

States Steel Corp. granted a wage rise voluntarily to the late Philip Murray as head of the USW, because steelworkers' wages had lagged behind mining and autos. The industry could suggest a voluntary moratorium on the automatic wage boost. "Long-term wage contracts," said Reuther, "should be living documents to meet changed conditions."

Meanwhile, the crocuses have begun to fight through this winter of discontent. Machine tool orders rose slightly in January and then again in February. Orders for structural steel were up 14 percent in February over January. Steel production still exceeds incoming orders, but, at the same time, consumption—the chewing up of steel—is thought to exceed production (deliveries to steel users.)

President Eisenhower feels that we're now going through the worst of the recession. If he's wrong, he has company—me.

**SHIRLEY LEEKE KILPATRICK—
VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 84)**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Scott in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 2110, for the relief of Shirley Leeke Kilpatrick.

On March 24, 1958, subsequent to the passage of this measure by the Congress, an adjustment of status to that of a lawful permanent resident of the United States was granted the beneficiary by the Immigration and Naturalization Service pursuant to section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. S. 2110 is therefore unnecessary.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 31, 1958.

**THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF RADIO
IN THE PRESERVATION OF FREE
SPEECH AND FREE ENTERPRISE**

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, on March 27 I brought to the attention of the Senate the important role that radio plays in the preservation of free speech and the American system of free enterprise. I referred to the recent reports that had been published about the possible curtailment of the American radio broadcasting network, and expressed the hope that it would be able to continue its radio network operations.

In my remarks I referred to the radio networks which are operated in conjunction with television and noted that these radio operations were being maintained although they were unprofitable.

Inadvertently, I failed to mention the Mutual Broadcasting System, the largest in the United States in point of number of affiliates. Mutual has served the Nation faithfully and well in all areas of broadcasting. In the area of news relating to public affairs it has done an outstanding job.

The remarks I offered concerning the other networks apply in full measure to the Mutual Broadcasting Co.

**STAY IN REDUCTION OF SUPPORT
PRICES—VETO MESSAGE**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the veto message of the President on Senate Joint Resolution 162, the joint resolution passed by the Senate by an overwhelming vote, and also passed by the House of Representatives.

It should also be noted that a substantial majority of the Republican Party caucus in the Senate also urged the President to sign the joint resolution, as did an overwhelming majority—I believe it was 42—of the majority party in the Senate.

It is very unfortunate, indeed, that the President found it necessary from his point of view, and obviously on the basis of the advice he received, to veto this first agricultural antirecession measure.

Senate Joint Resolution 162 was designed for 2 purposes and passed on the basis of those 2 purposes. First, it was designed to prevent further price declines and further income declines in agriculture. It was designed to maintain Government protections at the 1957 levels.

In view of the announced reductions in Government price supports for 1958, it was understandable why an overwhelming majority in Congress took the action it did in asking that price supports, insofar as Government activity is concerned, be maintained at the 1957 level.

The second purpose was to afford Congress the time needed to perfect long-term, long-range basic agricultural legislation. Those of us on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who have that responsibility, at least initially, did not want to have to work under the gun, so to speak, with the economic gun loaded and pointed at us, ready to go off any minute. We preferred to be able to work after more mediation and deliberation and consideration.

Therefore, the joint resolution was passed by Congress. However, the action of the President of the United States throws the entire agricultural economic picture into a whirl and into utter confusion.

I predict that prices paid to farmers for their commodities will go down as the result of the veto. I predict that the farmer will suffer economic loss because of the veto. I predict that the family farm and the family farm system will suffer economic tragedy because of this kind of negative action.

I further predict that corporate farming will expand, that the growth of large commercial corporate farms will be expedited and intensified. I do not believe that is good for America. The kind of negative policy which is embraced in the veto message will lead to that kind of development on our agricultural front, namely, the expansion and extension of corporate agriculture. That will be done to the detriment of our American social and political systems.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that the people who live on the farms will anticipate from the veto message that the administration intends to lower supports?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. As the Senator knows, the President reiterates his recommendation of lowering price support levels and broadening flexibility from the present 75 to 90 percent, to the level of 60 to 90 percent. In fact, he is recommending, in some instances, the full scale, from 0 to 90 percent.

The Senator from South Carolina further knows that the President asks that the escalator clauses, which are built into the present farm laws, whereby when surpluses are removed, prices tend to increase be eliminated.

Therefore, I can say that the veto message will result in lower prices for farmers for the commodities they produce, and that there will be no saving—not so much as one cent in saving—for the consumer in the food market. Food prices have been going up despite the fact that farm prices have been coming down. Recently, over the week-end, we heard some so-called good news with reference to an increase of farm prices.

What did they consist of? They consisted of certain types of citrus fruits. Those prices rose because of an act of nature, a calamity, which struck the producers and caused a shortage of citrus fruits. Because of the shortage of citrus fruits, and because of the frost, and because of the losses to the citrus producers, citrus prices went up well above 100 percent of parity in some instances. I trust that that is not the administration's program. I trust that the administration is not endorsing a type of farm program in America which is based on calamities.

What else caused the price rise for farmers? Potatoes are up to 125 percent of parity. That is again because of a short supply, brought about by unfavorable weather conditions. We can go down the whole list of products from fresh vegetables and citrus fruits to potatoes, and find that that is what has basically raised the parity price structure.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask the Senator not to forget cotton.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator calls our attention to a certain type of cotton, of which there is a desperate shortage, and that again has resulted in higher prices.

The Senator from Minnesota has pointed out that an abundant supply of agricultural commodities is the consumer's best protection. I wish to warn consumers that the administration's program will take the consumers of America to the proverbial economic cleaners. The administration's program results in surpluses for agriculture, and also results, because of uncontrolled production and because of unplanned methods in agriculture and because of a failure of a plan, in higher prices to consumers.

I notice that the administration has tried to give the poor dairy farmer a little more hope. They have said to the dairy farmer, "We are going to reduce