loss or damage. Our savings-share accounts are insured commercially to $10,000.

Superior diversity: Local loans are made selectively in communities which are enjoying steady commercial and industrial development and extraordinary population growth.

Superior liquidity: Monthly repayment of short- as well as long-term loans, together with special investments and high reserves, assure a maximum of liquidity.

SAVE WITH SAFETY FOR YOUR FAMILY'S FUTURE

How your family's savings earn 4½ percent:

Loans are made only to responsible people for valid purposes. Our loans, amply secured by sound collateral and comprehensively insured, are subject to competent examination and periodic reevaluation. Local real-estate investments that are stable and profitable yield substantial returns. Our dividends conservatively reflect these yields. Our short-term loans, repaid monthly in accordance with closely supervised schedules, keep our funds constantly productive and assure liquidity.

Based on conservative principles, our long-term loans are made to correspond with ability to pay and individual family needs. For both short- and long-term loans, our underlying security are homes owned by local members which are fully insured against the risks of loss or damage.

Fundamentally, current interest rates, our low operating expenses, and the productivity of selected investments provide us with a rate of return which exceeds those earned by most other kinds of savings investments.

Why your family's savings grow:

Dividends are paid on dividends, so that, as added to your savings, they compound. Four and one-half percent compounded quarterly truly accelerates the growth of your savings. Indeed, $1,000 compounded quarterly at 4½ percent for 10 years yield an average annual return of more than 5.6 percent. Savings, therefore, double themselves in less than 16 years. Regular saving, of course, maximizes this growth.

What if your family's savings are needed:

If funds are needed, you may take advantage of our counseling services, and you may exercise your right to borrow against your family's savings without disrupting your savings program.

Withdrawals, of course, may always be made at your convenience, personally or by mail.

When does your family receive its emergency protection:

At once, and automatically thereafter, if you elect the family-savings plan. By means of your savings, your family is protected against the risks of death, disability, and personal disasters. As you save, automatically your life and disability protection increases.

THE FAMILY SAVINGS PLAN—AN OPTIONAL PROGRAM WHICH PROVIDES TRIPLE PROTECTION FOR YOUR FAMILY

The family savings plan, a unique program to triple your family's protection through liberal dividends and automatic life and disability insurance. Your family's security requires this protection of savings and insurance.

Liberal dividends: Every dollar added to your family's savings-share account earns dividends for you at our current rate of 4½ percent per year. However, under the family savings plan, you receive cash dividends of 3½ percent per year, compounded and credited quarterly, to make your savings grow faster, and the additional 1 percent per year earned by your savings is the full cost of your life and disability insurance. This insurance automatically terminates at age 55 in respect of total and permanent disability benefits and at age 65 in respect of death benefits.

Automatic life insurance: Automatically, with each addition, the balance in your family's savings-share account is matched by an equal amount of insurance on your life up to age 65. As you add to your savings, you automatically add to your family's life-insurance protection.

Automatic disability protection: In addition, in the event of total and permanent disability before the age of 55, your family's lost income will be replaced by insurance benefits equal to the amount you have in your share-account under the family savings plan.

Maximum savings benefits: Regular saving helps your family both to meet its needs and to satisfy its wants. Funds are always available for emergencies, opportunities, advancement, and pleasure. The family savings plan effectively assures your family the full benefits of regular saving.

Convenience and protection: Even in times of need, when protection is most desired, you need not make withdrawals and reduce your insurance. Under the family savings plan, you may conveniently borrow against your account, using only your passbook as collateral.

Triple security: The family savings plan is designed to afford your family extra protection when it is needed most. Upon death or disability, the balance in your account is automatically doubled. Under the family savings plan, $2,500, for example, is automatically increased to $5,000. At times when the family's income has been reduced or interrupted these addtional funds are made available to meet your family's needs.

It's all automatic: Under the family savings plan, your insurance grows automatically with your savings. Premiums, at a rate not to exceed 1 percent per year, are paid by the association for you from dividends earned by your savings * * * at no out-of-pocket expense to you nor any cash burden on your family's current budget.

THE FAMILY SAVINGS ASSOCIATION—COMPARE SERVICE—SAVE WHERE SERVICE MEETS YOUR FAMILY NEEDS

Save conveniently by mail.

No notice required for withdrawals.

No minimum balance required to earn dividends, or to open your share account.

Special dividend of $1 is credited to new accounts.

Our experience is at your family's service for counsel on financial matters. Our advice and counsel are directed to the management of family debt, the budgeting of current and lifelong expenses, adequate insurance programs, family investments and retirement plans.

Funds are made available on terms appropriate to financial ability and need for home ownership, construction, or modernization.

Emergency family protection is earned without extra cost through automatic life and disability insurance.

Family credit is established for you by our record of your prudent savings.

Personal loans are granted secured only by your family's savings without disrupting your family's savings program.

RULES AND PROCEDURES

1. Dividends are declared and credited quarterly. Dividends are thereby compounded.

2. Dividends are credited from the 1st of the month on payments received by the 10th.

3. Loans are made on mortgages, improved real estate, and pledged savings-share accounts.

4. Loans require comprehensive insurance against risks of loss or damage.

5. Loans require only small monthly repayments. No commission and no minimum expense are required.

6. Interest is charged only on the actual balance of the loan each month.

7. Payments are due monthly without notice.

8. The association must be notified promptly of any change in address.

9. Your passbook should always accompany payments or withdrawals whether made in person or by mail.

A State-chartered institution, our association achieves maximum security through prudent management and comprehensive insurance against risks of loss or damage. Our savings-share accounts are insured commercially to $10,000.

THE FAMILY SAVINGS AND HOME LOAN ASSOCIATION, INC.

Offices: 640 Frederick Road, Baltimore, Md.; 16 North Liberty Street, Cumberland, Md.; 127 North Street, Elkton, Md.; 27 North Court Street, Frederick, Md.; 6 East Washington Street, Hagerstown, Md.; 8431 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.; 4653 Huron Avenue, Suitland, Md.

[From the New York Times, of March 21, 1958]

PUBLIC IS CAUTIONED ON SAVINGS CLAIMS

The Better Business Bureau of New York City cautioned the public yesterday against putting funds in out-of-State savings and loan associations that advertise higher-than-usual dividend rates and represent their accounts as commercially insured to $10,000.

In Washington Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat of Brooklyn, said an amendment would be offered to the pending Financial Institutions Act to compel such savings and loan associations to disclose fully the nature of such claims in their advertising.

Hugh R. Jackson, president of the Better Business Bureau, said that savers in about 3,700 recognized savings and loan associations throughout the country had insurance coverage on savings accounts up to $10,000 through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, a Federal Government instrumentality. Commercially insured savings and loan associations, he said, do not have this insurance.

Some Utah, Maryland, and Arizona savings and loan associations, a bureau spokesman said, have advertised commercially insured accounts, adding that companies insuring some of these accounts have been based in Tangiers and Morocco.

STAY IN REDUCTION OF SUPPORT PRICES—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 85)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the veto message of the President on Senate Joint Resolution 162 be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying joint resolution, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, Senate Joint Resolution 162. I have given earnest consideration to the many representations made to me both for and against it. It is my judgment that to approve this resolution would be ill advised, from the standpoint both of the Nation and of our farm families as well. It is regrettable that for the second time in 2 years the Congress has sent me a farm bill which I cannot in good conscience approve.

Specifically, the resolution would have such consequences as these:

First. It would pile up more farm products in Government warehouses.

Second. It would restrict the growth of markets.

Third. It would postpone the day when agriculture can be released from the straitjacket of controls.

Fourth. It would bypass the problems of the small operator who produces so little for sale that price supports have scant meaning.

Fifth. It would hold up the needed transition to modern parity and would in fact disregard the parity principle.

Sixth. It would be unfair to those winter-wheat growers who signed up under the 1958 acreage-reserve program with the understanding that the price supports which had then been announced would be the effective rates.

This resolution would fix farm price supports and farm acreage allotments at not less than existing levels. The true need is to relate both price supports and acreage allotments to growing market opportunities.

With regard to Government controls, what the farm economy needs is a thaw rather than a freeze.

Improvements have been made in farm legislation in recent years. The keys to these improvements have been expansion of markets and greater opportunity for our farm people to exercise their own sound judgment.

Fears were expressed by some that farm prices might collapse when high rigid price supports were abandoned. These fears did not materialize. Instead, farm prices rose. This month the index of prices received by farmers is 9 percent above the level that prevailed in June of 1955 when high rigid price supports were last generally in effect. The parity ratio now stands at 87, up 6 points from a year ago.

Most of agriculture is without production controls and without price support. This is generally true of meat animals, poultry, and fruits and vegetables.

There is impressive evidence that farmers stand to profit from less rather than more governmental intervention. Unsupported prices of cattle and hogs are unusually strong.

Despite these bright spots, many farm problems remain to be solved. The price-cost squeeze continues to harass our farm people. Production restrictions impose a severe burden. Many of our farmers—those on farms not large enough to be profitable—are earning incomes which are below any generally accepted standard.

Cotton, wheat, corn, and other basic crops have major problems. Progress in solving the problems of these crops cannot be made by going backward. We must continue in the direction which the Congress set in 1954 and endorsed in 1956—changes in the direction of greater opportunity for adjustments made necessary by our ever-changing agriculture.

I said, prior to the passage of this resolution, that what it proposed would be a turn of 180° in the wrong direction. After reviewing the resolution in its final form, I adhere to this conviction.

For the 1957 crop, prices were supported, product by product, in accordance with a complex set of legislative and administrative considerations. The same was true in the establishment of acreage allotments. To carry these forward unaltered, despite changes in demand, in supply, and in surplus stocks would be contrary to sound legislative procedures and would completely disregard economic fact.

Now, I want to turn to the progress that has been made through programs already in effect. In recent years a many-sided attack on farm problems has been launched. Substantial gains have been achieved:

Through the rural development program to help those at the low end of the income scale.

Through market-making exports which last year reached an alltime high.

Through providing needed credit to family farms.

Through sharing our abundance with the needy at home and abroad.

Through market development in cooperation with producer organizations and the food trade.

Through surplus reduction, which has cut down our stocks by more than a billion dollars.

Through stepped-up research to find new uses for farm products.

Through special programs to increase milk consumption.

Through expanded long-range conservation measures.

While it is necessary to reject the freeze embodied in this resolution, the Congress and the executive branch can be helpful in other ways.

A five-point program should be undertaken, involving various separate but related actions. Some of these are the responsibiilty of the Congress and some are administrative. Some call for legislation, while ample authority already exists for others.

1. The old basic law should be revised. On January 16, 1958, I sent to the Congress a special message on agriculture which recommended needed changes. Many of the problems will be alleviated if the Congress will act on these proposals in this session:

Authority to increase acreage allotments up to 50 percent, and to widen the range within which price supports may be provided.

Elimination of acreage allotments for corn, permitting all corn farmers to plant in accordance with their best management decisions, so that price supports would apply to all corn rather than, as the freeze bill would have it, to only about 1 acre in 7 in the commercial corn area.

Abolishment of escalator clauses in the law because these rigid provisions keep farm people continually under the shadow of price-depressing surpluses.

Extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, with substantial increased authority to move surplus stocks abroad.

Shifting the price supports for cotton to the average of the crop, the same as for all other farm products.

There is opportunity to make these needed changes before fall seeding time if the matter is undertaken promptly.

2. When these necessary legislative changes have been made, 1959 acreage allotments will be established at levels as high or higher than those prevailing in 1958. Certain statutory provisions which place a floor under acreage allotments for cotton and rice are scheduled to expire after the 1958 crop. Producers face sharp acreage reductions unless the law is changed. When the Secretary of Agriculture has been given the necessary authority to adjust price supports and acreage allotments he will set 1959 allotments at levels at least as high as those in use this year. For cotton and rice these allotments will be substantially above the levels which would otherwise prevail.

3. When necessary new authorization is provided in keeping with my legislative recommendations, the special export programs for our surplus crops will be enlarged. Opportunities exist to export, both for dollars and through special programs, large quantities of our staple commodities.

Wheat is becoming better known to consumers abroad. Market development and promotional activities have made more people acquainted with the merits of our many export products. These commodities can alleviate hunger and need, and should be so used.

4. Dairy products acquired under the price-support operation will be used outside the regular domestic commercial market. These products will not be offered for sale in such markets during the remainder of 1958 at less than 90 percent of parity. While freezing supports would not be a useful step, we seek to help the dairy industry in other ways.

To strengthen markets, the butter, cheese, and dry milk acquired under price support will be donated to the school-lunch program, to charitable institutions, and to needy persons. Exports will be made when this can appropriately be done.

Such inventory management will serve to bolster the market.

Meanwhile, the administration will continue to support the special school milk and armed services milk programs. We will also support as a further aid to dairy farmers, the accelerated brucellosis control program. Stepped up promotional activity will increase consumption.

Every constructive step available to us will be taken to increase the use of our wholesome dairy products.

5. An export program for cotton, corn, and other feed grains, similar to the present export program on wheat, will be put into effect. This can be done without legislation. The effect of this program will be to move these products directly from commercial markets to the export trade without running them through the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under the wheat-export program farmers have obtained broader markets and substantial price benefits in the market place. Marketing efficiency has been promoted and the amount of wheat which has moved into Government channels has been reduced. The new program for cotton and feed grains is expected to have similar effects.

To meet the rapidly changing conditions in agriculture, farmers must be able to make their own management decisions on their own farms. They must not have their production and prices frozen in an outmoded pattern. They must not be made the captives of a restricted history; they must be given freedom to build a brighter future. This can be done if farmers and those who serve them will team up in support of sound legislative and administrative action.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 31, 1958.*

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I cannot say that I am very much surprised at the veto message which has just been submitted to the Senate, although I had hoped the President would sign this very mild joint resolution.

The hard facts are that our country is in the midst of a recession. Business, industry, and labor are today feeling the impact of an economic distress which has stalked our agriculture for the past 4 or 5 years.

The resolution which the President has seen fit to veto was reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry solely and simply because we believe it offered a mild form of relief to our farmers who have already suffered disastrous declines in their incomes.

I note in his veto message that the President takes the position that because farm prices rose slightly during the past month, the outlook for future farm income is bright. I would remind the President that the slight rise to which he has referred was due first and foremost to weather conditions. For example, an analysis of the price rise indicates that strawberries accounted for 15 percent of the increase; Irish potatoes, 20 percent; and eggs, 12 percent. In other words, price increases for these three commodities—strawberries, potatoes, and eggs—made up 47 percent of the entire rise in the parity ratio. These commodities, however, make up less than 10 percent of total cash receipts from farm marketings. Of course, the reason for higher prices for these three commodities is the shortage in supply. In the case of strawberries, these prices are for the new crop which is just beginning to come in, while in the case of potatoes, the fact that storage stocks are down 20 percent below March 1 figures coupled with weather damage to the new crop of potatoes is responsible. The increase in egg prices was caused by generally unfavorable weather conditions in Northern and Eastern States.

Increase in the prices of meat animals accounted for 28 percent of the total increase in parity ratio. The fact is that slaughter at federally inspected plants of cattle during this period decreased 19 percent; slaughter of calves dropped 4 percent; hogs, 16 percent; and sheep, 14 percent. These figures show the principal reason for the increase in prices of meat animals. Meat animals account for about 29 percent of total cash income from farm marketings.

The facts available indicate that price rises reported in this latest release are the result of shortages of supplies, and not the result of expanded markets for these commodities.

In addition, it is inconceivable to me that any action directed towards lowering of price supports in any way could be based on increased prices occurring in only 1 month under the stress of unusual shortages of supplies.

Even a hasty reading of the Presidents veto message shows that the administration has definitely made up its mind to beat down farm prices even below the levels of this year, but above and beyond that is the fact that the President has done again almost the same thing he did in 1956.

Senators will recall that in 1956, Congress passed and sent to the White House, a stop-gap farm bill which would have supported farm prices for the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity for 1 year only. The President vetoed this act, and in his veto message made much of the fact that the legislation involved an abandonment of the administration's flexible price-support program. Yet, in almost the same breath, he, himself, abandoned the sliding scale, and in an unprecedented move announced an arbitrary high-level price support for the basics—a rigid price support—a 1-year price support, and—I might add—an election year price support.

In this veto message, the President has, in a sense, done almost the same thing.

He has vetoed the bill which froze acreage allotments for 1959 at the 1957 levels. At the same time, he has held out a "carrot" to Congress and said that if we give Mr. Benson the authority he wants to fix support levels at between 60 and 90 percent of parity, he, the President, will see that, and I quote:

> Nineteen fifty-nine acreage allotments will be established at levels as high or higher than those prevailing in 1958.

In other words, Mr. President, if Congress freezes acreage, it is terrible, but if the administration freezes acreage, it is constructive.

Now, Mr. President, as to price supports, the Chief Executive almost ignores these. He speaks in glittering generalities of the prosperity farmers will enjoy if only Congress makes it possible for price supports to be further lowered. Therefore, Mr. President, we can only assume that the President wants lower prices.

Now, let us take him at his own word. Let us assume that he gets what he wants. He has promised to give farmers at least the same acreage in 1959 as they had in 1958. Yet, he also says that price supports should be reduced.

Given the same acreage and a lowered price support, it is obvious that farm income will be further reduced. Therefore, I am drawn inevitably to the sad conclusion that this administration doesn't want to bolster farm prices—that it wants only to see farm prices further depressed.

The President said in his veto message that the price of meat animals, for example, has remained reasonably stable and that since the price of meat is not supported, the experience of the livestock industry offers support for his position that price supports depress, rather than assist, farm income. The President should know that the price of grain is supported. This factor alone has its stabilizing mark on the meat industry. In addition, the price of meat is receiving support under the program of Government purchases. As the record will show, when the price of pork or beef, for example, sag, the Department of Agriculture undertakes direct purchases in order to bolster the price of meat.

In addition, as I have already stated, cattle marketings are much lighter this year due to the fact that ranchers are now restocking depleted herds—herds that were previously liquidated because of weather conditions. Now with the end of drought conditions along the Great Western Plains, the grass is beginning to grow again, and ranchers are once more able to use lands which lately were unusable. This is another good reason why the price of meat products has been firm—there has been a scarcity of good beef.

There are two other points in the veto message which are of great importance. The first is the contention that lower farm prices mean lower consumer prices. This is not so. The record demonstrates that even while farm prices have been declining, food prices have been soaring to an alltime high. The share of the consumer's dollar received by farmers for a representative number of food items has been declining from around 51 cents in 1948 to 40 cents today.

The second point is somewhat more difficult to explain, and evidently the President either did not receive an explanation, or saw fit to ignore it. I refer to the fact that the bill he has vetoed has been described as a freeze. The bill was not a freeze, in the sense that it froze price supports and acreage at 1957 levels. It merely provided that price supports and acreage could not drop below 1957 levels. In other words, all the bill did was place a floor beneath price supports and acreage.

I am most hopeful, Mr. President, that over the Easter recess, while Members of the Senate and the other body are at home, their constituents will discuss with them the President's action. I am sure that if this is done, it will be possible to override the President's veto. At any rate, I think the effort should be made.

The President is wrong; the Congress is right.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum I have prepared, dealing with the President's veto message, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

MEMORANDUM

Today the President returned Senate Joint Resolution 162 to the Senate with a veto. He states that the resolution had many unfavorable points which compelled him to exercise his veto.

Specifically he stated that:

1. It would pile up more farm products in Government warehouses. My comment is that this short-term legislation could not