percent of parity in the market place. This proposal would do just the opposite.

Mr. ELLENDER. In our discussions in committee we studied the problem very closely. The restriction would tie the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture and would defeat our objective. As my colleague has just stated, we would say to the farmer, "We are going to limit you to $25,000 in acreage reserve payments." It may be possible that there may be 4 or 5 large farmers in the State of Louisiana who might be willing to take such a cut in their allotted acres that it would require payments above $25,000. By doing so, they would not make it necessary for the Secretary to attempt to get acreage reductions of uneconomical proportions from smaller farmers. If the Secretary of Agriculture is denied the privilege of selecting the acres that he feels can best be taken out of production, in an area where he should be given the broadest discretion, we are simply tying his hands. In my humble judgment the restriction will result in making the soil bank—I will not say it will be rendered inoperative, but it will certainly hamper the Secretary and may prevent him from retiring from production the full number of acres established as an acreage-reserve goal.

Let us not forget that the purpose of the acreage reserve is to reduce production on the allotted acreage. That is the purpose of it. Whether the acreage is taken from a small farm or a large farm or a medium-sized farm should make no difference, because our purpose is to reduce the huge surpluses, and not further aggravate them. If discretion on the part of the Secretary and freedom of decision on the part of all farmers are curtailed, we may find that the soil bank will result in a lot of uneconomic production.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

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 proposal, by the way, is an administration proposal—had stated publicly on the floor that the $25,000 limitation is adequate to take care of it. That is the only reason that 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 under the 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 unrealistic. I will tell the Senate why 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 50-percent payment for what 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 $50,000 productive value against 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 or 15 percent of the acreage.

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 dislike 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 Louisiana, 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. Is it correct to say that the bill as reported to the Senate includes as one of its principal features in the soil bank section a provision to secure the retirement from production of allotted acres?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is the incentive provided in the bill whereby it is hoped to bring about a reduction of allotted acres the provision to which the chairman of the committee has referred as reserved acres?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. As stated, the Secretary of Agriculture is given full power to pay whatever incentive may be necessary to encourage the farmers to take their allotted acres out of production so as not further to aggravate our present surpluses.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator further 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 of 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 respond, the remaining 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 decrease in production 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 the other 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 produce all he desired 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 get more than $25,000 of benefits 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 allotted acres, 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 corn or wheat or rice or cotton, that would put him in a bracket where he would have a greater production than the $100,000 loan would provide for, and then his only other alternative would be to dump his entire production on the market, which would be a burden on everyone producing that commodity. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly correct. I misunderstood the Senator a moment ago.

Mr. YOUNG. 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 production 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 firmed 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 would be affected above $50,000, we would foreclose the retirement 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 study the precise aspects of the question, it is not unjust and 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 the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia is an improvement on 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 $100,000 worth, we must ask what is he going to do 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 further, 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 a short period of time.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. As he knows, the Secretary of Agriculture has already established acreage allotments for the basic commodities. That was done on 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 express approval of such a situation. However, if we prevent many farmers from qualifying for commodity loans, we shall place the entire program in jeopardy.

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 so 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, a marketing certificate is 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 onto the market than would have been the case if a higher commodity loan limit had been established, such 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 degree that this trend is associated with the development of more economic and more efficient farm units it is in the interest of farm families and of the Nation. To the degree, however, that it has resulted in 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 to make specific recommendations as to what ought to be done.

All of us, as I said a while ago, are more than willing to try to keep the small-sized farm in operation. I favor that. But that objective will never be accomplished in the manner which is now being suggested.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. All of us want to help the small farmer. Under the soil bank program, the fundamental principle is that the acreage must be reduced if any production is to be taken away from the big farmer. The small farmer, the man farming 80, 90, 100, 160, or 200 acres, is the fellow we are trying to help.

The farmer who has only 30 or 40 acres of corn allocation is not going to take any of his acreage out of production. He cannot afford to do so. He farms his land by himself. He is not going to go through the field, farm 20 acres, and leave 2 acres lie idle. We know he will not do that.

So, if we are to secure any acreage reduction under the acreage reserve plan it will be necessary to reduce the acreage of the big operators. If we are for the small farmer and want to help him, then we should not place any restrictions in the bill. If we do, the big farmer will continue to grow as much as he ever did, perhaps more, and will run the prices down on the small farmer.

That is the fundamental principle of the soil bank. We simply cannot take any other meaning from it. We might as well face the issue that if we are for the small farmer and want to help him, then it will be necessary to impose the acreage reduction and the decrease in production on the big farmer, because the little farmer just cannot afford to do those things. He will not split a 10-acre or a 20-acre field in order to take out 1, 2, or 5 acres, and place them in the soil bank or the conservation bank. He simply will not do that.

I shall have to disqualify myself, possibly, because I operate a fairly large-sized farm. But I am pleading with Senators that if they want to reduce surpluses and to make certain that surpluses do not accrue in the future, and if they want to help the little farmer and to keep prices up, then we should not agree to this amendment. But if we do not

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 produce all the cotton he can on his 100 acres, and sell it on the cash market for whatever it may bring.

On the other hand, if he were given an incentive to come under the program, he would retire a certain percentage of his land and remain in compliance. This would help to stabilize farm markets.

If the market is ruined, it will be ruined also for the family-sized farmers, whom the Senator so well champions.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is not a Senator on the floor who has not received complaints from small farmers that their acreage allocations for corn and other crops were so meager that they could not get along under them. Therefore, we know the small farmers are not going to turn over any of their acreage to the conservation or acreage reserve. We know that if we are going to help the small farmer, if we are going to reduce surpluses, and if we are to raise prices, it will be necessary to take the production away from the big farmers. By adopting the amendment, we shall be defeating the very thing that I know we are trying to do. We are moving in the wrong direction.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I promised to yield first for 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I cannot say I am in accordance with the views of the Senator from Indiana. It seems perfectly ridiculous to approach the farm problem by saying that we have to pay the absentee farmers, the multimillionaire farmers, to take their land out of production. It was never intended that we subsidize that type of dude farming.

Out of every 600,000 loans which went to the wheat farmers, 554,000 were under $5,000; 20,184 were between $5,000 and $10,000; 9,490 were between $10,000 and $25,000; and only 1,068 loans in the whole United States were over $25,000.

When the loan figure is raised to $100,000, as is proposed, or whether it be left at $50,000, the numbers would diminish substantially again.

On corn, there were 283,605 loans below $5,000; 10,842 loans between $5,000 and $10,000; 957 loans between $10,000 and $25,000; and only 104 loans in excess of $25,000 last year.

On oats, 42,845 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 in excess of $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 66 were over $25,000.

On sorghum, 30,753 loans were under $5,000; 1,643 were between $5,000 and $10,000; 401 loans were between $10,000 and $25,000; and 25 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 2,000 farmers 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 was offered by the Senator from Indiana, is an essential 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, if he can be called a farmer, who has a 340,000 wheat-acreage allotment. He would be eligible to receive a check from the United States Government in the amount of about $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.

However, by 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 allotted 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 $100,000 worth of products, 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.

As I see it, 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, by our own action, made it impossible for the soil bank to work.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware a moment ago read into the record the figures which illustrate why we are now considering this question, namely, the farmers have not been complying with acreage controls. Had they complied with acreage controls, there would not have been any surpluses. There would have been high prices for the farmer. That is the reason why we are considering the pending measure. The farmers have not complied with acreage reductions, and they have grown more than they should have.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

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 complied. That is why huge 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 my point, because the Senator knows there are more than 104 farmers in the United States who are growing those quantities. The Senator would defeat the very thing he 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 acreage reductions are not obtained from the big farmers, none will 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 stand as it was made by the Senator from Indiana, in which he said farmers had not complied with acreage allotments.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator will yield I did not say all of them had not; some of them had not.

Mr. YOUNG. Wheat farmers and cotton farmers have complied almost 100 percent. It is the corn farmers who have not complied.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is what I was talking about.

Mr. YOUNG. I thought the Senator was talking about cotton and wheat farmers.

Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not think a $50,000 limitation would impose any hardship on the farmers of America. It would work this way: A farmer could take up to $50,000 in loans. Over and above that amount he would have to sell on the open market and take what he could get for his products. If the cash market was near support levels, he would keep on producing and selling for the market, but if it was not he would curtail production. There is a great incentive now for a farmer to pick up scattered pieces of land in order to increase the size of his farm. The bigger a farm is, the cheaper the cost of production usually is.

Anyone who has studied the proposal very carefully would have to admit that a provision of $50,000 would impose no hardship on the average farmer of America and do no harm to the program itself. Instead, it would help make it a better farm program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does any other Senator desire to be heard? If no other Senator desires to speak——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to strike out "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, as amended by the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to strike out the last paragraph of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Delaware.

On Friday evening—may we have order, Mr. President? A point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber, please?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Tennessee that the amendment has been agreed to. Therefore, the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee would not be in order. If the Senator seeks recognition, he would have to propose another amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to strike the first paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. In view of the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], dealing with one of the figures in the first paragraph, has just been voted on, would an amendment to strike out the entire paragraph be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled that the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is in order. Therefore, the Senator from Tennessee may continue.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE ON VOTE ON AIKEN AMENDMENT ON MARCH 9

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator yield to me, for the purpose of permitting me to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] may be notified? He desires to be present when the Senator from Tennessee makes his statement.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Does the Senator from Tennessee now seek recognition?

Mr. GORE. Yes; Mr. President.

For the advice of other Senators, I do not expect to use more than 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee yield to me long enough to permit me to thank him for permitting me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GORE. I thank the senior Senator from Texas.

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 recapitulation, nor could the Vice President then vote.

I rise today merely to advise the Senate that I, my staff, and to some extent the Parliamentarian, I am sure, have been studying the precedents 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.

I do not rise today to attempt to reopen it. The distinguished senior Senator from California [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 parliamentary ruling, immediately after the ruling was made. 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 idly made. Indeed, after examining the precedents in the other body, where the Speaker by custom many times votes only to untie an issue, we find that it is new there, too. 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 then faced the Senate.

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 untie a tie vote?

Mr. GORE. By precedent 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, which he has a right to do, being a Member of the House, he could not thereafter vote to untie 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 minority leader [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 Senate can take to close and dispose of an issue. It operates with such finality that the issue can then be reconsidered only in two ways: first, by unanimous consent; second, by a motion to suspend the rule, which motion, if it to carry requires the favorable votes of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

I am prepared to concede that the moral suasion presented so eloquently and forcefully by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was strong. Certainly the Vice President should have been allowed to untie 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 the right to vote, but to deny 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 yea-and-nay 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 Chair at that time. I recognize 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 Aiken amendment, the Vice President, who was then presiding, was misinformed as to the result, and announced it as 46 yeas 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 colloquy 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 announcement 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, under 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 rose and indicated that he understood there was some discrepancy, because one of the clerks had got one total and another a different total, and asked that there be a recapitulation.

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 then be confronted with the same parliamentary situation which would have been presented had the correct total been given to the Chair. It was made very clear that at that point the Vice President would be able to vote.

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 recapitulation. Of course, the RECORD is very clear in that regard.

It is now the contention of the minority leader—and it was his contention at that time—that when that unanimous 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 unanimous 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 having to make that motion all over again.

Some mention has been made of the precedents in the House. For the information of the Senate, I should like 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 5969, volume 5:

The Speaker has voted when a correction on the day after the rollcall has created a condition wherein his vote would be decisive.

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 two-thirds vote required—suspended the rules and passed a resolution presented by Mr. 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. Nathaniel P. Banks, of Massachusetts, moved that the Journal and RECORD be corrected so 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 RECORD might be further corrected so as to show that he voted in the affirmative upon the aforesaid resolution, stating that he was present and so voted when his name was called.

The Speaker decided, as in the case of Mr. Plaisted, that the gentleman from Indiana was entitled to have his name recorded.

And therefore the names of Mr. Plaisted and Mr. Fuller were recorded, the first in the negative and the last-named Member in the affirmative, upon the adoption of the aforesaid resolution.

After the two votes had been recorded the Speaker said:

"The vote on the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. Hewitt, as announced, was, ayes 156, noes 78. There seems to have been an omission on each side. The votes omitted, if correctly recorded, 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 two-thirds. * * * The Chair must insist upon his right to vote in the case that his vote would produce a 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 *Smalls* v. *Tillman*, the question was taken on the resolution declaring that Tillman 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 Speaker thereupon voted, making 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, a total of 145—1 less than 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, of Pennsylvania) cited precedents in 1803, 1849 to show that such a vote was proper. He further said:

"It has never been the rule or practice for the Speaker's name to be called in the regular rollcall, and therefore the Speaker does not respond to the rollcall as other 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 after 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. BARKLEY] is eminently correct when he says that the Speaker has a right, as a Member of the House, to vote upon any issue. However, customarily his name does not appear on the rollcall, 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 in the House, though he 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. GORE. 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 involved the question 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 I am able to find, 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 untie a vote in the Senate. Likewise, every Senator has a constitutional right to vote on any issue before the Senate. However, both a 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 vast 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 never gets his right to 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 is able to 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 submitted a 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 objected to. I do not wish to go further into the argument, but merely to say that, rightly or wrongly, a precedent was set in the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For 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, from the first column:

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know what the recapitulation will show; but if the recapitulation shall show a tie vote, will the parliamentary situation then be as it would have been at that point if a tie vote had been announced?

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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 facts were known to the Members of the Senate. Unanimous consent had been given. It was only after the several discussions had taken place on the floor of the Senate, and when Senators, understanding the situation, had had the facts presented to them, that unanimous consent was finally given. To that extent I believe that that had the legislative effect of rolling back the process to the point where it would have been had the correct announcement been given to the Chair by the clerk at the desk.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator's argument is persuasive. However, it must stand alongside of two other parliamentary rulings, or the giving of parliamentary advice. Neither the statement which the Senator has read nor the two statements which the junior Senator from Tennessee proposes to read are rulings which conclude or settle the issue. They constitute parliamentary advice by the Presiding Officer. What the Senator has read must be measured alongside of this statement:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the Senator from Texas is, in effect, asking that the Senate return to the vote on the Aiken amendment in order to have a recapitulation of that vote. The recapitulation, once it has been announced, will be, in effect, the vote which will be recorded in the records of the Senate.

Continuing, a little later in the RECORD:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair also wishes to make another parliamentary ruling, that once the recapitulation has been made, no Senator may change his vote. The recapitulation will stand as it is.

I respectfully say that all three rulings must be taken together, but that neither of them constitutes positive action, such as is involved in laying upon the table a motion to reconsider.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, where I believe the Senator from Tennessee falls into error in this situation—if I may be pardoned to say this most respectfully—is that had the Vice President not been in the chair and presiding, or had been out of town, for example, a tie vote would have lost the amendment under the rules of the Senate. Therefore, if that had occurred, and the Vice President had not been present, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] would not 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 a week later, if the issue was still unresolved before the Senate, he could have then voted. However, the Senate proceeded, not according to the set of circumstances which the able 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, so far as the parliamentary procedure available to the Senate 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 Senator 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 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 RECORD should show that 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 to defeat 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 to bring out the true result of the vote for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

As the Senator from Connecticut has said, parliamentary rules and precedents are built up as a result of deliberations of this body, conducted as accurately, as factually, and as honorably as they can be conducted. Parliamentary rules are based greatly 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 on Friday evening 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 came about because of a factual error in connection with a very close vote.

If we are going to carry forward the debates in this body and get the desired results, we could not do so on a more honorable basis or on a higher plane than was done on last Friday night. I told the majority leader, and I think I told the minority leader, that I was proud of their quick thinking and of the honorable way in which they acted.

The Senator from Tennessee, who brought this situation up, is an honorable man. He did not try to break a unanimous-consent request to get a correct record at that time.

The facts are perfectly simple and fundamental. As the minority leader has said, the Vice President cannot vote unless there is a tie, and he knows there is a tie.

Obviously, he would have voted as he did vote last Friday night after he knew there was a tie. There was a recapitulation, and on the recapitulation no Member of the Senate tried to take advantage of the fact that he could change his vote. So there was a tie vote and the Vice President voted. We all acted honorably, and the result was as has been brought out, and the whole country knows it today.

As I have said, Mr. President, I was proud to be a Member of the Senate on last Friday night when the matter suddenly came to the front. I was proud of the way in which it was handled on both sides of the aisle and by the Presiding Officer, the Vice President, on the advice of the Parliamentarian. I think we can be very well satisfied, on whichever side we are, that the true result was brought out by the final vote.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator 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 recapitulation was made it was found that the original vote was a tie, in which event the Vice President would have had the right to vote and break the tie. 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 gave unanimous consent to recapitulate, they certainly did not intend to foreclose the Vice President from voting.

I think we have a correct ruling.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, of course at that time one of three things could have been done: Either that the announcement originally made was correct and that the motion had been agreed to by a vote of 46 to 45, or that it had been defeated 46 to 45, or that it was a tie vote. A motion for reconsideration would have been made just as I felt when the vote was originally made and it turned out the way it did, it was therefore again necessary to make a motion to reconsider which I did by unanimous consent, rather than taking another rollcall.

Mr. LONG. It seemed to me that no one had any idea of taking advantage of the situation. The minority leader was eminently correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his indulgence. I know it is very interesting to discuss precedents of the Senate and rules of the Senate. We have to have them. But, at the moment, Mr. President the cotton grower is getting ready to plant his cotton, and instead of worrying about the planter of cotton we are worrying about what precedent was established last week. Why can we not get busy? The cotton farmers will not know, until we pass this bill, what to expect this year. I think it is important, too.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was eating my dinner when on Friday night last this question arose.

I hope the Senator from Georgia will remain in the Chamber.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am honored. I shall remain in the Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I had been present at the time the question arose I would have participated in the discussion.

It seems to me there is one fundamental thing which we must keep in mind, namely, the constitutional right of the Vice President to vote in case of a tie. If he is against the proposal which is before the Senate, on a tie vote he would not have to vote, because it would not change the result. A tie vote defeats a proposition. Unless he wanted to be recorded on the question he would not vote. The only effective vote of the Vice President is an affirmative vote.

I doubt very much, Mr. President, whether the Vice President can be deprived of that right by anything that happens based upon an error in tallying a rollcall of the Senate.

As the Senator from California has indicated, the Vice President does not keep a tally of the votes. He can know there is a tie only when he is told so by the tally clerks, who rarely make a mistake. They are amazingly accurate. I remember John Crockett would take a rollcall and run his pencil up one side and down the other and come up with the result. The tally clerks are accurate, although they can make a mistake. If they make a mistake, of course, it is an honest mistake. 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 vacate the vote on the motion to reconsider in order that the Vice President could cast his vote, because if the vote had been 46 to 45 the other way, and the motion had been made by those who were in the minority but who would have been in the majority if the motion had carried, he would be deprived of his right to cast his vote if the proper rollcall result had been reported. I think there is no question that the Vice President had the right to vote.

The situation in the House of Representatives is different. The Speaker cannot untie a tie vote as Speaker. He has a fundamental right to vote as a Member of the House. By custom, the Speaker's name is not called, but he can always order that his name be called in order that he may exercise his 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 Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to remain in the Chamber for a moment, because I recall that when I was the majority leader a good many years ago, and the Senator from Oregon, Mr. McNary, was the minority leader, there had been a yea-

and-nay vote on which the Senator from Georgia voted, and after voting, but before recapitulation, had left the Chamber.

The next day, when the result of that vote was on our desks, it showed that the Senator from Georgia had not even voted. His name was not on the roll-call. I am not certain of this, but I think his vote would have decided the result.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is quite correct in all that he has stated. As a 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 bill was lost on a tie 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. I 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 Parliamentarian, and 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 been 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 I had voted. He chided me, as I recall, because, as he claimed, I did not vote quite loud enough as a general proposition, and he thought also that I should have stayed in the Chamber during the recapitulation. But he admitted the facts as set forth in 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 Senate had adjourned overnight 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, condone an error in a yea-and-nay 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 or was required 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 Kentucky that the Constitution—and I have read it a few times—is explicit that the Vice President has a right to vote in case of a tie. But does the Senator from Kentucky think the Constitution is any more explicit as to the right of the Vice President to vote than it is as to the right of a Senator to vote?

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 part he can 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 no right to object; but by that fact 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 denied 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 Vice President's right to vote 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 could happen at any time, based upon a falsity, an inaccurate record, or a mistake, do Senators mean to tell me that the right of the Vice President to vote, given him under the Constitution, 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 to vacate the vote, or because some other proceeding had taken place since the original vote, which was a tie vote? I do not think so.

It may be that this is the first time this particular situation has arisen in this way in the history of the Senate.

I was prompted to make these remarks merely because we must be guided in the future by what happens today in the interpretation in this case, if a similar situation should again arise.

I shall lay down the fundamental principle as I believe it to be, that the Vice President of the United States cannot, either by indifference of the Senate, mistake of the Senate, or refusal by the Senate to grant unanimous consent to bring a proceeding back to the position in which it would have been before a tie vote had been announced, deprive the Vice President of his constitutional right to vote—because legislation may turn on such action, and frequently does.

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 might be left to rest upon a matter of courtesy or upon a matter of the granting or withholding of unanimous consent which, while sound in this case due to the foresighted question by 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 recapitulations were not entirely uncommon. But a recapitulation was never an idle thing. That is, a recapitulation was not made simply for the purpose of having the names read over again; a recapitulation was made for the purpose of determining whether a vote had been accurately recorded and accurately reported.

If a recapitulation 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 that fact, the Speaker of the House also enjoys one right which the Vice President does not have in the Senate. The Speaker may make a tie vote as well as break one. That is, if the yeas are ahead one vote, the Speaker may ask that 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 created 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 precedents would show 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 presently before the Senate, the recapitulation, 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 voting. But any Senator who 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 was why in 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 the constitutional questions 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 unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings of reconsideration.

In the long years 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 heritages 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, then he has the right to vote nunc pro tunc. 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. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia observed that in his opinion the Senate could not deprive the Vice President of a vote even by the granting of 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 resist any 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 at such time and under such 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 shall therefore accept 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, and I should particularly like to have the attention of the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader, I find that there is no printed volume of the precedents of the United States Senate. One must go to the Parliamentarian's office and turn through the files. Surely, so august a body as this, the greatest deliberative body on earth, as I believe it is, should hasten to have printed, in bound volume form, with indexes and annotations, the precedents of the Senate.

Mr. CASE of Scuth Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say I learned the other day that such a volume is in process of preparation. I think the point made by the Senator is an excellent one. I happened to be sitting in the chair of the Presiding Officer the other evening when a question arose, and the Parliamentarian at that time showed me pages of a volume on which they are working.

Mr. GORE. That is fine.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say to my delightful friend from Tennessee the Senate already has acted on a resolution authorizing the printing of the precedents. Last week the majority leader, with the concurrence of the minority leader, took steps to authorize the Parliamentarian to proceed with the preparation of an index of those precedents.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, almost at the end of the debate on last Friday, March 9, on the parliamentary question which is being discussed, I asked the Senator from Tennessee to yield. He did yield to me, and I then said:

> I have listened very carefully to this debate. I think it is very important, and probably will be a precedent. But are we setting a precedent that any time the clerk may make a mistake in reporting a vote he can, by that mistake, unless there is a unanimous-consent agreement, deprive the Vice President of his right to break a tie?
>
> Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That would be the effect of it.
>
> Mr. MALONE. Let us not do that.

I still say there should be a little horsesense in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I withdraw my amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the vote is taken, the Chair, for the purpose of the RECORD, should like to be permitted to make an observation with regard to the discussion which has just taken place.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has very well stated the rules of the Senate, as he interprets them, with regard to the rights of the Vice President under the Constitution. When the rulings were made on last Friday, the rulings, as all Members of this body who sit in this chair from time to time may know, were made on the advice of the Parliamentarian. The Parliamentarian, of course, advises on the basis of precedents. It seems to the Chair most interesting and appropriate that the rulings which were made on Friday by the present occupant of this chair were based on precedents which were reasserted by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

There were two basic rulings: First, that on recapitulation no Senator may change his vote; and, second, that on recapitulation the Vice President has the right to vote.

If we read from the RECORD the proceedings on a precedent previously referred to, the reconsideration of the

Thomas amendment, I think we can see how the Senator from Kentucky, who was then Vice 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 on the recapitulation of the vote on the oil amendment to be that the recapitulation would consist merely of accurately counting the vote and announcing the result, and that Senators who were not present at the time of the vote or Senators who did not vote at that time could not vote on the recapitulation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The recapitulation is merely for the purpose of seeing whether any Senator has been recorded incorrectly on the rollcall—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 fur 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 VICE PRESIDENT. 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 would have been the case if the result had been correctly announced—the Chair feels that he would not be deprived of 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 spelled 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 Tennesese [Mr. GORE]. Does the Senator from Tennessee withdraw his amendment?

Mr. GORE. I do.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

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

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. CLEMENTS. 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

Aiken	Frear	Monroney
Allott	George	Morse
Barkley	Goldwater	Mundt
Barrett	Gore	Murray
Beall	Green	Neely
Bender	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hill	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Payne
Bridges	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Saltonstall
Byrd	Jenner	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Langer	Sparkman
Curtis	Lehman	Symington
Daniel	Magnuson	Thurmond
Dirksen	Malone	Thye
Douglas	Mansfield	Watkins
Duff	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Dworshak	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McNamara	Young

NAYS—11

Anderson	Hayden	Long
Eastland	Holland	McClellan
Ellender	Kerr	Stennis
Fulbright	Knowland	

NOT VOTING—6

Capehart	Kefauver	Robertson
Cotton	Millikin	Russell

So Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "2-24-56-B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the entire amendment read, or does he ask that it be printed in the RECORD without reading?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this amendment has been on the desks of Senators for several days. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading.

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

The amendment offered by Mr. CARLSON, for himself and other Senators, is as follows:

On page 3, line 14, insert the following new section 102a, reading as follows:

"WHEAT—DOMESTIC PARITY

"SEC. 102a. Title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by changing the designation thereof to read as follows: "Title III—Loans, Parity Payments, Consumer Safeguards, Marketing Quotas, and Marketing Certificates"; (2) by changing the designation of subtitle D thereof to read as follows: "Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Provisions and Appropriations"; and (3) by inserting after subtitle C a new subtitle D, as follows:

"'SUBTITLE D—WHEAT MARKETING CERTIFICATES

"'LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

"'SEC. 380a. Wheat, in addition to being a basic food, is one of the great export crops of American agriculture and its production for domestic consumption and for export is essential to the maintenance of a sound national economy and to the general welfare. The movement of wheat from producer to consumer, in the form of the commodity or any of the products thereof, is preponderantly in interstate and foreign commerce. That small percentage of wheat which is produced and consumed within the confines of any State is normally commingled with, and always bears a close and intimate commercial and competitive relationship to, that quantity of such commodity which moves in interstate and foreign commerce. For this reason, any regulation of intrastate commerce in wheat is a regulation of commerce which is in competion with, or which otherwise affects, obstructs, or burdens, interstate commerce in that commodity. In order to provide an adequate and balanced flow of wheat in interstate and foreign commerce and thereby assist farmmers in obtaining parity of income by marketing wheat for domestic consumption at parity prices and by increased exports at world prices, and to assure consumers an adequate and steady supply of wheat at fair prices, it is necessary to regulate all commerce in wheat in the manner provided under the marketing certificate plan set forth in this subtitle.

"'DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTA

"'SEC. 380b. Not later than July 1 of each calendar year the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the domestic food quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year. Such domestic food quota shall be that number of bushels of wheat which the Secretary determines will be consumed as human food in the continental United States during such marketing year.

"'APPORTIONMENT OF DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTA

"'SEC. 380c. (a) The domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary 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. The reserve quota set aside herein for apportionment by the Secretary shall be used to establish quotas for counties, in addition to the county quotas established under subsection (b) of this section, on the basis of the relative needs of counties for additional quota because of reclamation and other new areas coming into the production of wheat during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed.

"'(b) The State domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in subsection (c), shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the State on the basis of the total production of wheat in each county during the 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 3 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for which the quota is proclaimed begins, on the basis of the normal yield of the acreage planted to wheat during such 3-year period. The reserve provided under subsection (b) shall be used to adjust farm quotas which the county committee determines to be equitable on the basis of tillable acres, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

"'MARKETING CERTIFICATES

"'SEC. 380d. (a) The Secretary shall prepare for issuance in each county marketing certificates aggregating the amount of the county domestic food quota. Such certificates shall be issued to cooperators in an amount equal to the domestic food quota established for the farm pursuant to the applicable provisions of section 380c of this act. The marketing certificates for a farm shall be issued to the farm operator, but the Secretary may authorize the issuance of marketing certificates to individual producers on any farm on the basis of their respective shares in the wheat crop, or the proceeds thereof, produced on the farm. The Secretary shall also issue and sell marketing certificates in such quantities as may be required to persons processing wheat into food products. Marketing certificates shall be transferable only in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

"'(b) Whenever a domestic food quota is proclaimed for any marketing year pursuant to section 380b of this act, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim for such marketing year (1) the estimated parity price and the estimated farm price for wheat, and (2) the value of the marketing certificate. The value of the marketing certificate shall be equal to the amount by which the estimated parity price exceeds the estimated farm price as determined herein. The value of the marketing certificate shall be computed to the nearest cent. The proclamation required by this subsection shall be made during the month of June immediately preceding the marketing year for which such domestic food quota is proclaimed.

"'(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates issued for any marketing year at the value proclaimed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. For the purpose of facilitating the purchase and sale of certificates, the Secretary may establish and operate a pool or pools and he may also authorize public and private agencies to act as his agents, either directly or through the pool or pools. Certificates shall be valid to cover sales and importations of products made during the marketing year with respect to which they are issued and after being once used to cover such sales and importations shall be canceled by the Secretary. Any unused certificates shall be redeemed by the Secretary at the price established for such certificates.

"'MARKETING RESTRICTIONS

"'SEC. 380e. (a) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products composed wholly or partly of wheat are hereby prohibited from marketing any such product for domestic food consumption or export containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380 of this act have been acquired by such person.

"'(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons are hereby prohibited from importing or bringing into the continental United States any food products containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act have been acquired by such person.

"'(c) Upon the exportation from the continental United States of any food product containing wheat, with respect to which marketing certificates as required herein have been acquired, the Secretary shall pay to the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the quantity of wheat so exported in the food product. For the purposes of this subsection, the consignor named in the bill of lading, under which the article is exported, shall be considered the exporter: *Provided, however,* That any other person may be considered to be the exporter if the consignor named in the bill of lading waives claim in favor of such other person.

"'(d) Upon the giving of a bond satisfactory to the Secretary under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe to secure the purchase of and payment for such marketing certificates as may be required, any person required to have a marketing certificate in order to market or import a food product composed wholly or partly of wheat may market or import any such commodity without having first acquired a marketing certificate.

"'(e) As used in section 380e of this title, the term "marketing" means the sale and the delivery of the food product composed wholly or partly of wheat.

"'CONVERSION FACTORS

"'SEC. 380f. The Secretary shall ascertain and establish conversion factors showing the amount of wheat contained in food products processed wholly or partly from wheat. The conversion factor for any such product shall be determined upon the basis of the weight of wheat used in the processing of such product.

"'CIVIL PENALTIES

"'SEC. 380g. Any person who violates or attempts to violate, or who participates or aids in the violation of, any of the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of section 380e of this act shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to three times the market value, at the time of the commission of such act, of the product involved in such violation. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

"'ADJUSTMENTS IN DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTAS

"'SEC. 380h. If the Secretary has reason to believe that because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in demand for wheat, the domestic food quota for wheat should be increased or suspended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether the increase or suspension is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for wheat. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds that such increase or suspension is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding (and if he finds an increase is necessary, the amount of the increase found by him to be necessary) and thereupon such quotas shall be increased or shall be suspended, as the case may be. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is increased under this section, each farm quota for wheat shall be increased in the same ratio and marketing certificates shall be issued therefor in accordance with section 280d of this act. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is suspended under this section, the Secretary may redetermine the value of marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act.

"'REPORTS AND RECORDS

"'SEC. 380i. (a) The provisions of section 373 of this act shall apply to all persons, except wheat producers, who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle, except that any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this section or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 for each such violation.

"'(b) The provisions of section 373 (b) of the act shall apply to all wheat farmers who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle.

"'REFERENDUM

"'SEC. 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 in lieu of marketing quotas under subtitle B. 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 subtitle B, suspend the operation 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 and marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall not be in effect for wheat under subtitle B. If the marketing certificate program authorized by this act is approved for the 1957 crop by farmers voting in a referendum as provided herein, the provisions of section 101 (d) (8) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall have no applicability to the 1957 crop of wheat.

"'PRICE SUPPORT

"'SEC. 380k. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"'(a) Whenever a wheat marketing certificate program under this subtitle is in effect, price support for wheat shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"'(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to producers of wheat who are cooperators. The amount, terms, conditions, and extent of such price-support operations shall be determined by the Secretary, except that the level of such support shall be determined after taking into consideration the following

factors: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat, (3) the provisions of any international agreement 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) may be 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 when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment 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, after conferring 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. It is our plan to dispose of the bill before we adjourn. We do not expect to have any more yea-and-nay votes this evening. I hope we can expedite action on the farm bill tomorrow. We will plan to stay in session tomorrow evening until 7 o'clock.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say for the information of the Senate that the bill referred to by the majority leader has a time limit on it, because the Commission which would make the disposal under the bill expires on March 22, if I am not mistaken. The bill was reported by the committee unanimously, by both the majority and minority members.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. Tomorrow, after the Senate convenes at 11 o'clock, we shall 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 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 them 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, tomorrow, 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 require 2 full hours of debate. I should appreciate it very much if the majority leader would permit us to begin the debate tomorrow.

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. MAGNUSON. 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 amendments too. I understand that we will proceed tomorrow with the debate. I do not want to use any time now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We will dispose of S. 3091 this evening and then 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. CARLSON] to the unfinished business. I assure the Senate that we will have a quorum call.

AMENDMENT OF RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL ACT OF 1953

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND 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. 1673 (S. 3091).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S 3091) to amend the Rubber Producing Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 1297 at Louisville, Ky.

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, either to 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 is producing synthetic rubber made 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. Yes; it 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 and difficult 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 22d day of March. It is necessary to get action in the House before that time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under those conditions, I do not wish 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 believe the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] has very well stated the situation. I hope that favorable action on the bill will be taken by the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am delighted 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 strike out "forty-five" and insert "thirty"; on page 4, line 4, after the numeral "4", to insert "(a)"; after 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 by the Attorney General, 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 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 or lease extension is disapproved by either House of the Congress by resolution 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 shall proceed to carry it out in accordance with its terms.

And, on page 6, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

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 such terms and conditions including type of use and duration (up to 15 years) of any lease, as the Commission deems advisable 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 sale or lease would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Each such lease or contract of sale 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 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 under subsection (a) shall be placed and maintained in adequate standby condition pursuant to, and be otherwise subject to, the provisions of section 8 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (other than the provision prohibiting leases).

(d) All the powers and authority conferred by this section upon the Commission may, after the termination of the existence of the Commission, be exercised by such agency of the Government as the President may designate for the purpose, and for this purpose such successor agency may exercise all the authority conferred in the Rubber Producing Facilities Dispostal Act of 1953 upon the Commission.

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. 27. (a) Notwithstanding the second sentence of section 7 (a), the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Government-owned rubber-producing facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor No. 1207 and hereinafter referred to as the 'Louisville plant', shall not expire until the end of the 30-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this section.

"(b) If one or more proposals are received for the purchase of the Louisville plant within the time period specified in subsection (a), the Commission, notwithstanding the expiration of the period for negotiation specified in section 7 (f), shall negotiate with those submitting the proposals for a period of not to exceed 30 days for the purpose of entering into a contract of sale.

"(c) Within 10 days after the termination of the actual negotiation period referred to in subsection (b), or, if Congress is not then in session, within 10 days after Congress next convenes, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report containing, with respect to the disposal under this section of the Louisville plant, the information described in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 of section 9 (a). Unless the contract is disapproved by either House of the Congress by a resolution prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 9 (c)) of the Congress following the date upon which the report is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the contract shall become fully effective and the Commission shall proceed to carry it out, and transfer of possession of the facility sold shall be made as soon as practicable but in any event within 30 days after the expiration or termination of the existing lease on the Louisville plant. The failure to complete transfer of possession within 30 days after expiration or termination of the existing lease shall not give rise to or be the basis of rescission of the contract of sale."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (d) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), before submission to the Congress of its report relative to the Louisville plant, shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall, within 7 days after receiving the report, advise the Commission whether, in his opinion, the proposed disposition, if carried out, will violate the antitrust laws.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 336, 84th Congress, approved August 9, 1955, of section 4 of Public Law 19, 84th Congress, approved March 31, 1955, and section 20 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Commission established by the last-mentioned act shall cease to exist at the close of the 90th day following the termination of the review period provided for in section 27 (c) of that act, unless no sale of the Louisville plant is recommended by the Commission pursuant to section 27 (c) of that act, in which event the Commission shall cease to exist at the close of the 90th day following the termination of the maximum period allowed for negotiation in section 27 (b).

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 9 (d) and notwithstanding the period of lease limitation in section 9 (f) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Commission or its successor may, provided the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Louisville plant has expired as provided in section 27 (a) of that act and no proposal or contract 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.

(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 by the Attorney General, 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.

(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 or lease extension is disapproved by either House of the Congress by resolution 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 shall proceed to carry it out in accordance with its terms.

SEC. 5. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the disposal or lease of the Louisville plant shall be fully subject to all the provisions of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 and such criteria as have been established by the Commission in handling disposal of other Government-owned rubber producing facilities under that act: *Provided,* That the provisions of sections 7 (j), 7 (k), 10, 15, and 24 of that act shall not apply to the disposal or lease of the Louisville 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 such terms and conditions, including type of use and duration (up to 15 years) of any lease, as the Commission deems advisable 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 sale or lease would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Each such lease or contract of sale 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 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 under subsection (a) shall be placed and maintained in adequate standby condition pursuant to, and be otherwise subject to, the provisions of section 8 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (other than the provision prohibiting leases).

(d) All the powers and authority conferred by this section upon the Commission may, after the termination of the existence of the Commission, be exercised by such agency of the Government as the President 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 orderded 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 without the time being charged to either side.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging signs 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—39 from the majority and 44 from the minority. This is a 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 can 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 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 invitation to evasion that now exists.

In these respects, the measure is somewhat similar to the bill sponsored by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. 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 accord some 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 the 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 would not object to a temporary postponement of Senate action if such postponement would expedite consideration of the whole measure.

Mr. President, it is my 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 partisanship in such issues. The bipartisan sponsorship of this measure is 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.) Journal, the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, 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, as follows:

[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 is an encouraging development 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 close all of the latter, but the Johnson bill—cosponsored by a bipartisan majority of the Senate—at least would establish some 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 in the bill are the following: To increase from $3 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 must originate in the House, a bill to implement this deduction provision already has been reported out by the Ways and Means Committee.

Some criticism of the pending measure already has been voiced on grounds it does not go far enough toward controlling primary contributions and expenditures. It attacks this problem only to the extent of requiring that candidates for Federal office must file with the House or Senate the same statements required in their individual States. Some States do not nominate by primary at all, and the reporting requirements differ widely. For this reason, it was recognized that there would be opposition to more stringent Federal requirements, but the thought

is that the possibility of national publicity through the filing of reports in Washington 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 HENNINGS' unwillingness to support the Johnson-Knowland "honest elections" 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 candidates for Federal office should file 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 up to $100 from taxable income; it would enable major party candidates to obtain more free time on radio and television; it would raise the limits on campaign spending 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 a complete overhauling of the Corrupt Practices Act in the short time before the campaigns formally get under way.

One of the duties of the Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying and Campaign Contributions will be to recommend improvements in the Corrupt Practices Act. If the committee suceeds in getting off the dead center that has frustrated its organization efforts, it will have an opportunity to take a long look at our electoral system. The reasoning behind the Johnson-Knowland bill is that Congress should not wait that long to correct obvious and glaring defects. Let the emergency bill go forward with whatever improvements the Rules Committee can make promptly. Certainly it would be better to have an incomplete bill enacted than to have a more comprehensive bill set aside for future consideration.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 5, 1956]

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 political campaigns.

We hope this becomes a vigorous movement, not merely a timely drift.

The two leaders have introduced a bill designed to throw the spotlight on campaign contributions. Forty-eight other Senators have joined in sponsoring the bill.

The Johnson-Knowland measure doesn't include primaries—for the practical reason, Senator JOHNSON says, that no such bill can get through this Senate. Just the same, Senators MUNDT and HENNINGS are pressing for their own bills which do include primaries.

Attorney General Brownell indicates the weight of the administration will be thrown behind legislation of this type.

Out of all these proposals and the debate on them, plus the upcoming Senate investigation of campaign contributions and lobbying, there ought to come a constructive law. The conscience of Congress has been challenged by recent developments in 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 remedial legislation."

This from Senator ALBERT GORE, probable head of the investigating committee.

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

Why do political candidates accept aid from fatcats, the well-heeled individuals or organizations who make the big campaign contributions? From time to time, Americans work themselves into a lather of righteous indignation over this question. Usually 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 merely fill a void that the man in the street creates. Political parties are a vital cog in our machinery of Government. And it costs money to run them.

Neither party gets its postage free, its stationery on the cuff, or its radio or TV time for nothing. Both have overhead and bills that have to be met.

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. That is true whether he pays in the 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 $5 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.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Texas Democrat, and Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, California Republican, have introduced a clean politics bill that will encourage individual contributions. It will permit individuals, but not corporatons, to deduct political contributions in the amount up to $100 when figuring their income tax.

In addition, the Johnson-Knowland bill incorporates other worth-while reforms. They include a more realistic ceiling for campaign chests, and stricter accounting of where the money comes from and how it is spent.

The bill deserves a high priority on the Senate's calendar.

[From the New York World-Telegram of March 5, 1956]

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 political campaigns.

We hope this becomes a vigorous movement, not merely a timely drift.

The two leaders 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 of campaign contributions and lobbying, there ought to come a constructive law. The conscience of Congress has been challenged by recent developments in 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 remedial legislation."

This from Senator ALBERT GORE, probable head of the investigation committee.

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 Washington Post and Times Herald of February 27, 1956]

HONEST ELECTIONS BILL

The drive for enactment of the so-called honest elections bill is a necessary concomitant to the investigation into lobbying and use of money to influence legislators. One effect of the furor over Senator CASE'S disclosures and the forthcoming inquiry is likely to be a drying up of contributions for the 1956 campaigns from donors interested in getting bills through Congress. Even regular contributors are likely to think twice before offering any substantial sum to a Senator or Representative while the investigation is under way. It becomes especially important, therefore, to encourage campaign contributions from other sources.

The evil that has come sharply into focus as a result of the natural gas lobby's activities is not the spending of money in political campaigns. The people must be informed about issues and candidates if they are 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 the special interests want. The Senate concluded, largely on the basis of the CASE incident, that this danger demands thorough investigation.

At the same time the Senate leaders are keenly aware of the fact that campaign contributions do not grow on bushes. While striking a blow at gifts from special interests, they see the need for encouraging more numerous donations from the rank and file of citizens interested in good government. Consequently, the plan that seems to be emerging from conferences by Majority Leader JOHNSON, Minority Leader KNOWLAND and other Members of the Senate and House emphasizes three important steps:

First, it would permit taxpayers to deduct from their taxable income political contributions up to $100. This would be a substantial incentive to taxpayers to aid the party or candidates of their choice. Contributions on this level would not be large enough to create any sense of obligation on the part of the candidate to the donor. For some legislators, this proposal may well become a declaration of independence.

Second, it would permit radio and television networks to give free time to major candidates without extending similar favors to every fringe or splinter officeseeker. This

would notably ease the high cost of campaigns.

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 campaigns for nomination, which, in about one-third of the States, are equivalent to elections. Senator MUNDT's proposal that congressional candidates be required to file in Washington duplicates of their reports to the States on campaign contributions and expenditures appears to have a good deal of merit in this connection.

The important objectives are to stimulate a flow of contributions from the right sources, to discourage gifts that tend to sway legislative judgment and to expose all transactions bearing upon nomination and election to public office to the fullest public scrutiny.

[From the Scripps-Howard papers]

AN ELECTION-MONEY LAW

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON says Congress will be pressed at this session to pass a law which will encourage the "fullest public participation and the fullest public review" of all elections.

That is an apt description of the principle on which the proposed law should be written.

How to write an enforceable law which will be realistically effective is another matter.

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 defects in the present law which are obvious to any practical observer.

But before it is ended the Senate probe ought to give the lawmakers an abundance of useful guides on tightening up the law. Certainly, that will be the result if the committee runs a hard-hitting inquiry as promised.

A foremost purpose of this investigation to give the public a full review of how campaign funds are raised, how they are accounted for, or not accounted for, and what influences they exert on the candidates who benefit from them.

Public opinion often needs to be backed up by a stiff law, to make itself truly effective. But the public itself can be a decisive influence on public policies, once it has an opportunity to make its views heard.

[From the Dallas Times-Herald of March 9, 1956]

JOHNSON BILL IS MERITORIOUS

The bill which Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, has prepared in response to the need of better regulations of campaign expenditures and donations seems likely to prove helpful if enacted.

One feature of the measure would require candidates and campaign managers to make public the sources of all donations above $100. This disclosure would let the voters know definitely the chief supporters of the candidates or parties.

In most instances the public can guess with reasonable accuracy who is supporting a candidate, but, in the heat of a campaign, when charges are being made and denied, many voters can be confused. This is particularly true when accusations come so late in the proceedings that a candidate has not time enough to prove that they are false.

Since the cost of running for office is steadily rising, the proposals to raise the limitations on campaign expenditures are in order. However, costs vary from State to State and from congressional district to congressional district. This makes it difficult to apply a blanket limit to the whole country.

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 monetary aid from supporters. But why 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 them 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. It may be more risky for a lobbyist to offer a candidate a campaign "donation," but there are always men who will take chances when the stakes are high.

[From the San Angelo Standard-Times of March 9, 1956]

SENATE LEADERS WHO KEPT THEIR HEADS DUE HONORS

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 investigated itself more often than Congress. That is good. It is good, also, that after 170 years, the number of Senators and Representatives found deserving of censure for allowing improper influences to control their actions can be counted on the fingers of both hands. Bribery, vote selling, under-the-counter moneychanging are incompatible with representative government, and the long absence of such practices from Congress is by no means the least of our blessings.

What is bad about the record of frequent self-examination in Congress, however, is that only rarely has the leadership of either party had the initiative or the courage to press for corrective legislation to prevent future abuses.

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, limited campaign expenditures for Senate races to $25,000 and for House races to $2,500.

No Member of either House can or has conducted a seriously contested race within those limits in modern times. All manner of circumvention has been devised to evade the spirit of the law, while abiding by the letter of the law. Every Member of Congress—including the breast-beaters who have 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, as Senate leaders for the two parties, had been swayed by the hysterical fringe after disclosure of the CASE incident, one man or one company or one industry might have been punished for the sins of many. The public would have been led to believe that an evil had been cured, but violations of the law would have continued unabated. The only serious error would have been to get caught.

Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND met this situation by offering a goldfish bowl election spending law. Realistic and modern, it requires candidates to report all contributions received through various committees set up to finance campaign activity, requires candidates to file in Washington copies of all reports of spending which various State laws require regarding primaries, permits networks to donate free radio and television time to major parties, and encourages the general public to share in the election of candidates by authorizing tax deductions for political contributions up to $100.

Under the JOHNSON-KNOWLAND approach, hypocrisy and dignified deceit no longer need characterize election spending reports.

More importantly, we think, Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND have imbedded in their bill a sound and tested principle of honest Government: Reliance upon public disclosure of the truth. The high level of integrity in American Government has been achieved not by laws alone but by the ever-present knowledge that the powers of investigation—abetted by the initiative and courage of a free press—assured no wrong-doer the secrecy indispensable to corruption.

Whenever we allow a corner of Government to remain dark, we harbor a breeding place for misconduct. Those who seek to influence the National Legislature improperly will be far more effectively thwarted by the light of publicity which the Johnson-Knowland bill turns on them than by headline-making investigations or even by threats of punishment. We expect public officials, once in office, to live in a goldfish bowl.

At last report, more than two-thirds of the Senators had joined in sponsorship of this elections spending bill. This clearly indicates early and easy passage. Certainly the House is to be expected to move as promptly and decisively. If this reform measure becomes law, as it should, the Nation will be grateful to the two Senators for keeping their heads when others about them were losing theirs, and a potential black mark on the Senate record will stand instead as a lasting credit.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Journal of March 2, 1956]

GOLDFISH CAMPAIGN

Contributions to the presidential campaigns this year would be put in a goldfish bowl for all to see, if plans made by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democratic leader of the Senate, and concurred in by Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, the Republican leader, materialize. They would rush through for immediate enactment an election reform bill that would apply to the campaign this fall.

This announcement was made 2 days after the appointment of a select committee of 4 Democrat and 4 Republican Senators to police the campaign and report next January, with recommendations for a comprehensive election reform bill. However, it is thought some measure of reform can be passed now while the issue is hot, whereas apathy might set in after the election and a more ambitious bill then might fail to get wide support.

JOHNSON would encourage small contributions by allowing tax deductions on gifts of up to $100 a person; permit television and radio networks to give free and equal time to major parties without commitment to lesser parties; require stringent reporting of all contributions to a general election campaign, and impose realistic limits on campaign spending, perhaps based on the size of each State's electorate. It would not include primary elections—for fear of raising the issue of States' rights.

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News of March 3, 1956]

NEW ELECTION BILL OUTLOOK GOOD

Favorable action on a new elections bill at this session of Congress has been predicted by Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON regardless of investigation and recommendations by the special bipartisan committee of eight conducting an inquiry into campaign contributions, lobbying, and influence peddling.

The new bill, a revision of the Hennings bill, would permit individual senatorial candidates and their backers to spend from $100,000 up to a maximum of $1,910,000 in their campaigns. The latter figure is based on formula determined by the number of votes in a State.

Senator JOHNSON said cooperation from both parties is expected in getting approval of the legislation.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of February 29, 1956]

REALISTIC REFORM MEASURE

What the Democrat leader in the Senate is preparing to sponsor is described by him as a "complete realistic measure encouraging the fullest public participation and the fullest public review of all elections." It is intimated that the Republican Senate leader will be a cosponsor.

In view of the complexities of campaign financing and of public attitudes toward the parties and the individual candidates a complete realistic measure may not be actually attainable. But certainly some constructive changes are possible within the practical limits.

At present no nominee for the United States Senate can legally make personal expenditures totaling more than $10,000. Sentor LYNDON JOHNSON, Texas Democrat, is introducing a bill that would permit personal spending equivalent to 30 cents for each vote cast in the previous senatorial election.

The personal-expenditures classification would include not only what the senatorial nominee spent himself but also whatever spending he authorized others to do for him. A minimum ceiling of $100,000 on such expenditures is projected in the Johnson bill.

Each nominee for a seat in the House of Representatives is currently under a $2,500 restriction where personal campaign expenditures are concerned. If the Johnson bill were enacted in its present form each could spend $25,000 or, if the 30 cents-a-vote formula were applied, even more in the most populous congressional districts.

Under this bill all campaign expenditures over $100 would have to be reported to the Senate, the House, and to the United States district court in the nominee's home area.

Expenditures in primary campaigns are not covered by this bill. If legal limitations also were to be put on them the statutory ceilings projected in the measure would be unrealistic, at least in the States and districts where the popular voting is heaviest.

If this bill were enacted the present $3 million limit on spending by each party's national committee would be scrapped. Each national committee could spend the equivalent of 30 cents per vote cast in the previous election. That would mean $12,310,000 this year for each committee on the basis of the total national vote in 1952.

The Johnson bill projects Federal tax exemption on the first $100 of each contribution for political campaigning. This presumably would not cause a sensational increase in the number of really big campaign contributions. It might, however, stimulate a remarkable increase in the number of smaller contributions.

Revision of the Federal elections laws to put them more in line with the increased costs of campaigning is long overdue. In principle and to some extent in detail the JOHNSON proposals, which may be approved by the Republican leader in the Senate, Senator KNOWLAND, have sensible reform import.

Enactment of this measure in its present form is not clearly indicated, but it looks as if some corrective action will be taken by Congress in the current session.

[From Broadcasting-Telecasting magazine of March 12, 1956]

STUCK WITH A SPLINTER

With a heavy majority of Senators already committed to support it, the Johnson bill to amend the laws governing political broadcasting and campaign spending seems set for prompt action.

It cannot be passed a moment too soon.

It's too bad it wasn't passed early last week—before Lar Daly, who says he is running for the Republican presidential nomination as an America Firster, put the arm on all networks for equal time to answer President Eisenhower's February 29 appearance. The lunacies of the present political broadcasting law could not have been made more apparent.

In our view Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S bill is a good one, in the sense that it is probably the best broadcasters can hope to see enacted before the campaigns of 1956 begin in earnest and the splinter parties begin coming out of the woodwork in force.

The Johnson bill would modify the law to permit broadcasters to forget about giving equal time to unimportant candidates. It would increase the legal limits of campaign expenditures in recognition of contemporary costs of television time. These are desirable objectives.

But there have been behind-the-scenes maneuvers connected with the bill that are somewhat unsettling.

Some of the bill's supporters have unofficially let it be known that their support would intensify if networks volunteered substantial gifts of free time to political candidates. It would be very wrong if networks yielded to such pressure.

To deserve the support of broadcasters, any bill modifying the political broadcasting section 315 of the Communications Act must have as its purpose the freeing of restrictions on radio and television, not the freeing of time for canned oratory by politicians.

Broadcasters must be given more latitude in news coverage of political candidates and campaigns.

This news coverage may take many forms—straight news shows, panel discussions, interview programs like Meet the Press and Face the Nation. These are programs whose format and content are controlled by the broadcaster—not by the candidate or his party. They are journalism, not political rallies staged by partisan groups.

Under present regulations, radio and television are prevented from living up to the standards of good journalism in presenting politics. No responsible newspaper in the country would give a candidate with so little future as Lar Daly more than a few inches of type. Prospects at the time this was written were that if he proved to be qualified, radio and television would be obliged by an archaic law to give him a valuable block of prime time.

A good way for politicians to defeat their own attempts to obtain more exposure on radio and television is to continue to keep section 315 on the books in its present ungainly form.

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. HILL], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] be added as cosponsors 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.

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 rollcalls after that time. After the morning hour it will probably 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 unreservedly to the glorious task of doing Thy will.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

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. 2552. 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. JOHNSTON 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 disposition 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.