

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, on condition that the minority leader does likewise.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business as members of the U.S. delegation on parliamentary conferences in Canada.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] are absent on official business attending the opening ceremonies of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART],

and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are absent on official business as members of the U.S. delegation to conferences in Canada.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent on official business of the Committee on Public Works, attending the opening ceremonies of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—79

Allott	Goldwater	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Morton
Bartlett	Hart	Moss
Beall	Hartke	Mundt
Bennett	Hayden	Neuberger
Bible	Hennings	Pastore
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Bush	Hill	Randolph
Butler	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Saltonstall
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Schoenappel
Carroll	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Case, N.J.	Jordan	Smathers
Clark	Keating	Smith
Cooper	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cotton	Kennedy	Stennis
Curtis	Kerr	Symington
Dirksen	Kuchel	Talmadge
Dodd	Langer	Thurmond
Douglas	Lausche	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	Long	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McCarthy	Yarborough
Engle	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Frear	Mansfield	
Fulbright	Martin	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—19

Alken	Green	Murray
Capehart	Gruening	Muskie
Carlson	Holland	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Prouty
Chavez	McGee	Wiley
Church	McNamara	
Dworshak	Morse	

So the bill (H.R. 7523) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BUTLER, conferees on the part of Senate.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I also ask that the bill be printed, showing the Senate amendments.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign, during the adjournment following today's session, enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled, and that the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House.

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

VETO MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the President of the United States has transmitted to the Senate today two veto messages—one on S. 1901, the so-called tobacco bill, and the other on S. 1968, the wheat bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the messages be considered to have been read, and that, with the accompanying bills, they be ordered to lie on the table and be printed as documents.

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

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, TO STABILIZE AND PROTECT THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR TOBACCO—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 32)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith without my approval S. 1901, "an act to amend section 101(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the act of July 28, 1945, to stabilize and protect the level of support for tobacco." This bill fails by a wide margin to do what should be done if the best long-term interest of the Nation's tobacco farmers is to be safeguarded.

The bill's merits are few. For the first time in many years tobacco prices would be supported at less than 90 percent of parity—in the first year, for example, at 88 percent for Flue-cured tobacco and at 87 percent for burley. Supporting tobacco prices as provided in S. 1901, rather than at 90 percent of parity under a continuation of present law, would result in a saving to the U.S. Government in the first year of \$14 million.

The bill's demerits, however, are fundamental and far reaching. The bill takes a long step backward by resurrect-

ing 90 percent of "old parity" as one basis for determining the support level for tobacco. The Congress itself discarded the "old parity" formula years ago. Because the bill actually can result in the support level being set at 90 percent of "old parity," the American tobacco farmer in such circumstances could very easily be misled into believing he would receive 90 percent of parity, as parity is computed for all other commodities.

But more importantly, I cannot approve a bill that holds out hope to the tobacco farmer that it will help him solve his problems, when such is not the case. U.S. growers of many types of tobacco are heavily dependent upon exports. Yet we have been fast losing our fair share of foreign markets. The deterioration in our tobacco sales abroad can be directly attributed to the high level of price supports that are required by existing law. And while prices have been supported at these high levels, and would continue to be under this bill, the law has required severe cuts in tobacco acreage in the United States at a time when acreage and production abroad have been expanding. The best that can be said about S. 1901 is that it might slow down the rate at which we are losing our fair share of foreign markets. It would not prevent further losses. It certainly will not regain any lost markets, because the level of price supports it requires would still be too high.

I believe the bill's demerits far outweigh its merits, and accordingly I am returning it without my approval.

The Congress has a pressing responsibility to enact realistic legislation designed to meet the problems of tobacco farmers—legislation such as that recommended in my special message of January 29, 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 25, 1959.

STRENGTHENING OF WHEAT MARKETING QUOTA AND PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 33)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed:

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 1968, a bill "to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and Public Law 74, 77th Congress, as amended."

This bill seeks to enact temporary wheat legislation. It would require wheat producers to reduce their acreage by 25 percent and at the same time would provide for increases in price supports on wheat to 90 percent of parity.

On May 15 when I approved the joint resolution for extending the date for announcing the 1960 wheat acreage allotments and marketing quotas I said:

It is my hope that these additional 2 weeks will be used by the Congress to enact

realistic and constructive—not stopgap—wheat legislation.

The proposed legislation embodied in H.R. 7246 is stopgap. It is not realistic. It is not constructive. It goes backward instead of forward. It is not in the interest of the wheat farmers of America.

The bill disregards the facts of modern agriculture. The history of acreage control programs—particularly in the case of wheat—reveals that they just do not control production. Under acreage controls in the 1954-58 period, acreage was reduced by over 25 percent but at the same time yield per acre was increased by about 30 percent. The same situation would be likely to happen in 1960 and 1961. The poorest acres would be retired from production and all the modern technology would be poured onto the remainder.

Hence the bill would probably increase, and in any event would not substantially decrease, the cost of the present excessively expensive wheat program now running at approximately \$700 million a year.

In my January 29, 1959, special message on agriculture, I recommended that price supports be related to a percentage of the average market price during the immediately preceding years. In this message I also stated that if in spite of the tremendous increases in yields per acre the Congress still preferred to relate price support to existing standards then the Secretary should have discretion in establishing support levels in accordance with guidelines now in the law.

Contrary to the recommendations I made, this bill prescribes for a sick patient another dose of what caused his illness. The proposed return to the discredited high, rigid price supports would hasten the complete collapse of the entire wheat program.

While the hour is late I feel that this Congress still has the opportunity to adopt realistic wheat legislation beneficial to all segments of our economy.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 25, 1959.

FLAG RAISING CEREMONIES AT JUNEAU, ALASKA, JULY 4, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 423, Senate Resolution 135.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 135) authorizing the appointment of a special committee to attend the flag raising ceremonies at Juneau, Alaska, on July 4, 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Vice President is authorized to appoint seven Members of the Senate as a special committee to represent the United States Senate at the ceremonies to be held at Juneau, Alaska, on July 4,

1959, where the United States flag bearing forty-nine stars will first officially be flown in commemoration of the admission of Alaska into the Union as a State, and to designate the chairman of said special committee.

Resolved further, That the expenses of the committee, including staff members designated by the chairman to assist the committee, which shall not exceed \$15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

REPORTING BY SENATE OF DETAILED INFORMATION ON ITS PAYROLLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 422, Senate Resolution 139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 139) to provide for the reporting by the Senate of detailed information on its payrolls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri to make a brief explanation of the resolution.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, this resolution was called to the attention of the Committee on Rules and Administration some several weeks past. It relates to what many of us have heard and read about, and about which inquiries have been made of us concerning the staffs of the respective Senators and themselves.

In considering the matter, the Committee on Rules and Administration tried to reach what we thought was a proper conclusion. We did so after two meetings. We spent the greater part of the time in discussing what we thought would best meet the responsibility of the Senate to the people of the United States in a full and free disclosure of our own financial transactions, our payrolls, and all other information, about which some of us feel strongly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Was this a unanimous report?

Mr. HENNINGS. The resolution was reported to the Senate unanimously by a full attendance of the Committee on Rules and Administration, either in person or by proxy, on Wednesday of this week.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the resolution contain language which would require the names of the employees to appear under the name of each Senator; that is, to identify them together with their respective salaries?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not read the resolution in that way. The meaning is not clear. The resolution should provide that under the name of each Senator