

And why is the prospect of more inflation pleasing to some big business men?

Most of them are hired managers, not principal owners. Their reputations are enhanced when the dollar profit of their companies go up year by year. Their personal fortunes are enhanced when the value of their stocks rises. Inflation is helpful toward both those ends.

Thus there is a community of interest between the welfare politicians of big government and the latter-day managers of industry who have taken the places of such giants as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and Henry Ford.

We are not here trying to explain American politics entirely in terms of economic determinism. Some people have convictions and stand by them at any cost—and damn the torpedoes.

But we think it is true that people who are in the same boat, or on the same roller coaster, are likely to have a common interest in the conveyance they are riding. That is why we say it is not particularly surprising that certain spokesmen for big business have declared themselves in favor of the political ticket which emphatically supports big spending.

We hope the time will come when those who are harmed by inflation—primarily men and women who work on salaries or on farms and those who live on fixed incomes—will become equally interested in maintaining an honest dollar.

FEDERAL FARM SPENDING FIGURES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Those Federal Farm Spending Figures," published in the Stockman's Journal, of Omaha, Nebr., for August 26, 1964.

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

THOSE FEDERAL FARM SPENDING FIGURES

The New York Times tells us that nearly all the defense savings achieved by Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, were offset in the fiscal year just ended "by another large and unexpected spending increase in the program that has been the despair of successive administrations for 15 years—the farm program."

Warning to its subject, the Times says that "detailed figures for the fiscal year reveal that farm spending hit a record of \$7 billion. This was \$1 billion more than had been estimated in January of this year and \$1.3 billion more than had been estimated when the budget for the fiscal year was first presented more than 18 months ago.

"If the record of the past is any guide, it is highly unlikely that this spending will drop to \$4.9 billion as estimated in the budget for the current fiscal year. If the President's target of holding total spending below \$98 billion is to be met, there will have to be savings elsewhere. Despite the changes in the farm program proposed by the present administration, most of which Congress has accepted, farm spending has risen steadily. The administration has regularly claimed that the changes would reduce costs.

"In all but 1 year of the decade of the 1950's farm outlays were less than \$5 billion. But in fiscal 1961, they rose to \$5.2 billion, then to \$5.9 billion in 1962, \$6.9 billion in 1963, and \$7 billion in 1964. And in nearly every year they have turned out higher than the budget estimates."

This record may be difficult to run on in the campaign ahead, though members of the Democratic Party have demonstrated an adeptness at turning a record of spending and budget deficits into votes in national

elections. Perhaps they will succeed in doing so again, but we lean to the view that, if they are successful at the polls in November, it will be more in spite of their Federal farm programs than because of them. It will be interesting to see what is singled out to brag about in this administration's handling of the farm question.

Just exactly how the farmer's cause has been advanced during the past 4 years of steadily increasing farm spending, we aren't sure. But perhaps the campaigners will enlighten us. Despite what the general public may erroneously think, the condition of the farmer's pocketbook would seem to indicate that those billions of dollars appropriated and spent in the farm name must have been sidetracked and diverted from their intended destination.

It would help a great deal, of course, if farm budget figures were broken down and analyzed for the public in their true light. For instance, the cost of administering farm programs takes a healthy sum. How much? The public should be told. And, too, how about the welfare and relief programs—school lunches, food for the needy, etc., both at home and abroad—that are being financed out of the agriculture budget?

Surely all these and other such ventures should not be lumped together in Federal farm spending totals. No wonder the public is confused and tired of hearing about the farm problem.

There is more than a touch of irony, incidentally, in the fact that just about the time that record farm spending figures were being publicized and worried over in high places, it was also revealed that the farm parity price ratio had skidded to its lowest level in around 20 years. It will also be interesting to see what there is in this situation to brag about on the campaign trail.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States says without equivocation in article 4, section 4, that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

The Constitution does not say that after 1¾ centuries as a republic, the Federal courts will summarily reorganize the governments of the many States. But that is exactly what the Supreme Court is requiring in its June 15 edict on reapportionment.

The importance and impact of this edict are the reasons why we have spent the last month debating proposals by the distinguished majority and minority leaders and why we will tomorrow vote on a compromise offered by the Senator from New York. Let me point out at this juncture of my remarks that I cannot lend my support to a compromise which is, in the words of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], supplication to the High Court. As the distinguished minority leader pointed out in debate on last Thursday:

There is not a binding word in (the Javits' proposa.)1

I would hope that not only would the proposal by the Senator from New York be rejected by the Senate, but that the stronger, although not completely ade-

quate, amendment authored by the minority and majority leaders would be passed subsequent to the rejection of the proposal by my friend and colleague from New York.

The Mansfield-Dirksen amendment is brief. It embodies substantially more than supplication. Simply stated, it provides for the halting of reapportionment actions until January 1966, to permit States to hold elections under existing laws. It would also allow State legislatures reasonable opportunity to reapportion in regular session or to amend the U.S. Constitution.

For nearly 200 years, Mr. President, the many States of the Republic managed to transact their constitutionally lawful affairs, protect the welfare of their citizens, and enjoy general prosperity with State governments organized as the Federal Constitution provides—by the States themselves within the framework of a republican form of government.

As the Senator from Illinois has so eloquently stated, and as the title of his bill substantiates, a stay of proceedings is all that is being sought in this proposal. We are not asking nor can we ask that the Congress override the ruling of the Court. We ask only that the system which has endured, which has prospered, and which has given us a chain of union forged of 50 strong and viable links not be summarily destroyed. We ask only that a reflective pause be granted long enough to allow voluntary reapportionment or the consideration of a constitutional amendment to lawfully and properly overrule the High Tribunal's edict and allow bicameral legislatures their historic prerogative of constituting one house on other than a population basis.

The Mansfield-Dirksen measure is not an anti-Court amendment, it is not an antimetropolitan amendment, it is not an antisuburban amendment. It is a proposal to the Senate that we agree to a reapportionment breather; that we grant the governments of the 50 States time in which to rethink the question of their own composition without the specter of the Federal courts hovering above their capitol ready to snip the horse hair and send a juridical sword of Damocles cleaving through their governments, their philosophies, and their institutions.

Senators supporting this bill seek not to use it as a vehicle for changing the Constitution. We seek not to deny any groups or any areas or any classes or segments of our society their constitutional representation in the governments of the States.

We seek in this legislation to protect those individual and States rights by providing time for serious consideration by the States of the whole question of legislative apportionment.

My sentiments on this bill are as those of the Judiciary Committee on an earlier proposal. I feel this bill "would provide the Congress with sufficient time to consider proposed amendments to the Constitution dealing with this subject. It would relieve the States from hurried acts of reapportionment made pursuant

1964

to Court order issued before the matter is fully resolved."

The committee further noted:

Many proposed amendments to the Constitution dealing with the right of the citizens of a State to determine the apportionment of the membership of the State legislature are pending in committee both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. There may not be sufficient time remaining in this session of the Congress to give adequate study to these proposals. A breathing spell is needed both for the harassed States and for the Congress.

Mr. President, the one sentence, the one rationale absolute, which in itself cries out to the Senate to pass legislation of this kind is the committee's assertion that it "does not believe that reasonable reapportionment laws or amendments to State constitutions, when required, can be contrived in haste."

Mr. President, contriving apportionment in haste is precisely what the Federal courts seek to do behind the impetus of the High Tribunal's June 15 decision.

Contriving in haste is precisely the purpose of the special interest groups who have filed reapportionment suits in States whose legislative compositions are clouded by the High Court's decision.

Contriving in haste is the purpose of metropolitan power cliques who seek to prostitute the Court's edict and derive from it a greater measure of Tammany-type control over State governments.

One of the principal champions of the city-dominated State legislature system, the Washington Post, published an article datelined August 9, announcing:

Fifteen prominent law school deans and professors wired Senate leaders that this proposal to delay reapportionment "dangerously threatens the integrity of our judicial process."

The dispatch further stated that these "legal scholars" denied their protest had anything to do with the correctness of the Court's June 15 decision on reapportionment—which is a stroke in their favor. Instead, their fears are based on the contention that the bill would be "a drastic interference" with the powers of the courts to enforce the Constitution.

Even though their *bête noire*—the original Dirksen amendment—has been abandoned, it gladdens my heart and elevates my spirits to think that any group of men whose credentials are those of bona fide legal scholars would suddenly be so concerned about drastic interference.

If they seek to occupy themselves with issues of drastic interference, let these gentlemen consider the instances—and they are legion—in which the Supreme Court has interfered drastically in the affairs of Congress.

In the Sanders case, the Court interjected itself into the question of congressional districts, and in the issue before the Senate today, we must remember that the Supreme Court has invaded the domain not only of the Congress but also of the States themselves in asserting—in Reynolds against Sims—the specious "one man, one vote" thesis.

Furthermore, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has been quoted as say-

ing that he is more than willing to interject the Court into any social, moral, religious, or political question.

Where, then, is the concern of the legal scholars for the drastic interference of the Court into the affairs of the other two-thirds of government?

America, in her greatness, is anchored firmly to her constitutional framework of laws respecting the rights of individuals and the rights of States. Surely, no national issue has ever affected or threatened these rights more than the wiping out of nearly two generations of law and precedent with Justice Warren's summary announcement:

The fundamental principle of representative government in this country is one of equal representation for equal numbers of people.

Reapportionment is an issue which requires not sophomoric presumption in haste and indignation but intellectual deliberation in research and thought. It is an issue in which the States must be given an opportunity to act either through voluntary reapportionment or in the drafting and ratification of a remedial amendment to the Constitution.

I importune and I implore my colleagues to pass this bill. Let it become a part of the foreign aid bill, and let it be signed into law, so that the legislatures of the States may continue to be constituted on the historically tenable dual basis of area and population—rather than on capricious edicts "contrived in haste."

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

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

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR THE APPALACHIAN REGION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, unfortunately, I was not present in the Chamber on Tuesday, September 8, during the colloquy between the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] on S. 2782, but I should like to associate myself with the position and the remarks of the Iowa Senator. I have every sympathy for the plight of the people in the Appalachian area, and particularly for the people of West Virginia. Indeed, the senior Senator from West Virginia has made an eloquent plea for this proposed legislation. One might say that he has plucked a mournful melody upon our heartstrings.

However, Mr. President, I am concerned at this time with the pasture-improvement feature of this bill. I hold in my hand a copy of a news story which was published on the front page of the Bluefield Daily Telegraph, Bluefield,

W. Va., on Friday, September 4, 1964. This story, datelined Lewisburg, W. Va., carries the byline of John Hall, Associated Press writer, and announces that one of the finest cattle herds east of the Mississippi will be put on the auction block. We wonder why a top Hereford cattle herd, in a State which is requesting Federal assistance to encourage the cattle industry, must end on the auctioneer's block. The reason given in this newspaper article is:

Sources close to the family said the sale was undertaken to avoid both corporation and personal income taxes.

Has the State of West Virginia implemented such tax laws as to make the cattle industry, and maybe others, in that State prohibitive? This news story certainly gives that impression.

This is no ordinary cattle herd. The Morlunda herd, situated in the rolling hills of southern West Virginia, is composed of 115 bulls, 627 cows, and 350 calves, and has won 253 blue ribbons over the last 2 years. On the first day of the auction, 131 head sold for a total of \$133,950. This included \$29,500 paid for the 1,900-pound merit bull "Morlunda Coxwain the 23d," and \$10,000 for "Morlunda Matador the 77th."

Mr. President, in order that Senators may have the full details of this incident, I ask unanimous consent to have this news story, entitled "Bull Brings \$29,500 as Morlunda Sells Herefords" printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, this article indicates that there are problems within the boundaries of West Virginia, and they would appear to be problems which must be resolved within that State. It is the responsibility of every State to provide a climate to make it possible for business to grow, to progress, to flourish. When businesses are forced to the auction block because of the tax structure of that State, such a climate has not been provided. This situation, unfortunate as it is, substantiates my conviction that this proposed legislation is not an aid but a handout. The people in the Appalachian area are too fine to receive this kind of treatment. Neither the pasture-improvement feature, nor any other portion of this bill will be a kindness to these people.

EXHIBIT 1

BULL BRINGS \$29,500 AS MORLUNDA SELLS
HEREFORDS

(By John Hall)

LEWISBURG, W. Va.—Cattlebuyers from 30 States and Canada were lured to the rolling acres of Morlunda Farms Thursday as one of the top Hereford cattle herds in the Nation went on the auction block.

The Nelson family, owners of the Morlunda and blue-ribbon Hereford breeding stock with such names as "J. H. Beau Promino 826th," planned to sell its entire herd during a 3-day auction.

Sources close to the family said the sale was undertaken to avoid both corporation and personal income taxes.

Auctioneers had sold 131 head by late Thursday for a total of \$133,950.