

burden of combat in two successive wars. We think the obligation of military service should be spread a little more than that. We used the date July 27, 1953, which will mean that combat veterans will not be called upon to serve again in anything short of an all-out congressional mobilization.

The gentleman's amendment would bring that date to 1956. Here is what is wrong there. It would mean that you would eliminate your Ready Reserve at the present time. You would have no Ready Reserve at the present time. You would have to begin at scratch. You would weaken the defenses of this country very, very seriously by destroying the Ready Reserve.

The gentleman has stated this is changing the ground rules. The only change in the ground rules has been to soften the impact of the ground rules on those since 1953 and to this hour. We have actually reduced the obligation to some extent of those people but we have in no instance made the obligation heavier on those who were in the service since 1953 to the present hour than it is at the present time. We have made the obligation lighter. They have no complaint about the obligation that they have assumed prior to the time when this bill would go into effect.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that if the Department of Defense wanted to they could apply the provisions of law which states that if a man does not fulfill his Reserve obligation he is subject to a fine of \$10,000 or 5 years in jail?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes, but I am not in favor of enforcing that drastic provision. It is far too severe. We have reduced the obligation and reduced the penalty. We have reduced the overall ground rules so that they are softer on the man in service under this measure than they were before this bill came to the House.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I think the gentleman misunderstands the intent and the effect of the amendment. The effect and the intent is simply that these requirements with regard to men volunteering or drafted for the service of the 48 drills, and so forth, will become effective with all men drafted or enlisting after the effective date of the act. I do not know where the gentleman gets the 1956 date.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman by inference would relieve us of the Ready Reserve we have at the present critical time. Then we would have to start from scratch with no Ready Reserve and build here in the 4 or 5 years allotted under this law a brand new Ready Reserve to defend our country. We need those men at the present time.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman's amendment would postpone the implementation of this program until 1956, should the amendment become law within the next several months.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is what I understand. So I think the amendment is a bad one. I ask that it be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think the motion speaks for itself. I have no desire to take any further time and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ENGLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7000) to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House resolution 291, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NELSON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NELSON moves that H. R. 7000 be re-committed to the Committee on Armed Services for further study.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NELSON) there were—ayes 52, noes 161.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON H. R. 5614

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 5614.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PREDICTION WITH RESPECT TO APPLE PRICES—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 213)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the United States House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5188, to prohibit publication by the Government of the United States of any prediction with respect to apple prices. This bill would amend section 15 (d) of the Agricultural Marketing Act (12 U. S. C. 1141 (j) (d)), as amended, by inserting after the word "cotton" the words "or apples." The effect of this would be to extend to apples the existing prohibitions with respect to the publication of price prospects that now apply only to cotton.

The provision of the act to which apples would be added is very broad. It applies to any officer or employee of the United States, in either the legislative or executive branch of the Government, except to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. It should not be extended to other farm products. In particular, the addition of apples to this provision would further restrict the agricultural outlook service of the Department of Agriculture, since it would prohibit the publication and, on occasion, the formal discussion of future price prospects for apples by any employees of the Department, including cooperative employees of the Federal-State Extension Service.

I believe that it is a vital responsibility of the Federal Government to gather and disseminate accurate, timely, comprehensive, and useful economic information, so that producers and consumers, buyers and sellers may have available to them the maximum amount of economic knowledge. This is especially true of farmers, who generally are not in a position to acquire for themselves all the necessary facts concerning supply and demand conditions affecting their commodities. Because of the great instability of their prices and incomes, they stand in particular need of accurate, timely, and comprehensive economic information to assist them in the development of their plans for production and marketing. Denial to farmers of this type of information in the case of another major commodity would represent a backward step, tending to undermine the foundations of the entire agricultural outlook service.

It is difficult to see how the cutting off of analysis of price trends and dissemination of price prospects by the Department of Agriculture can in any way assist the farmer. Interpretations of the price situation will still be made by others. At times, these may come from sources whose interests run contrary to those of the apple producers. This legislation would reduce or seriously limit the ability of fieldworkers to counteract price rumors detrimental to the farmers' interests.

For these reasons I have felt obliged to withhold my approval from this measure.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The WHITE HOUSE, July 1, 1955.

The SPEAKER. The objection of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered printed.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the President's action in vetoing a bill to stop apple price forecasting by the Department of Agriculture is as inexplicable as it is petty. It is a cruel and unwarranted blow to the smaller apple farmers. The veto does not square with the professed determination of the administration to get the Federal Government out of activities which are wasteful of the taxpayers' money and serve no essential purpose. Apple farmers will find it difficult to understand why the President heeded the plea of bureaucrats of his Department of Agriculture to let them continue the useless and often damaging guessing game on apple prices without giving the apple farmers' organizations, the American Farm Bureau Federation, or the authors of the bill any opportunity to explain why price forecasting on apples has been of no value and has done substantial harm.

In congressional hearings on this legislation, representatives of the apple farmers, and of agriculture generally, testified to the damage and confusion caused by these price guesses, when made under auspices of the Federal Government. The only witness in opposition to the bill was a bureaucrat who understandably did not want to be told to stop doing what he had been doing at public expense, even if it were useless. It was agreed that the bill would have no effect on the other valuable statistical services of the Department of Agriculture, to which the President refers in his message, and would prohibit only price forecasting unwanted by all who were supposed to be served by it. For a number of years, cotton farmers have been protected by law against this crystal-balling by Federal bureaucrats on cotton prices. The apple farmers merely

thought they were entitled to the same treatment as the cotton farmers. The Congress agreed. The President now has told them they are not.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my shock at the President's action in vetoing H. R. 5188. This measure would prohibit publication by the Department of Agriculture of its predictions as to the future price of apples. This was a bill which passed the House and the Senate with little or no opposition. This happened because it had been clearly demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Members of both Houses that this was legislation that was needed. It was needed because many apple growers, large and small, had suffered substantial losses on their crops because in past years the Department of Agriculture's guess as to the future prices of apples proved to be well below the ultimate market prices. As the result of relying on the bad guessing of Mr. Benson's experts, many a farmer was misled into selling his crop for a price far short of what he could have realized without the misleading guidance forthcoming from the Department of Agriculture.

When similar speculations in cotton prices worked a hardship on the cotton growers the Congress passed a law prohibiting the Government from expressing any predictions as to cotton futures. What the Congress attempted to do was to give this same protection to the apple growers of this country, but now the President has come along to deny them this protection. Mr. Eisenhower has recently taken up residence in one of the great apple producing counties of this Nation, and it is difficult to estimate the losses which will flow to many of his new neighbors as a result of today's action by the President. This is indeed an unfortunate veto. One that reflects a complete failure to understand the plight of the typical farmer and the problems he faces.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 107]

Anfuso	Bentley	Burdick
Baker	Bolton,	Canfield
Barden	Oliver F.	Cederberg
Barrett	Bowler	Celler
Belcher	Boykin	Chase
Bell	Buchanan	Chatham

Chipperfield	Hill	Preston
Clark	Hollifield	Reece, Tenn.
Cole	Jackson	Reed, Ill.
Coudert	James	Reed, N. Y.
Dague	Kean	Riehlman
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Rivers
Dawson, Ill.	Kearns	Robison, Ky.
Dempsey	Kelly, N. Y.	St. George
Denton	Kilburn	Scherer
Dies	Kirwan	Sheehan
Dingell	Kluczynski	Siler
Dollinger	Krueger	Smith, Wis.
Doyle	McDowell	Taylor
Eberharter	McGregor	Udall
Fine	Mack, Ill.	Van Pelt
Fino	Mason	Watts
Fjare	Morrison	Widnall
Frazier	Moulder	Wier
Grant	Mumma	Williams, N. Y.
Green, Pa.	Perkins	Yates
Gubser	Polk	Zelenko
Hess	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 349 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION

BILL, 1956

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 294 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7117) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 294 which will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 7117, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 294 would waive points of order against the bill and that is all that it would do.

Mr. Speaker, I think a rundown on the figures that are contained in this bill would be helpful and interesting to the membership of the House. In 1955 the total appropriation in this bill was \$63,062,003. The budget estimate for this year was for \$66,572,138 while the Committee on Appropriations actually recommends in this bill the sum of \$66,280,675 for this fiscal year, which is \$1,291,463 less than was in the 1956 budget estimate.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains the appropriations necessary for the House of Representatives, the joint offices, the Architect of the Capitol, the Botanic Garden, the Library of Congress and the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Speaker, the waiver of points of order is necessary because of a few limitations and legislative provisions not