

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