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 majority 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 PRESIDENT 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. MURRAY) 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. MOSES), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MUSKIE) are absent on official business as members of the U.S. delegation on parliamentary conferences in Canada.

The Senators from New Mexico (Mr. CHAVEZ), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GUEWING), 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. MURRAY), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. McNAMARA) are absent on official business attending the opening ceremonies of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The Senate 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. MURRAY), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. McNAMARA) are absent on official business attending the opening ceremonies of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

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

The PRESIDENT 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 PRESIDENT 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. 901, 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 PRESIDENT 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. 32

The PRESIDENT 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. 901, "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 falls 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 the tobacco price 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 97 percent for burley. Supporting tobacco prices as provided in S. 901, 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 that he would receive 90 percent of parity, as parity is computed for all other commodities.

For 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, when such is the case.

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 at the modern technology they would be poured onto the remainder.

Hence the bill would probably increase, and in any event would not substantially decrease, 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 yield 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 should have an opportunity to adopt realistic wheat legislation beneficial to all segments of our economy.

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 is reported to the Senate.

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

If 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 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...