

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1949

(Legislative day of Friday, March 18, 1949)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, we pray that the chosen representatives of our beloved country may meet the duties and responsibilities of their high vocation with loyal and steadfast devotion.

May they daily dedicate themselves humbly and heroically to the glorious task of building a social order in which the spirit of the Prince of Peace shall prevail.

Grant that they may accept the challenge of every noble adventure and lofty endeavor with a resolute faith in the guiding and sustaining presence of Thy spirit.

May they be inspired with the courageous mind which welcomes new revelations of knowledge and truth and the warm heart which is sensitive and responsive to the needs of struggling humanity.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 6, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 7, 1949, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 790) to grant the consent of the United States to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED
BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Jose Babace;

S. 27. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 208. An act for the relief of Ella L. Browning;

S. 278. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

S. 629. An act to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

S. 748. An act for the relief of Charles L. Bishop.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS—
CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted, without debate, to present routine matters, including insertions in the RECORD, as though we were in the morning hour, without jeopardizing the parliamentary situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest to the able acting majority leader that we have a quorum call.

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Butler	Humphrey	Mundt
Cain	Ives	Myers
Connally	Jenner	Neely
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Downey	Kefauver	Reed
Eastland	Kerr	Robertson
Eaton	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Ellender	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	McCarthy	Stennis
Flanders	McClellan	Taylor
Frear	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McGrath	Vandenberg
George	McKellar	Watkins
Green	McMahon	Wherry
Gurney	Malone	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hill	Millikin	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the junior Senator from Ohio

[Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official committee business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS AT COM-
MITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma subsequently said: Mr. President, at the roll call this morning certain Senators were absent by reason of the fact that they were in attendance on a joint session of the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the House Office Building. The Senators who are members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and who attended the joint session, are the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and myself, as chairman.

I ask unanimous consent that the official reporters be permitted to insert my statement immediately following the roll call which was had this morning.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if the request which he has made either expressly or by any implication includes a request that the names of the Senators mentioned by him shall be included as being on the roll call this morning.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I tried to make it perfectly plain. I asked that, immediately following the roll call, the official reporters be authorized to insert in the RECORD a statement showing the reason why the Senators were absent was that they were in attendance at a joint session of the Agriculture Committees of the two Houses. My statement had no reference to the roll call itself.

Mr. DONNELL. Reserving the right to object, am I correct, then, in understanding that the Senator is not asking that the names of those Senators be included in the roll of those who were present this morning?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator is entirely correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

Mr. TYDINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, I have two matters which will take only half a minute. First, I should

like the RECORD to show, immediately following the quorum call this morning, but not as a part of the quorum call, that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] were in a meeting of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and were there from 10 o'clock this morning until 12:30 o'clock this afternoon, at which meeting there appeared the Secretary for Air, Mr. Symington, the three Chiefs of Staff—Denfeld, Bradley, and Vandenberg—and General Gates, of the Marine Corps.

The reason why we did not leave the meeting was that we felt that these were all busy men, and we did not want to take the time to come over and answer to the roll call and return, thus delaying them and keeping them away from their desks.

I should like to have this explanation appear, not as a part of the quorum call, but immediately following, so that our absence from the roll call will be properly noted in the Journal and the RECORD.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I assume that not only does the Senator mean that the explanation is not to be included as a part of the roll call, but that he is not asking that the names of these Senators be included in the roll of those who were present in the Senate this morning?

Mr. TYDINGS. The names of the Senators I have named will not be included in the roll call, and obviously the explanation could not be included in the roll call, but the explanation is to come immediately after it, so that when the absentees are noted, those who read the RECORD may know what detained them, as they were on more important business for the moment than if they had come over to the Senate Chamber and answered a mere roll call at the morning session.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in order that the RECORD may be absolutely clear, even to my mind, I ask the Senator if I am correct in my understanding that he is not, either expressly or impliedly, requesting that the names of these Senators be included in the roll of those who were present this morning at the roll call.

Mr. TYDINGS. Without using the exact words, the Senator from Maryland, in answer to the interrogatory of the Senator from Missouri, would say that in no manner, shape, or form, directly or indirectly, high or low, broad or narrow, large or small, is it conceived that the request of the Senator from Maryland in any way includes the insertion of the names of the eminent Senators he has referred to in the quorum call held earlier on this floor in this Chamber today.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, by the use of the word "eminent" the Senator is

including all the Senators on the list. Is that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. With the exception of the chairman.

Mr. DONNELL. He is not asking that he himself be included in the roll call? Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I have no objection. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the Chair will recognize Senators for routine matters, without debate, and without interfering with the parliamentary situation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

HERBERT L. HUNTER

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NON-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, together with a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reason for ordering suspension of deportation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE FUND (S. Doc. No. 41)

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, and the Federal Security Administrator, members of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting, pursuant to law, the ninth annual report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid by that Commission during the calendar year 1948, under the Federal Tort Claims Act (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMPACT BETWEEN STATES OF WYOMING AND SOUTH DAKOTA

A letter from the representative of the United States, Cheyenne River Compact Commission, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a compact entered into between the States of Wyoming and South Dakota to provide for the most efficient use of the waters of the Cheyenne River Basin for multiple purposes, together with a copy of his report and recommendation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twenty-seventh annual report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EFFECTS OF TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM ON UNITED STATES TRADE

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Executive Order 10004, a report entitled "Effects of the Trade Agreements Program on United States Trade," being part V of the first annual report of the Tariff Commission on the Operation of the Trade Agreements Program, June 1934 to April 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

W. P. BARTEL

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a statement of facts covering an exception taken by the Comptroller General of the United States to the payment of a claim, together with a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of W. P. Bartel, certifying officer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

EDUCATION OF CERTAIN CHILDREN

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the education of children residing on certain nonsupporting federally owned property, and children residing in localities overburdened with increased school enrollments resulting from Federal activities in the area, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 14

"Concurrent resolution protesting and remonstrating against certain provisions contained in a bill introduced in the Senate of the United States under date of February 25, 1949, by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, entitled 'A bill to foster the cooperative agriculture education work of the extension services; to free the extension services from the performance of nongovernmental functions and political activity; and to promote economy in the expenditure of public funds for the conduct of cooperative agricultural extension work; and for other purposes'.

"Whereas it is necessary and essential that the Agricultural Extension Service be permitted to work with and to assist organizations of farmers, cooperative corporations and associations in order to accomplish the object and purposes of the agricultural extension program; and

"Whereas in the carrying on of the agricultural extension program in Kentucky no funds or other assistance have been accepted from farmers' organizations or other private interests in Kentucky with any conditions attached which would in any way impair or compromise extension agents in the conduct of their work as public servants; and

"Whereas no relationships or activities not proper to the performance of their duties as

public servants have been established or performed by cooperative extension agents in Kentucky; and

"Whereas the bill introduced by Senator THOMAS carries implications of improper activities which in fact have not occurred in Kentucky; and

"Whereas certain of the provisions of the bill introduced by Senator THOMAS would curtail and hamper many of the legitimate and proper functions of the Agricultural Extension Service as conducted in Kentucky; and

"Whereas the effectiveness and usefulness of the Agricultural Extension Service would be seriously impaired and the agricultural economy of Kentucky would be jeopardized if the bill proposed by Senator THOMAS should become law; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"That the bill identified and described in the title of this resolution be and it hereby is condemned and denounced as an unwarranted and unacceptable obstruction of and interference with the proper and advantageous operation of the agricultural extension program.

"That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Kentucky be and they hereby are requested and urged to oppose by all means at their command the passage of said bill.

"That the chief clerk of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky be and he hereby is directed to forward copies of this resolution, forthwith, to the President of the United States, the Vice-President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the United States Senators from Kentucky, and the Representatives in Congress from Kentucky.

"*LAWRENCE W. WETHERBY,*
President of the Senate.

"*T. HERBERT TINSLEY,*
Speaker, House of Representatives.

"*EARLE C. CLEMENTS,*
Governor."

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 20

"Concurrent resolution condemning the trial and conviction of George R. Jones, of Owensboro, Ky., and Clarence R. Hill, of Jackson, Miss., and calling upon the President of the United States and the Secretary of State of the United States of America to use all of the means at their command, including the full power and resources of our National Government and economy, to effect their immediate release

"Whereas shocking news has been received that George R. Jones, of Owensboro, Ky., and Clarence R. Hill, of Jackson, Miss., recruits in the United States Army, were tried in secrecy by the Czechoslovak Government and, without regard for the rights of the accused or without the protection of the normal safeguards provided by free and independent governments for the protection of those accused of law violations, were sentenced to 10 and 12 years, respectively, in prison at hard labor; and

"Whereas the youth of the Commonwealth of Kentucky and from every other State of the Union had given their lives and of their safety, security, and fortunes in order to establish orderly procedure and due process of law all over the world, and for which a terribly horrible and shocking war had just been fought; and

"Whereas the safety and welfare of our form of government demands the full and complete protection of the members of our armed forces, wherever they may be or what-

ever duty they may be given, so that we at home and those other freedom-loving people throughout the world may be able to enjoy the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: Be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"1. That the Commonwealth of Kentucky, as a free and sovereign State, but as a part of the Union of States comprising the United States of America, does hereby condemn as vicious, cruel, inhuman, and unjust the arrest, secret trial, conviction, and sentences of Recruits George R. Jones, of Owensboro, Ky., and Clarence R. Hill, of Jackson, Miss., by the Czechoslovak Government;

"2. That it is necessary in order to insure the welfare and security of our form of government and the maintenance of the armed forces thereof that the security of our citizens, and especially those members of our armed forces, who have been sent abroad be protected and secured at all costs;

"3. That the President of the United States and the Secretary of State of the United States are hereby called upon to use all of the means at their command and at the command of the National Government to effect the immediate and unconditional release of these two members of our armed forces, and to this end, and by this resolution, the Commonwealth of Kentucky pledges its aid, assistance, power, and resources; and

"4. That the clerk of the house of representatives certify sufficient copies of this resolution and that he forward same, via United States registered mail, air-mail special delivery, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, to each Member representing Kentucky in the Congress of the United States, to the family of each of the men affected, and that suitable copies be furnished the press with the request that same be published to the end that all free-thinking and loving people may be informed hereof."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the forty-fifth legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session, respectfully represent, as follows:

"Whereas since the founding of our Nation, the States have exercised sovereignty over the tidelands, the submerged lands, including the soil under navigable inland waters, and soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not; and

"Whereas under the common law and civil law the States' sovereignty and authority over and title to said lands has been long acknowledged, affirmed and respected by the Federal Government whose only powers were expressly delegated to it by the States at the time of the formation of our Government; and

"Whereas the States did not delegate unto the Federal Government authority or power over or title to said lands but retained same to and for the States; and

"Whereas the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of United States against California, while not deciding the question of ownership of the tidewater lands of California, casts a cloud on that State's title to said lands and the minerals and other natural resources beneath; and

"Whereas this decision of the Supreme Court recognizes that the matter of owner-

ship of said tidewater lands is still a question for the Congress to decide; and

"Whereas the title to the tidelands and submerged lands of the States is clouded by this decision and the language therein is so broad as to be extendible to the soil under navigable inland waters and soils under the navigable waters within the territorial jurisdiction of the States, and even to the minerals and other natural resources or important elements on or beneath the soil of the States; and

"Whereas this cloud of uncertainty affects minerals, fisheries, and all other natural resources and should be removed by the Congress, thereby acknowledging and reaffirming ownership to the States; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress passed a bill, reaffirming and acknowledging ownership in the submerged lands and resources of the respective States and quitclaiming all right and title thereto to the respective States reserving only a paramount right to the Government in case of national defense, by a vote of 198 for to 26 against, but the measure died in the Senate by the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States be and the same hereby is memorialized to further consider and enact suitable legislation for the purpose of acknowledging and affirming ownership of submerged lands and resources thereof to the respective States in accordance with the heretofore long recognized constitutional rights of the States; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to each House of the Congress and to each Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Oregon and to each of the United States Senators from this State, and urge that they individually and collectively give wholehearted support to bring about the enactment of such legislation.

"Adopted by senate March 7, 1949.

"*WM. E. WALSH,*
President of Senate.

"Concurred in by house March 28, 1949.

"*FRANK J. VAN DYKE,*
Speaker of House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution 89

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a joint resolution, bearing number House Joint Resolution 29, which contains the following title, recitals, and resolve:

"Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as 'Interfaith Day'

"Whereas the United States of America was founded on the firm basis of freedom of thought and conscience; and

"Whereas the fomenting of antagonism between Americans on a basis of sectarian creed is contrary to American traditions and to the spirit of the guarantees of freedom of worship embodied in the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas it ought to be, and is hereby declared to be, the policy of Congress to encourage the mutual understanding of all people of good will; and

"Whereas the program of the interfaith movement offers a practicable means for encouraging such mutual understanding: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fourth Sunday in September of each year is hereby designated as 'Interfaith Day,' and the Pres-

ident of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such day, and urging the participation of all Americans and all religious groups in the United States, regardless of sect or creed, to participate in the observance of such day by such means as they may deem appropriate; and

"Whereas the great State of New York, as well as the entire Nation, draws its strength and inspiration from all races and creeds and should by its example set a standard for the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed House Joint Resolution 29; and it is further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That His Excellency, the Governor of the State of New York, shall issue, publish, and declare an appropriate proclamation to the people of the State of New York designating and setting aside annually the fourth Sunday of September to be known as 'Interfaith Day' and inviting the people of the State of New York to observe this day in churches and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies designed to remind all people that the Fatherhood of God is best exemplified by living in brotherhood with all mankind; and it is further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York.

"By order of the assembly.

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,

"Clerk."

"In senate, March 30, 1949, concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the senate.

"WILLIAM S. KING,

"Clerk."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas certain real property in the heart of the business district in Seattle, familiarly known as the Metropolitan Tract, has for many years been owned by the University of Washington; and

"Whereas said tract has long been held under lease by the Metropolitan Building Company, a private corporation, and occupied by several large office and other buildings; and

"Whereas, said Metropolitan Building Company has paid tremendous amounts to the Federal Government by way of income taxes; and

"Whereas the aforesaid lease will expire by its terms on November 1, 1954; and

"Whereas public controversy has arisen on the question whether such lease should be renewed by the University or not, such controversy stemming from the fact that the operation of the buildings aforesaid by the University, rather than by a private corporation, would obviate the payment of Federal income taxes, and to such extent would result in greater income to the University; and

"Whereas the welfare of the State of Washington in this critical period would be materially advanced by a Federal grant to said University in the amount of the income taxes above mentioned; and

"Whereas such a grant, while tending to abate the public controversy within the State of Washington, would unquestionably conduce to a promotion of the Federal weal by providing additional revenue for higher education: now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Washington in the thirty-first regular legis-

lative session assembled, That the Congress of the United States be requested by appropriate legislation to provide for a grant to the University of Washington for university purposes in the amount of the Federal income taxes heretofore paid to the National Government by the Metropolitan Building Company, aforesaid, and for the payment to said University for the same purposes of such amounts as may in future be received by the National Government by way of income taxes from said Metropolitan Building Company; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be immediately transmitted to the Honorable, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Washington Congressional delegation."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas there is deep concern about the intention of the Atomic Energy Commission of the United States to condemn the Wahluke slope, which is situated in Grant and Franklin Counties, in the State of Washington, and constitutes some of the best farm land in the entire Columbia River Basin; and

"Whereas the land sought to be condemned represents about 20 percent of the potential productivity of the entire Columbia River project and has the longest-growing season of any land in the State of Washington; and

"Whereas if this land is taken the State will lose about \$30,000,000 annually in new wealth, which will entail a loss of many millions of dollars in taxes badly needed by the State; and

"Whereas the reason given for condemnation of this property is to protect the health of the farmers residing and to reside on this property; and

"Whereas this does not make sense for the reason that under the law and regulations of the Columbia Basin project, there will be only about 2,000 farms on the Wahluke slope to be occupied and used by about 2,000 families, or about 10,000 people, whose health would be involved; and

"Whereas the cities of Pasco and Richland, Wash., and the 20,000 people now employed at the atomic-energy plant near Richland, or an approximate total of 100,000 people, will be as close or closer to the plant than will the residents of the land in question; and

"Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission, upon hiring people to work in the plant, assures them that working in or near the plant will not be injurious to their health; and

"Whereas the taking of this land will also deprive approximately 2,000 war veterans of an opportunity for a farm and being able to make a good living on some of the richest farm land in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington in thirty-first legislative session assembled, That this highly important matter to the people of the State of Washington and the Wahluke Slope Landowners' Association receive immediate attention and that the effort to condemn this property be stopped in order that the Bureau of Reclamation may proceed with canals and ditches now in process of construction to bring this property in a proper state of productivity as soon as possible as heretofore planned; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the honorable, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Washington congressional delegation."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 29

"Concurrent resolution endorsing the project for a harbor at Kawaihae, Island of Hawaii, and requesting the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate Federal funds for said project

"Whereas the port of Hilo is the only port of the island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, where deep sea vessels can dock; and

"Whereas because of the possibility of tidal waves and other circumstances there is need of another such port on the said island; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, pursuant to Public Law 525, Seventy-ninth Congress, has reported favorably upon and recommended such a port and harbor at Kawaihae, island of Hawaii, at an initial cost to the United States Government of \$5,525,500 and to the Territory of Hawaii, for local cooperation, of \$1,478,000; and

"Whereas by Act 95 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1947, the board of harbor commissioners of said Territory was authorized to issue revenue bonds and the sum of \$1,000,000 was appropriated out of proceeds from the issuance of said bonds 'for overseas terminal, Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii, including plans, land acquisition, improvements to land and other necessary expenses,' subject to the proviso that no expenditures, except for surveys and design work, should be made for such project until the United States engineer department approved the project and agreed to cooperate through the development of said Kawaihae Harbor: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the project for a harbor at Kawaihae, island of Hawaii, as planned and recommended by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, be, and it is hereby endorsed; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby requested to appropriate the aforesaid Federal funds for the said project; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, expressing appreciation to the people of France for sending to the people of Oklahoma the Merci Car; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See context of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on April 4, 1949, p. 3852, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the Long Beach (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of legislation to curtail Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by A. Santacaterina, president, Italian Women's Community Hour Club, of Chicago, Ill., relating to the return of former colonies of Italy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the James Wallace Costigan Post No. 11, the American Legion, Department of Kentucky, of New Port, Ky., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit communism in America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by W. E. Pelk, president, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and dean of the College of Education, University of Minnesota, of Minneapolis,

Minn., and sundry other officials of colleges of the United States, relating to Federal aid to public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Weiser (Idaho) Chamber of Commerce; the Medical Society of the County of Albany, N. Y.; the Eighth District Dental Society, of New York, and the Fort Worth District Dental Society, of Fort Worth, Tex., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Mrs. Walter Carroll Anderson, State president, and Mrs. Claude Palmer Stephens, State recording secretary, Kentucky Society, United States Daughters of 1812, of Lexington, Ky., together with a resolution adopted by that society, relating to the Freedom Train; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 42. A bill for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson; with amendments (Rept. No. 229);

S. 408. A bill for the relief of Barbara O'Brien Farquhar; with amendments (Rept. No. 230);

H. R. 594. A bill for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 227);

H. R. 595. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 234);

H. R. 1094. A bill for the relief of Nellie M. Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 222);

H. R. 1164. A bill for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey; without amendment (Rept. No. 223);

H. R. 1169. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz; with an amendment (Rept. No. 228);

H. R. 1176. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hahn; without amendment (Rept. No. 224);

H. R. 1271. A bill for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 235);

H. R. 1280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes; without amendment (Rept. No. 225);

H. R. 1286. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland; without amendment (Rept. No. 226); and

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution for the relief of the First Citizens Bank & Trust Co., administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr.; with amendments (Rept. No. 231).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations to the Federal Security Administrator in addition to those authorized under title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 233).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 526. A bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 232).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 576. A bill to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to

Myton, Utah; with amendments (Rept. No. 238);

H. R. 220. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301); without amendment (Rept. No. 236); and

H. R. 1998. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 237).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 221) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-7793367, Acevedo, Ramona nee Diaz Galetty.

A-6683184, Adam, Emmanuel Konstantinos or Emanuel Constantinos Adam.

A-5880692, Altmann, Anton Frederick (Friedrich).

A-6758166, Alves, Domingos Esteves.

A-6115712, Angulano-Alcazar, Felix alias Agustin Valencia alias Agustin Valencia Angulano alias Felix Angulano alias Felix Angulano.

A-3224363, Andersen, Knud Kaspar.

A-2940833, Anderson, Axel Hjalmar alias Axel Hjalmar Carlsson.

A-9577267, Apeessos, Ioannis Pndelis alias John P. Apeessos.

A-6679669, Appelthaler, Katerina.

A-6679668, Appelthaler, Kurt Robert.

A-2211955, Arellano, Domingos Ramos.

A-1393347, Arellano, Soledad Valadez or Soledad Maria Valadez.

A-6071241, Arellano, Innocencio.

A-6071239, Arellano, Domingo, Jr., or Dominic Arellano.

A-6071240, Arellano, Juan or John Arellano.

A-3779214, Arlt, Hans Erich Lothar.

A-1153452, Arrighi, Alessandro or Alexander or Alessandro Arrigo.

A-6301280, Bagniewski, Wanda Stanislaw or Wanda Stanislaw Klernik.

A-6321666, Bastide, Genevieve Marcelle.

A-2118744, Bau, Siu-Tsung or Marguerite Janet Bau Chang.

A-3419857, Baum, Betty.

A-3151534, Baumann, Henrik Chaskiel or Henry Baumann.

A-6026888, Beitelstein, Anton, Anton Stein, Tony Stein or Anton Beitelstein, Anton Beitelstein.

A-7765476, Berard, Jorge Vandesmet.

A-5920168, Berkle, Ivera Romalia.

A-6434078, Bernheimer, Ludwig.

A-5153633, Bianchi, Luigi.

A-5932160, Blake, Eulalie Constanca or Eulalie Constanca Turnbull.

A-6760216, Blake, Helena Ketruda or Helena Ketruda Powell.

A-3113337, Bober, Maria Theresia Gerber.

A-6288068, Bronner, Helen Tamara Mariana formerly Helen Tamara Marianna Gavriloff.

A-6316110, Brouwer, Frans Hieronimus Borgman.

A-6625552, Brown, Doris nee Singh.

A-2673048, Brown, Morris Simon alias Movsa Braunreit.

A-6701608, Burgers, Willem Adolph Johan.

A-6645933, Butterick, Janet Barry or Janet Barry Mack.

A-7651629, Candia, Jose alias Jose Candia Urguidi or Jose Urguidi or Jose.

A-9769688, Carro, Alfredo or Alfred Carro.

A-3299176, Castillo, Geronimo or Giro Castillo.

A-6336616, Chalmers, Bromley Russell Scott.

A-6336617, Chalmers, Jill.

A-7041842, Chin, Yuen Chew or Chin Yuen Chew or Chew Yuen Chinn.

A-5138325, Chui, Wan; Chui Wan; Hang Kin Chui; Hankin Hunt.

A-1581731, Clesia, Ludwik.

A-5179937, Valdes, Maria Hortensia Clemente y Sanchez McDonald; or Hortensia Clemente y Sanchez McDonald Valdes nee Hortensia Clemente y Sanchez; Maria Hortensia Clemente Sanchez or Maria Hortensia Clemente McDonald.

A-5611302, Cohen, Joseph.

A-4860986, Cohen, Gertie Gertrude.

A-2554813, Conradt, Ernst Heinrich Wilhelm or Ernst Henry Conradt.

A-6262074, Cucullu, Francesca R.

A-2113086, DaGoutis, Louise Emille nee Masse.

A-6404432, Davis, Diane May.

A-6404433, Davis, Eileen Marie.

A-6404431, Davis, Philip Bennet.

A-2945357, Dawson, Harriet Mae or Hattie Mae Lloyd or Harriet Mae Gibson.

A-4746398, De Escalante, Alicia Adriana Vara or Alicia Adriana Vara-Solis DeCordero.

A-3197506, De Gomez, Rita Avena alias Rita Avena.

A-6079055, Dimakos, Christos alias Christos Demakos.

A-4665465, DiPietro, Sebastiano or Pietro Petrillo or Grido Cardella.

A-9836789, Drioli, Salvatore.

A-9671716, Elvir, Cesar Augusto.

A-4785369, Engles, Elsie Violet nee Elsie Violet Huffman.

A-5906567, Fahie, Adeline nee Nibbs.

A-3481412, Fahie, Joseph Alfred.

A-5832029, Fahie, Rebecca.

A-3193626, Fekete, Agnes Elizabeth nee Pauza now Kourcosk or Korsak.

A-6774677, Frank, Annie or Ann Frank or Ann Burtinik Frank or Annie Burtinik Frank.

A-6716135, Frazer, Joseph Wellington.

A-6464484, Frenkel, Mayer.

A-6020425, Gabriel, Manuel Gimenez.

A-6405609, Gallegos, Manuel or Manuel Medina.

A-3750703, Garcia, Juan or John Garcia.

A-6063595, Garcia, William Joseph.

A-5140522, Garlipp, Franz Hermann or Frank Herman Garlipp.

A-5048436, Ghinelli, Germano or Jerry Ghinelli.

A-6051631, Gobb, Marguerite Elinor nee Aaron also known as Marguerite Elinor Aaron.

A-6500830, Gomez, Maria Pilar alias Olivia Gomez alias Maria Olivia Gomez Pedroza or Maria Pila Gomez Quesada.

A-6288439, Greaves, Anne Marie nee Anne Marie Erneste Pierre Monlouis-Eugene.

A-6630053, Gson-Niebling, Goesta Bertil.

A-3053878, Hanko, Joseph Ewald or Joseph or Jozef Hanko.

A-6413603, Harvie, Meryl Lorraine or Meryl Lorraine Grayson.

A-6369265, Hernandez-Gutierrez, Jose Maria.

A-4463931, Haimburger, Rudolf Gustave or Rudolf Haimburger.

A-6590997, Huggins, William Archibald.

A-6425288, Jacobs, Olive Jane.

A-6446194, Joanta, Florence nee Florence Antonescu.
 A-9505156, Johansen, Kristian Rudolf.
 A-4624493, Kimbell, Ofelia Aycardi nee Aycardi.
 A-9706894, Kokolis, Jonnes Peter; or Kokolis, John Peter alias John Nicholas Kokolis or Ioannis Kokolis or Ioanis Gianaris or Ioannis Panagiotis Kokolis or Ioanis Koukalis.
 A-6489767, Kostrzak, Lita Foerster, nee Lita Foerster.
 A-6440727, Kovar, Anton or Anton Joseph Kovar.
 A-6208118, Kromhout, Arle Jan.
 A-4549342, Laeske, Hedwig Anna, formerly Browne nee Bardeleben.
 A-6484122, Lansford, Ethel Matilda, formerly Ethel Matilda Molohon, nee MacDonaid.
 A-2773539, Lee, Ruth Mo or Ruth Lo-Tak Mo.
 56122/739, Lencovich, Joseph Peter.
 A-1304739, Lepore, Salvatore, alias Samuel or Sam Lepore alias Samuel Le Poce.
 A-4769421, Lettsome, Edward, or Edward Letsome.
 A-1424552, Levitsky, Thomas.
 A-6261599, Longos, Katina.
 A-1322447, Lopez-Martinez, Juan.
 A-2365797, de Lopez, Maria Valadez-Romero.
 A-4388670, Lo Surdo, Sebastiano.
 A-2145986, Lucas, Lieselotte, or Lieselotte Muenzer or Lotte Muenzer or Munzer.
 A-6706960, Luschning, Klaus Oswald or Klaus Carnival.
 A-4584463, Mac Clymont, David, or Thomas Wood.
 A-5777765, Mahlman, Bruno William, or Bruno William Dietrich Mahlman.
 A-4052648, Malerba, Domenico, or Domenick Malerba.
 A-6095324, Mantzuranis, Evagelia, or Evagelia Mantzuranl or Evagelia Stratigakis.
 A-6645782, Mar, Judy, alias Judy Muck.
 A-6645783, Mar, James, alias James Muck.
 A-6566614, Mariades, Helene Agouras, formerly Helene Andrea Agouras.
 A-6612108, Marquez, Arturo.
 A-6612107, Marquez, Maria Del Carmen.
 A-6694634, Martinez, Cruz.
 A-6689502, McDougall, Joseph Ignatius.
 A-3024922, McGill, John Joseph.
 A-6603045, Mendoza, Julio.
 A-6608918, Mendoza, Jose Salome.
 A-9578104, Montgomery, Clem.
 A-5694677, Muller, Mathias, or Mathew Muller.
 A-5694675, Muller, Barbara, nee Messner.
 A-3869778, Munoz, Maria Amparo Gegunde Gomez, nee Maria Gegunde.
 A-2481845, Munroe, Harold Bruce.
 A-9801088, Newton, Arthur.
 A-4026037, Nimeneh, Thomas Kun, or Thomas Nimeneh or Thomas Nimeneh-Bey or Thomas Kun Nemerea or Keen Nimeneh or Sam Nimeneh or Keen Nimeh.
 A-4651936, O'Dwyer, Elizabeth nee Ahern alias Elizabeth Organ.
 A-6611843, Ottley, Robyn Josephine.
 A-9836874, Palceira, Vicente or Vicente Palceira Perez.
 A-2201575, Palermo, Rosario or Richard Ross Palermo or Ross Palermo.
 A-3140422, Palermo, Salvatore or Samuel Palermo.
 A-3236433, Palermo, Vincenzo or James Palermo.
 A-3140520, Palermo, Anna.
 A-9769360, Pane, Antonino or Anthony Pane or Antonio Pane.
 A-6256122, Papadakis, Georgia N.
 A-4642742, Parasiliti, Nicola Sebastiano Collazzo or Nicola Sebastiano Parasiliti Collazzo or Nicholas Parasi or Benny Pernite or Nicholas Benny Pernite.
 A-6374752, Paul, Alvin Colton Thomas Theophilus.
 A-6321342, Piekarz, Hersz.
 A-6633957, Pilostomos, Christos Antonios.

A-7598205, Questel, Francois Marie Edouard, or Edouard Questel.
 A-5369159, Ramos, Anastacio.
 A-3586557, Ramos, Anacleto.
 A-5711339, Rando, Bartolo.
 A-4798904, de Rangel, Rita Morales or Rita Arroyo.
 A-7703612, Rehen, Estrid Viola Margareta or Estrid Viola Margareta Tengwall nee Sundberg.
 A-9582529, Reinsma, Otte or Otto Reinsma.
 A-6290531, Reiter, Fanny nee Diamond or Fany Reiter.
 A-4030409, Resch, Frank or Frank Reck or Franz Resch.
 A-6608814, Reynolds, Bernard Douglas.
 A-5917858, Robles, Isidro.
 A-6001963, Roberts, Norma Elizabeth or Norma E. Roberts or Norma Roberts.
 A-7757524, Rodgers, Naomi Elizabeth.
 A-6113669, Roman-Rodriguez, Antonio.
 A-3680851, Rostar, Victor.
 A-6373974, Rothstein, Izydor.
 A-6373973, Rothstein, Helena.
 A-6611826, Rudd, James Sidney.
 A-3667351, Ruiz-Carillo De Quintero, Maria or Dolores Cardenas-Soto.
 A-2548950, Rullo, Hazel Ann nee DeLisie.
 A-9776541, Russo, Salvatore.
 A-5155756, Sagert, Clarence James.
 A-5573562, Schenk, Otto alias Otto Lehman.
 A-5151143, Schneider, Richard Georg.
 A-4728863, Schoenberg, Wilhelm Heinrich August or William Schoenberg.
 A-6376906, Semega, Maria nee Maria Palovick.
 A-5314309, Shee, Ong Kwok or Ong Kwock Shee or Roy Ong.
 A-6378078, Shumis, Artemis Troyannou or Artenoula Trogiannou or Artemis Trolannou or Artemis Troyannou.
 A-1963646, Sirianos, George or Georgios Theodore Sirianos.
 A-6446698, Smedley, Shane Karen Douglas.
 A-4699538, Sommer, Oscar Felix or Oskar Felix Sommer or Felix Sommer.
 A-5465763, Stevens, Annie Isabella.
 A-6772017, Sturmer, Gerlinde Maria.
 A-4433087, Tackolander, Leonard Helge, alias Leonard Quire.
 A-5880975, Tatem, Edmund Adolphus.
 A-7539649, Tomas-Morely, Jose or Jose Tomas, Jr.
 A-5357499, Tornow, Marie nee Wejnis or Marie Fischer.
 A-6345256, Trapatsa, Chrysoula.
 A-9836782, Ullah, Anfar.
 A-6346062, Valdes, Olga nee Rafaelades.
 A-9727432, Valjas, Artemi.
 A-6459280, Vasquez, Jorge Carrion alias Robert Franco.
 A-1114647, Vestes, Stratos or Ernest Vestes alias Efstiatios Vestis.
 A-6690309, Villegas, Ramon, alias Ramon Villegas-Ortiz.
 A-6785838, Wallace, Ezra.
 A-1052865, Wasserman, Benjamin or Bernard Wasserman or Benjamin Wasserman.
 A-5750607, Wayditch, Julia alias Julia Bornyaszi Oroszy.
 A-4392874, Whearty, James Patrick or James Wheatley.
 A-6431871, Willman, Philip John Archibald.
 A-4777885, Wilson, Arthur Rutherford.
 A-7799625, Wilson, Walter Allen.
 A-6078139, Wright, Lourdes Dizon.
 A-6757818, Yang, Chao-Chen.
 A-6739338, Yang, Dzing-Tsch Shun.
 A-2963680, Yuelling, Joseph or Yoesef.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 7, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Jose Babace;
 S. 27. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 208. An act for the relief of Ella L. Browning;

S. 278. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

S. 629. An act to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

S. 748. An act for the relief of Charles L. Bishop.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1524. A bill for the relief of Edith Schelber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH (by request):

S. 1525. A bill to provide for the appointment of a deputy disbursing officer and assistant disbursing officers for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1526. A bill for the relief of Helena Vieira de Sa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MILLER, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SCHOEFFEL, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 1527. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON (for Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 1528. A bill for the relief of Elmer Belier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1529. A bill for the relief of Amy L. Hefington; and

S. 1530. A bill for the relief of public utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 1531. A bill for the relief of Mayer Minikes; and

S. 1532. A bill for the relief of Alfred F. Bosche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOHN D. MAGRATH MEMORIAL VETERANS' HOSPITAL, WEST HAVEN, CONN.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, on March 24, 1949, I had the pleasure of introducing a bill, S. 1387, which provides that the proposed Veterans' Administration hospital in West Haven, Conn., be officially designated on the public records as the John D. Magrath Memorial Veterans Hospital, a fitting tribute to Connecticut's great American, who was killed in action just 4 years ago today. I have a statement in connection with that bill which I would like to have printed in the RECORD.

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

On the field of battle in Italy on April 14, 1945, John D. Magrath, then in his twentieth year of age, gave his life for his country in an action that has since been designated to be "gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty."

John D. Magrath was one of Connecticut's many great and illustrious sons who went forth to do battle for those ideals which all of us who are true Americans believe in.

This young Connecticut youth, in the action which resulted in his death, captured

an enemy machine gun, killed eight enemies and wounded six others before making the supreme sacrifice. His individual action and bravery resulted in his being awarded posthumously the Medal of Honor.

The citation, as signed by President Harry S. Truman, and which now reposes on the mantel of the Magrath home in East Norwalk, Conn., overlooking the beautiful blue waters of Long Island Sound, where John Magrath went swimming and played as a boy, reads as follows:

"Magrath, John D.: Rank and organization: Private, first class, Company G, Eighty-fifth Infantry, Tenth Mountain Division. Place and date: Near Castel d'Alano, Italy, April 14, 1945. Entered service at East Norwalk, Conn., G. O. No. 71, July 17, 1946. Citation: He displayed conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty when his company was pinned down by heavy artillery, mortar, and small-arms fire near Castel d'Alano, Italy. Volunteering to act as a scout, armed only with a rifle, he charged headlong into withering fire, killing two Germans and wounding three in order to capture a machine gun. Carrying this enemy weapon across an open field through heavy fire, he neutralized two more machine-gun nests; he then circled behind four other Germans, killing them with a burst as they were firing on his company. Spotting another dangerous enemy position to his right, he knelt with the machine gun in his arms and exchanged fire with the Germans until he had killed two and wounded three. The enemy now poured increased mortar and artillery fire on the company's newly won position. Private Magrath fearlessly volunteered again to brave the shelling in order to collect a report of casualties. Heroically carrying out this task, he made the supreme sacrifice—a climax to the valor and courage that are in keeping with the highest tradition of the military service."

FEDERAL AID TO CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. KERR, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. McCLELLAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 834) to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments for the construction of additional school facilities, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, ordered to be printed, and printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 8, after the word "Administrator," insert the following sentence: "No loan or grant shall be made hereunder unless the school facilities proposed to be provided therewith shall have been approved by such State educational authority as may have jurisdiction or control of such school facilities."

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, between lines 6 and 7, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 5. Section 350 (a) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out so much of the proviso as precedes the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Provided, That—

"(A) the President shall suspend the application to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of any country which, through restrictive quotas, discriminatory taxation, or other restrictive trade practices, discriminates against articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States, its Territories or possessions; and

"(B) the President may suspend the application to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of any country because of any other discriminatory treatment by it of American commerce or because of other acts (including the operation of international cartels) or policies which in his opinion tend to defeat the purposes set forth in this section."

"(2) By adding at the end thereof the following:

"Any suspension pursuant to subparagraph (A) of the preceding paragraph shall continue in effect so long as the country to which it applies continues such discriminatory practices. During such period no agreement pursuant to this section shall be entered into or renewed with the government of such country or any instrumentality thereof, and any such agreement then outstanding with such government or instrumentality shall be terminated as soon as may be possible under its terms."

"On page 2, lines 7 and 18, redesignate sections 5 and 6 as sections 6 and 7, respectively."

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and myself I submit a resolution dealing with the Missouri River Basin, which I ask to have appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD together with a statement which I had expected to deliver on the floor of the Senate; but in order to save the time of the Senate, I am willing to have the statement printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the resolution and statement by the Senator from Kansas will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 104) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Whereas there is now before Congress large requests for appropriations for projects in the Missouri River Basin for flood control, irrigation, navigation, domestic and industrial water supply, power development, and other purposes; and

Whereas the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government has filed with Congress reports declaring there is wholly inadequate assurance that the projects undertaken are feasible, and that the objective of maximum benefits at the lowest cost is being obtained; and

Whereas we are told that it would be foolhardy to undertake a further expenditure of billions of dollars without revision of both policy and organizational arrangements and the task force further recommends at least a partial moratorium on further projects; and

Whereas the task force report and the report of the Commission constitute a warning to Congress that enormous amounts of money are being expended on the Missouri River Basin notwithstanding the fact that there is no coordinated plan in existence to justify such expenditures; and

Whereas the economic feasibility of many existing and proposed projects in the Missouri River Basin have been seriously questioned in the report of the Commission on

Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government and by other engineering authority; and

Whereas there is not now before Congress an over-all study to enable Congress to determine the impact of one program upon the other in the Missouri River Basin; and

Whereas a unified, independent and competent study and investigation of the total needs of the basin is necessary before Congress can properly pass upon pending and future requests for appropriations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to appoint a committee of independent, competent, and experienced persons, including competent engineers, to make a survey and investigation of the needs of the Missouri River Basin, taking into consideration present and proposed programs for flood control, irrigation, navigation, domestic and industrial water supply, power development, and all other matters pertinent thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That such committee is hereby directed to make its report together with its recommendations to the President and Congress on or before the 30th day of September 1949.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee should be authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places as it deems necessary, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants, to request the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the service, information, records, data, and facilities of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. It is suggested that the sum of \$250,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution be made available.

The statement by Mr. REED is as follows:

COMMENT OF SENATOR REED, OF KANSAS, ON HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN FOR MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Kansas is nearly equally divided, territorially, between the Missouri River Basin and the Arkansas River Basin. The population of Kansas is also nearly equally divided between these two basins. I have lived all my life in Kansas. My children were born in Kansas and grew up in that State. Everything I own is in Kansas. I am tremendously concerned with the fullest possible development of the Missouri River Basin. Along with many others who view this situation objectively, but with deep interest, I have had growing doubts as to the adequacy of what is known as the Pick-Sloan plan for development of this basin. There seems to be an almost utter lack of actual coordination between the Army engineers, who are responsible for flood control and navigation, and the Bureau of Reclamation which is responsible for irrigation. Power development is divided between these two agencies. Neither pays any attention to soil conservation. When representatives of each of these agencies appeared before the Senate committees of which I am a member, I failed to find anyone who had an adequate conception of the whole Missouri Basin policy and development.

Along with the people of the country, generally, I welcomed the recent report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, known as the Hoover Commission, and the report of its task force on natural resources. Among the people, I find universal approval of the purpose of that report in the way of greater efficiency and less cost, including extravagance of Government. I have not heard dissent from

the objectives set out in the Hoover Commission report from a single citizen, whether from Kansas or any other part of the United States.

After having given much thought and study to the Missouri Basin general picture, I was not surprised to find on page 30 of the Hoover task force report this comment:

"The result (the combined Pick and Sloan plans) is in no sense an integrated development plan for the basin, and there is serious question whether agreement between the two agencies (the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation) is not more costly to the public than disagreement."

Much has been, and is being, said from time to time, about how adequately the so-called interagency has met, and can continue to meet, the various problems. My own observation has been that the interagency committee is not really effective. It is made up of governors and representatives of the various States which meets from time to time and generally accepts conditions laid down by Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. There has been scant consideration by the interagency committee of the economic soundness of many, perhaps most, of the projects that have been listed by these two agencies. I have conversed with representatives from some of the various States and find them without adequate conception of the whole problem. They are mostly concerned in the amount of money to be spent in their respective States.

Therefore, I was not surprised to find this comment by the Hoover Commission task force.

"The committees have failed to solve any important aspect of the problem of interagency coordination because the dominant members, the corps and the Bureau, have been unwilling to permit interagency committees to settle their differences. . . . It has been demonstrated time and again that neither by voluntary cooperation nor by executive coordination can the major conflicts be ironed out."

The task force, without any recorded opposition, ordered published as a part of its report a study of the Missouri Basin operations of the Army and the Bureau as an example of present bureaucratic mismanagement and waste.

On page 119 of the task force report we are told that in July 1948 the estimated cost of the then planned Missouri basin projects was set at \$6,359,711,399. This is a huge sum of money even in these times of Government extravagance and reckless spending. Beginning at page 136 of the report I am discussing, the task force states cogent reasons why the Pick-Sloan plan should not be used as a pattern for river basin developments. I am quoting briefly from that report:

"1. The program as a whole has not been properly evaluated in terms of the national interest. As far as can be determined, the relative merits of extensive subhumid irrigation development as compared to other means of increasing agricultural production have not been considered. . . .

"2. The program has been planned very nearly backward. . . .

"(a) The programs started with the big dams and other engineering structures of some size. They were planned without reference to multiple demands for the same water, and without knowledge of the likely over-all pattern of social and economic development. . . .

"(c) Probably most serious is the fact that the programs were planned in many of their phases without adequate data on soil fertility, irrigability, water amount and quality, consumer acceptance of irrigation, and other basic economic data. . . .

"3. A corollary of the lack of basic data is the fact that planning has been undertaken, and construction started in the face of funda-

mental uncertainties which may lead to a waste of public funds. . . .

"4. The organization for administering the program for the basin as a whole lacks flexibility. Twenty-four Federal agencies are already concerned, and a few more should be. Each of these is administratively responsible to Washington, and only a few of them are so organized that the basin falls under a single management for them. . . . The result is lack of "cross-fertilization," even at higher administrative levels, lack of consultation on day-to-day decisions, a tendency to consider plans crystallized once they have been authorized. . . .

"6. After mention of the complicated organization now concerned with Missouri Valley development it perhaps is superfluous to say again that there is no program for the valley as a whole."

Every Member of this Senate should study this task force report, and the special report on the Missouri Basin with a view to an investigation of the agencies and some of the men who have come before committees of Congress and represented to us that they sought appropriations for a unified, coordinated Missouri Basin development plan. This report shows that they knew better.

The task-force study tells us, at page 130, that personnel in the Bureau of Reclamation at one time warned Congress against certain projects, but after negotiating a compromise—a deal—out in Omaha, Nebr., they took the cynical view that they had no obligation to the people who employ them to warn against continuation of the plans for those wasteful, unnecessary projects.

One engineer bluntly stated:

"When the Bureau opposed the Garrison and Gavin's Point Dams there was no complete program. When we reached an agreement we withdrew from the fields of flood control and navigation. We shall be the sole judge of requirements for reclamation. If the Army engineers say those dams are required for their functions, we have no opinion."

That is the attitude, Mr. President, of men upon whom this Congress is forced to rely for engineering guidance, for sound engineering, for honesty, and for facts upon which to base our judgments in the appropriation of hundreds of millions—yes, billions—of dollars of money. They were ready to shut their eyes to waste, to maintain silence while hundreds of millions were poured into projects which were of little or no value. They stood ready to have no opinion while this went on.

This report shows we have been misled; this Congress was not told the whole truth; enormous appropriations were made while the men who should have warned Congress stood aside deliberately silent to protect their own bureaucratic prerogatives in the Missouri Basin. For a time they warned about wasteful proposals, but later they made a deal to keep mum about each other's extravagances and waste.

The chairman of this task force was Leslie A. Miller, a former Governor of Wyoming, who is known to many of us as a man of great ability and integrity. Next is Horace M. Albright, former director of the National Park Service. There are two more former governors—one from each party—former Governor John Dempsey, of New Mexico, and former Governor Ralph Carr, of Colorado.

The other men are also eminent citizens. They are Donald H. McLaughlin, president of Homestake Mining Corp.; Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president of Johns Hopkins University; Dr. Gilbert White, president of Haverford College, and Prof. Samuel T. Dana, dean of the school of forestry and conservation at the University of Michigan.

These eminent men tell us that this Congress has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars on the advice and testimony of ad-

ministrators who failed to give us the true picture of their operations.

The full implications of this report, Mr. President, actually add up to a scandalous episode in the history of our Government. I believe we should call before an appropriate committee the men who have been telling us that this was a unified, coordinated plan to get appropriations and see what they say now. I think that we might start with that publicity release which Senator GILLETTE recently quoted to the Senate, when the Pick-Sloan scheme was first floated, and bring out into the open the motivations—the complete cynicism of men in high places about use of the people's money—which a rereading of that press release now reveals.

Let me repeat the excerpt which Senator GILLETTE read to us. The Army and the Bureau had 2 days of discussions at Omaha and on November 8, 1944, told us that they had developed:

"The best practical plan for the Missouri River Basin for navigation, flood control, irrigation, reclamation, power, and all other beneficial uses of the water of the Missouri River and its tributaries."

Today we are told by the eminent men I have named that it was no plan at all, and that the participants were moving forward to obtain from the Congress and expend more than \$6,300,000,000 in pursuance of their scheme.

What has happened to standards of public service? What sort of political morality is it that men, entrusted by the people to protect their interests, can permit themselves to make deals to close their eyes to gigantic waste? They propose to spend \$6,300,000,000 without any plan except an inside agreement not to expose each other's stories before the public and this Congress.

I direct your attention to the fact, Mr. President, that in the Department of Interior report of the Hoover Commission, the conclusions of the task force are quoted with approval. Some of the passages I have read to you were picked up by Mr. Hoover and his associates. The report finds that Pick-Sloan was not a plan, and the interagency committee was not solving the conflicts which really existed, although the public had been told that there were none.

There were dissents about a proper reorganization, but I do not find any member of the Hoover Commission contradicted any of the statements which I have quoted.

There is a growing criticism of, and lack of confidence in the work of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The country can fairly hold the Army engineers to the highest standard of professional morality and accuracy. They are lifetime servants of their country, most of whom were educated at the country's expense. They are very proud of themselves and have no hesitation in promoting their own interests. Certainly they are entitled to severe criticism in this situation.

From matters that have recently come to the attention of the Senate committees, of which I am a member, conditions in the Bureau of Reclamation are actually scandalous. There are charges of corruption, incompetence, waste, and extravagance to a degree that makes one wonder if the Bureau set-up should not be completely overhauled and revised.

The Senate has not been without warning as to the actual situation with regard to the Pick-Sloan plan failing to answer the whole problem in the Missouri River Basin. There is no Senator with whom I more frequently disagree than Senator MURRAY, of Montana. I do, however, want to give Senator MURRAY credit for standing on the floor of the Senate and utter repeated warnings very much along the lines that the Hoover Commission report finds justified—that the Pick-Sloan plan is not a

coordinated or unified program of development. Senator MURRAY has not yet convinced me that his MVA plan is the answer, but the Hoover Commission report has certainly made valid all of the criticism that he has uttered. That report also makes crystal clear the absolute necessity for immediate consideration, by objective and competent engineering judgment, of the economic feasibility of many of these Pick-Sloan projects. Some of them are fantastic and apparently are completely lacking in justification. Time is of the essence in stopping a wholesale waste of taxpayers' money.

In view of the disclosures made, it must be obvious that there must be a complete, thorough, and searching investigation so the people may know the huge expenditures have a justifiable basis. I call your attention to another statement made by the Hoover Commission task force. On page 18 of their report is found the following:

"It would be foolhardy to undertake a further expenditure of billions of dollars without thorough revision of both policy and organizational arrangements; and unless and until such revision is forthcoming, the committee recommends to both Congress and the Executive at least a partial moratorium on further projects."

I have clung to the hope the Interagency arrangement would work out the conflicts and confusion of the rival Pick and Sloan plans. But it has not done so. Appropriation requests are before Congress now asking for more tens of millions which do not reflect an iota of correction. Witnesses are telling the same old story, which has now been exposed as false.

Mr. President, above all things the people out in the Missouri Basin must not be punished for the mistakes that have been made. They have been abused enough by floods and pestilence and bureaucrats. But this Congress should not whip the people of the Missouri Basin—punish them further—for mistakes which were not theirs.

Congressman ALBERT COLE, of Kansas, sensing the truth about Pick-Sloan, a month ago proposed over in the House that there be a 3-year investigation of the Pick-Sloan plan by a joint committee of 27. The Hoover Commission advises us of projects about which the Army and the Bureau were sharply critical before they made their deal.

There should be an investigation of the most searching sort.

The Missouri Basin is rich in resources. It has millions of acres of rich, irrigable lands, waiting to produce an abundance of food for the Nation when it is watered. The basin has mineral resources awaiting development including materials now in critical shortage. The basin can prosper and be a stronghold for the Nation.

Today, except for the State of Kansas, the basin is losing its population, its young people move away, it is fearful of floods and drought, its resources are underdeveloped or not developed at all.

These requests for funds are before us now in a dozen different items. They are not submitted in one package but are to be found in Interior appropriations, Army appropriations, Agriculture, and probably others.

I want to see proper development of the Missouri Basin as much as anyone in the Senate. It becomes obvious, however, as demonstrated by the Hoover Report, we cannot permit the Pick-Sloan plan to continue if we are to honestly and sincerely represent the citizens of this country and especially those living in the Missouri River Basin.

I, therefore, propose to the Members of this Senate what I consider necessary steps to permit us to arrive at an honest appraisal of the needs of the Missouri River Basin. I suggest the following:

1. The appointment, by the President, of a board of competent, independent engineers,

to make a comprehensive study, investigation, and survey of the Missouri River Basin.

2. The Board to make its report and recommendations to the President and Congress on or before September 30, 1949.

3. That Congress restrict appropriations for the Missouri River Basin until such report is received by the President and Congress. I earnestly believe, in light of the findings of the task force of the Hoover Commission, and of the existing circumstances, that this is the only practical solution of the problems of the Missouri River Basin.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY TO THE SENTRY CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator WHERRY before the Sentry Club of Philadelphia, April 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR HOLLAND ON THE PROGRAM MEET THE PRESS

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Senator HOLLAND by newspaper reporters, on the radio program, Meet the Press, on March 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLITICS HAS A PART IN INTERNATIONAL OIL—ARTICLE FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Politics Has a Part in International Oil," published in Life magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR WILEY'S LEGISLATIVE RECORD

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a list of bills introduced by him in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENTS ON LABOR LEGISLATION BY REPRESENTATIVE WERDEL, OF CALIFORNIA

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD comments on labor legislation recently made by Hon. THOMAS H. WERDEL, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO ABOLISH THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of a letter which was published in this morning's Washington Post, and which refutes in a very wise, and I believe accurate and authoritative manner, the complete misconception which exists in a few quarters regarding the operation of Senate Joint Resolution 2, which is the proposed constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and count the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote. The letter is very brief; and because it relates to a constitutional amendment which I hope will soon be before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

ELECTORAL-VOTE REFORM

The April 4 letter from Mr. J. Harvie Williams criticizes the constitutional amendment which abolishes the office of presidential elector and provides for an automatic counting of electoral votes in direct proportion to the popular vote on the grounds that

it is "based squarely on the principle of proportional representation" and would encourage, therefore, a "multiplicity of parties."

There is actually no resemblance at all between proportional representation as applied to the election of a group (such as a legislature or board of aldermen) and electing a single officeholder as proposed in the pending constitutional amendment. Electing a legislature by proportional representation gives a voice to so many shades of opinion that it often becomes impossible to find a common meeting ground on any course of action. We have seen this weaken government in many of the parliamentary democracies of Europe. But in the case of a single officeholder that reasoning does not apply. Even the cleverest surgeon cannot divide one man up—proportionally or otherwise—and expect him to live.

The reform we propose does not, of course, seek to do that. It seeks, as the Washington Post has often pointed out, simply to reflect more accurately the will of the people in counting the electoral votes. If we were electing three Presidents to hold office concurrently as a sort of modern triumvirate, Mr. Williams' criticism would have some validity. But the reform proposed in the pending constitutional amendment is no precedent for that sort of election at all.

The Brookings Institution very ably summarized the often-heard and wholly unsound contention that this amendment would foster multiple parties. In a letter to me last year, it was said of this proposal that—

"It will practically remove the chance that small minority groups can attain and exercise great power over Presidents, presidential candidates, and political parties because they hold the balance of power in pivotal States. These minority groups will have no power beyond that justified by their number of voters in a presidential election."

The proposed amendment would strip splinter parties of their bargaining power (so evident in the 1948 elections, as for example, in New York) and would oblige them to seek popular support on the basis of their real appeal rather than on their ability to shift so-called pivotal States to one or the other of the major parties under the present all-or-nothing system. This reform would, therefore, definitely discourage rather than encourage a multiplicity of splinter parties. Their future success cannot conceivably depend on the very slight advertising value which might accrue from their being credited with an unimportant number of electoral votes.

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senator from Massachusetts.
WASHINGTON.

ARMED FORCES DAY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I note that the new Secretary of Defense, Hon. Louis Johnson, has announced that next year Army Day, Navy Day, Marine Corps Day, and Air Force Day are all to be merged into one Armed Forces Day. I feel this is a step in the right direction, that it gives moral support and prestige to the new loyalty which must develop if we are to have real national security, and I therefore applaud Secretary Johnson for taking this forthright stand. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Armed Forces Day."

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

ARMED FORCES DAY

Gen. Omar N. Bradley said many things of significance in his Army Day speech Tuesday night, but none was of more importance nor more quickly realized than his proposal to

end the separate service commemoration days in favor of a single day for all the armed services. Within 24 hours it came to pass. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, to whom unification means unification, has made calendar history by merging four days into one. No more Army Day, Navy Day, Marine Day, or Air Force Day, but henceforth only Armed Forces Day. This is a significant contribution to unity. Why not go further and, we tremble to write it, abolish the Army-Navy game? Is it not time to recognize in all these symbolic ways that the real mission of the three services is to be part of a larger entity—the defense of the United States?

EXTENSION OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the amendment. The amendment which I have proposed, would simply provide that loans to the ECA countries for rehabilitation and construction of industry would be placed on a basis comparable to loans to American citizens through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the same purpose.

CRIPPS AND FREE TRADE

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excerpt from a statement by Sir Stafford Cripps, of England as contained in an article entitled, "Enlightened" United States Tariff Held Vital by Cripps," called in the body of the article an enlightened policy of importation by the countries of the Western Hemisphere, published in the New York Journal of Commerce of April 7, 1949.

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

ENLIGHTENED UNITED STATES TARIFF HELD VITAL BY CRIPPS

LONDON, April 6.—Sir Stafford Cripps told the House of Commons today that Britain's ability to earn enough dollars to exist was dependent on an enlightened policy of importation by the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer made this statement in the course of presenting his 1949-50 budget in which he disappointed most hopes for reduced taxes.

MEANING DEBATED

Whether his reference to imports, by Western Hemisphere countries, was to be regarded as a bid for further tariff concessions by the United States or a warning that Britain might have to take further cuts in purchases in the United States and Canada if imports fell off was a matter of conjecture here.

"In broad terms," Sir Stafford said, "We have succeeded in carrying out the policy of restricting our dollar expenditure to what can be covered by our dollar earnings together with the aid at our disposal, and we intend to continue that policy for the rest of the ERP period."

SECOND STEP—FREE TRADE PROGRAM

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this statement of Sir Stafford Cripps leads directly to the consideration by this body of the second step of the three-part free-trade program—the 3-year extension of

the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade principle upon the theory that the more they divide our markets with the countries of the world, the less their trade-balance deficits will be—then Mr. President the next rivet is to be driven into the coffin of jobless men—the International Trade Organization.

ECONOMIC EQUALITY—LEVELING

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "ERP Goal Shifted to Economic Union," published in the New York Times of April 7, 1949.

This article points the way to an economic union of which we would eventually be an integral part, through the three-part free-trade program, which would bring into this country the products of low-wage living standard labor of Asia and Europe, unhampered by any tariff or import fee, equalizing the standards of living.

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

ERP GOAL SHIFTED TO ECONOMIC UNION—WESTERN NATIONS, WITH TOP UNITED STATES BLESSING, CONSIDER UNIFORM MONEY AS A FIRST STEP

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, April 6.—The ground work is being laid for a complete revamping of the Marshall plan soon after Congress completes action on next year's appropriation.

Separate strands of the ideas growing in Europe and in top Government circles in the United States are being pulled together in preparation for a drastic new action to make European economic integration a reality instead of just so many words. One big idea for 1950 already deeply implanted in the convictions of top United States and European officials responsible for directing the recovery program is that the time has come for both Europeans and North Americans to take some risks on creating a permanent economic union in western Europe.

On the European side, it is now recognized that the United States Congress is unlikely to appropriate huge amounts for a third year of the Marshall plan on the basis of a dated-up version of the same recovery story. To come back again with nothing more to report than greater output, improved exports, better balanced budgets and frustrated Communists, the Europeans realize, will fail to impress either Congress or the United States public. That story is true and important, but it has been told too often.

PRESSURE OF CONGRESS IS FELT

Straws in the wind are the reactions during this year's hearings on the Marshall plan of individual Congressmen who are favorable to aid to Europe but nervous about the lack of progress toward what looks like something durable in the way of a more viable economic system. At least as important is the pressure from continental countries, particularly Belgium, for some progress toward the goals of freer trade, greater convertibility of currencies and the opening up of long-barreled market avenues.

On the United States side, the feeling is that, having made irrevocable commitments in the military sphere, it is time for western Europe to make irrevocable commitments in the economic sphere. It is felt that little more can be gained from more planning, more committee meetings, more long-term projects. This feeling is shared by the highest officials of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, who see the

workings of European cooperation from the inside.

One such unity measure now in high favor is to establish now, while United States aid is still available, a complete currency union in western Europe. This means not just removing exchange controls and restoring the prewar freedom of convertibility, but literally having the same colored paper, bearing the same pictures, circulating throughout the area. This is the kind of step that brings a host of the other measures of coordination in its train, not as a matter of mere good intentions but as a matter of inherent necessity from which national governments cannot escape.

RISKS ENTAILED FOR UNITED STATES

To establish a uniform currency now would entail great risks for all the participating countries. Some would suffer unemployment in industries now protected by exchange control regulations; others would have to impose new taxes or forego popular social progress.

The step would also entail risks for the United States. Instead of allocating dollars, the United States role would become that of underwriting the dollar deficit of the participating countries. For some time the whole area would have to adopt some controls to keep dollar expenditure within bounds.

The immense advantage over the present system, however, would be that European business could at last begin the painful process of adapting itself to competitive conditions. Ultimately, continental experts feel, this would bring about such an improvement in productivity that Europe's inferiority to United States industry would be reduced to unimportant differentials.

Some of the keenest European observers of United States congressional and public opinion believe that it is in the nature of the North American character to be prepared to take a considerable risk in exchange for certain achievements of a broad political ideal—and Europe has finally recognized that the United States desire for European unity is a basic American urge.

The Benelux countries already have begun to plan for the inclusion of western Germany in a western European economic union. The logic of incorporating west Germany in any such plan is that it is better to have a rapidly growing German industry under the same roof than to deal with it as foreign competition.

Continental economists do not believe that Britain can or should join any tight European economic union: the complications of Britain's position as the center of a worldwide currency system of her own are too great. What they hope is that Britain at least will not seek to prevent some risky experiments in unity on the Continent. The British record in the European economic organization does not give them much hope that this will be the case.

BRITISH OIL—AMERICAN MARKETS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "British Oil Due Soon To Invade Dollar Markets," published in the New York Journal of Commerce of April 6, 1949.

The purport of this article is that the British Government expects, through the free-trade policy to bring into this country the petroleum and petroleum products produced in the low-wage living standard countries—without any import fee or tariff to equalize the high-wage living standards of this country with the low-wage living standards of the European, Middle East and Asiatic areas.

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

BRITISH OIL DUE SOON TO INVADE DOLLAR MARKETS

A British Government agency made it clear yesterday that the United Kingdom was planning to increase its oil-refining capacity in order to export oil products not only to sterling-area countries but also to invade dollar oil markets.

Declaring that Britain was pushing ahead on an eightfold increase in its petroleum refining capacity, the British Information Service, which identifies itself as an agency of the British Government, said: "One objective is to cut down imports from dollar sources," and added:

CAN SUPPLY STERLING AREA

"At the same time British oil companies will be able to play an increasing part in supplying sterling-area countries, western Europe, and other parts of the world with petroleum products which can be paid for in sterling, and not dollars."

"Britain's oil expansion program is not confined to multiplying here home refining capacity," the agency added. "Plans are underway," it said, "to increase foreign oil production of British companies by 1953 to double the 1947 rate, and to increase overseas refining capacity 40 percent during the same period."

"The plans now in hand for increasing overseas resources include a new refinery in Venezuela, and the enlargement of existing refineries in the Middle East and East Indies. Increasing output from the Middle East will entail additions to existing pipe lines and the laying of new ones. Including current maintenance, all the various plans will call for 3,500,000 tons of steel between now and 1953."

UNITED STATES GAP SEEN FILLED

Describing the gradual shift of the United States from a net exporter to a net importer of oil as a significant development in world markets, the agency said: "British oil concerns are taking a big share in filling the gap which this has created."

UNEMPLOYMENT RESULT FREE TRADE

Mr. MALONE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Connecticut Jobless Found at 11-Year Peak," published in the New York Journal of Commerce of April 6, 1949.

This article outlines in some detail the unemployment situation in one of the 48 States of this Union, and is a part of the present nearly 4,000,000 jobless and of the 9,500,000 part-time presently unemployed of this Nation, brought on through the administration's three-part free-trade program.

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

CONNECTICUT JOBLESS FOUND AT 11-YEAR PEAK
HARTFORD, CONN., April 5.—Unemployment has reached an 11-year peak in Connecticut.

The State labor department reported today that for the week which ended Saturday, a total of 67,974 claims for unemployment compensation were filed.

Lay-offs because of lack of work in all fields of manufacturing in Connecticut were blamed.

New claims stood at a 7,888 total as compared with 6,919 for the previous week. Such claims have averaged about 7,000 a week since the first of the year, the department said.

The total number of claims filed for the same week a year ago was 24,363, of which 2,582 were new claims.

Idle pay allowances for the past week amounted to \$1,122,967.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very hopeful that Senators will aid us in speeding the bill along today. We have been considering this measure for 2 weeks. The debate has been rather ample. We do not desire to shut off any Senator. However, there has been a great deal of debate on matters not directly related to the bill. I hope Senators will help us to speed along and get this bill out of the way. A number of other important measures await action. We cannot proceed with the legislative program, in which many Senators on both sides of the aisle are interested, until we dispose of the pending bill.

I appeal to every Senator to be as brief as possible in his discussions. It is not difficult to form a conception of these problems without long and extended debate. I very much hope that Senators will bear these things in mind and aid us in speeding along.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I am fully in sympathy with the sentiments expressed by the Senator. I should like to ask him a question.

This morning I received over the telephone some information which is not official or verified, but I should like to ask the Senator whether he has received information of a similar character. The information was to this general effect:

A young man who has just recently returned from Italy is of the opinion that the ECA is not doing any substantial good for the people of Italy in the southern area of that country. He mentions that in the city of Naples alone there are 40,000 people out of work. He made the statement, in substance, that today the price of labor, generally speaking, in Italy—I am not sure whether this applies throughout the country, but in some parts—is between 400 and 500 lira a day, which I understand is about a dollar a day. He also states that a small-sized loaf of bread, the weight of which I do not know, but which was described to me as a small-sized loaf, sells at 150 lira, which would mean that if a man were working for 450 lira a day, or a dollar a day, he must spend, for one small loaf of bread, about a third of his daily wage. I wonder if the Senator has any information along that line, and if he can tell the Senate what, in his opinion, is the actual operation of the ECA.

I ask this question with the utmost earnestness, and without any desire to impede the progress of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas has no detailed information at the moment, but many American visitors who go abroad for a few days seem to think that they have all the answers.

Mr. DONNELL. As I understand, this young man has been there for about 2 years. He is with one of the Government commissions, so I do not believe that he has the inadequate basis of knowledge to which the Senator refers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did he lose his job?

Mr. DONNELL. I do not know. I think he went there for a 2-year period, and has now returned at the end of that period.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to undertake to discredit the young man, but I have received a great many letters and have talked with a great many persons about conditions here and there. I find that some American visitors can spend two days in a country and tell more about conditions than one could accumulate in a year of intensive study.

I was in Italy last year. I saw Mr. Zellerbach, our representative in Italy, in Rome. He had just returned from a trip to southern Italy. I know that he is giving attention to the conditions there.

No organization can merely wave a wand and restore everyone to a job, and give everyone all he wants to eat and wear. Such a thing is not possible. The theory of this bill is to provide for the people, not by giving them doles of bread from day to day, but by providing instrumentalities and industries which will give them employment so that with their earnings they can buy the things in which they are interested and which they need.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption at this point? My question included a recital of the information which came from the young man to whom I referred. It was not he who spoke to me, but his mother. She had been informed by him that in Naples there are 40,000 persons out of work at this time. The Senator spoke about the purpose of providing opportunities for work.

Mr. CONNALLY. The unemployment problem in Italy is bad, and has been bad, because of the fact that the country has a surplus of population. There are not sufficient jobs to go around. The bill carries a provision, which was adopted a few days ago, for ships for Italy in which to send their surplus population to South America and Central America. We are doing all that is humanly possible to relieve that situation, but it cannot be done by writing a line or two in a bill. It cannot be done by eloquent speeches. We have to solve the problem by reasonable, sensible means, and that is what we are trying to do. Mr. Zellerbach, who is in charge of the American program in Italy, was here two or three weeks ago. We conferred with him. We stimulated him. I think he is doing everything humanly possible with the resources at his command.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does not the able Senator from Texas think it is appropriate in this instance to point out that as between northern and southern Italy there is a vast difference in the economy? From the standpoint of pure economics, it might be said that they are two entirely separate countries. Whereas constant improvement is being shown in the condition in northern Italy, the problem in southern Italy has not yet been solved.

I should like to point out in that connection, and as a part of this question,

that every effort is being made to solve the problem in southern Italy, which is primarily an agrarian problem. I think progress has been made. Does not the able Senator from Texas believe that that fact should be made clear?

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator, and I thank him very much for his interruption.

Everyone knows that northern Italy is the industrial section of Italy. The main factories and industrial plants are located in northern Italy. In southern Italy the economy is quite different, as suggested by the able Senator from New York. There it is largely an agrarian economy. We are working on it and the ECA is working on it. We are doing all we possibly can, with the resources at hand and with the machinery which has been set up, to solve that problem.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Texas mean to imply that ECA does not work as well in agricultural and agrarian areas as it does in industrial areas and centers?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, please; I have not finished my question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator had finished; it seemed to me it was a good, long question.

Mr. WHERRY. It is a double-barreled question, and I hope it will be listened to by the Senator from Texas, for whom I have the most profound respect.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope that will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope so, too.

Mr. President, there seem to be some difficulties in respect to southern Italy, because if ECA can help only in industrial centers, but not in agricultural areas, that fact, if it be one, would prove conclusively that the question before us is only one of financing foreign trade to help industrial centers, rather than to help the whole economy.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. In that connection, I should like to emphasize what I previously stated in the question I posed to the able Senator from Texas, namely, that the problem in southern Italy is primarily agrarian. But that does not mean that the ECA undertaking is restricted primarily to industrial projects and foreign trade applicable only to industrial projects and industrial undertakings. For the most part, the land in southern Italy is a very poor type of soil. The mountains are not conducive to very much production of agricultural commodities or to very much agricultural activity. The soil there must be built up.

Under the ECA program, measures are being taken to build up the soil, so as to put southern Italy into such a condition that, from an agrarian standpoint, it will be able to take care of itself.

Furthermore, I wish to point out that the great population problem in Italy is

peculiarly acute in southern Italy, and that also bears on this matter.

But let it not be understood that the ECA is not interested in this type of effort or is not doing anything in this field. I, myself, happen to have had some direct contacts in southern Italy in recent months, and I know that a particular effort is being directed in that area of Italy, all under ECA.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I hope the Members of the Senate will recall the plea I made a little while ago to help speed the bill along today and be as brief as possible in the discussions and debates, so that we may obtain some action, because this bill and the disposal of it are affecting the entire legislative program of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Texas, I should like to say that I have made it a point to listen carefully to the debate on the floor of the Senate for the past 2 weeks. I have heard no Senator depart from the economic subject that so vitally affects our Nation. I have listened carefully to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], for example, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELLY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and other Senators; and I wish to say for the RECORD that none of the Senators have departed from the debate on the economics of our Nation as this bill affects them.

THREE PART FREE TRADE PROGRAM

Mr. President, this measure is the first of a three-part or three-phase program for free trade for the American people, and it strikes at the heart of the workingman of America. The next thing we shall have before us will be the 1934 Trade Agreements Act extension bill. That is the act under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade policy over a period of 10 or 12 years, on the theory that the more the markets of the United States are divided with the nations of Europe and of the rest of the world, the less will be their trade-balance deficits; and it is well known and acknowledged that the purpose of the ECA is to make up their trade-balance deficits with the hard-money countries each year in cash—our chief export is cash.

Mr. President, with 4,000,000 persons out of work in this country, and with nine and one-half million of our people on part-time work, and with 67,974 claims for unemployment compensation in 1 week at Hartford, Conn., as shown by a dispatch coming from there, it ill behooves this Nation to worry too much about the 40,000 jobless in Italy, while our own people are being forced out of their jobs through our own actions here in fostering the importation of the low-wage living standard labor of Europe.

I wish to emphasize again, Mr. President, that the bill, presently before the Senate, is but one part of the three-part

free-trade program, and that many other bills which are or will be before the Congress will shove us further along the road of economic equality with Europe and Asia—forgetting that we broke our economic ties with Europe in 1776 because of the treatment we were then receiving as a colonial possession of Great Britain. The pending measure is No. 1 of that group; the 1934 Trade Agreements Act extension bill will be No. 2; the International Trade Organization bill will be No. 3; and after it there will be many more, which can be named. All of them constitute one large over-all program to level the wage-living standards of this Nation with the low-wage living standards of Europe, Asia, the South Seas, and Africa; and Mr. President, it will not be long before the people of the United States will realize that fact.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute or two to join in the comments of the Senator from Nevada in regard to the importance of this issue and the other great issues which are about to come before the Senate, and also to add my word in emphasizing the importance of subjecting them to full debate. I think we may just as well face the reality that the Senators who have been speaking in opposition to ECA in this debate—and as the voting record shows, I do not share their opposition—have nevertheless been representing what I consider to be a growing sentiment in the United States in regard to United States foreign policy. I think it is well and wise that they present their point of view on the floor of the Senate and that those who entertain an opposing point of view answer them, because I think that unless they are answered and unless we can have a full and lengthy debate on this subject, we may discover in the not-too-distant future that increasing numbers of the American people will be asking for the answers. I know of no better place to give the answers than here on the floor of the Senate. I join with the Senator from Nevada in saying that I think the record of this debate on these issues speaks for itself. The debate thus far has been on the merits of the issues.

It was not so long ago, Mr. President—and if Senators on the Democratic side are so anxious to make haste in the Senate on this issue, they should reflect upon this—that the entire program of the Senate was bogged down as the result of a prolonged extraneous discussion which certainly had nothing to do with the need of efficiently and effectively transacting the business of the Senate. We saw the spectacle of a large number of Democratic Senators, on the Democratic side of the aisle including the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] engaging the Senate for days in what constituted a filibuster. The Democrats who participated in that filibuster were not heard to cry for speed in considering civil-rights legislation.

We have had approximately 2 weeks of debate on the ECA subject which involves the expenditure of several billion dollars of the taxpayers' money. Yet we on this side of the aisle are frequently almost constantly, being needled by Democratic Senators to make haste. I

say the type of haste they are asking for will make for a great deal of waste, too, if we do not have a full and lengthy discussion of these issues.

Mr. President, I repeat now, and I shall say it again in the future, that so long as the Democrats seek to steam roll issues through the Senate, there will be resistance from the Senators on this side of the aisle.

DR. EDWIN G. NOURSE'S COMMENTS ON ECONOMIC SITUATION

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I think the statement just made by the eminent chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas, is most surprising, in view of the article that appeared in the newspapers this morning giving an account of the address made by the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse. I hold in my hand a copy of the account of the meeting at which he spoke, taken from the Washington Post of this morning. I am sure it must have caught the eye of the Senator from Texas, if he read the Washington Post this morning. The headline is, "Cost of arming Europe may curtail defense and ECA spending." Under it is the sub-heading, "Economic chief's warning serves to complicate security set-up." I read from the article:

America's current security programs—defense and ECA—should be trimmed to offset at least part of the cost of sending arms to Europe, President Truman's chief economic adviser declares.

This warning from Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers—delivered at the Pentagon with Mr. Truman's advance approval—had immediate repercussions throughout Washington.

It certainly would influence the forthcoming Senate fight over ratification of the North Atlantic Pact, as Members had already been asking questions about the cost of implementing it with arms.

So, Mr. President, I do not think any Senator who asks such a question on the floor of the Senate need apologize. The article continues:

CERTAIN TO AFFECT ECA BILL

The ECA appropriation authorization bill, now before the Senate, was certain to be affected.

Further, the job of whipping the administration's military aid bill into shape for presentation to Congress and the course of that legislation on Capitol Hill was further complicated.

And, Nourse's suggestion of further cuts in America's armed forces caused not only concern at the Pentagon, but promised to affect plans of the House Appropriations and Armed Services Committees.

The former was reported early this week to be ready to boost Air Force appropriations by some 800 million dollars, through trimming Army and Navy funds. Many members of the House Armed Services Committee plan amendments to increase the latter outlays also when the armed forces spending bill reaches the floor next week.

The article then recounts certain statements made yesterday, on the occasion of Army Day, with reference to the necessity of maintaining the armed strength of America throughout the world.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I read that article, and I ask the Senator, does he interpret Dr. Nourse's statement to mean that if we were to ratify the North Atlantic Pact and pass the implementing legislation, a review should be made with the idea of taking money from ECA funds and placing it in the fund to implement the North Atlantic Pact so far as arms are concerned? Did the Senator from Missouri get that interpretation from Dr. Nourse's remarks?

Mr. KEM. I can answer that in the direct words of Dr. Nourse, as quoted in the article.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. KEM. Dr. Nourse is quoted in the article as follows:

"It would be wrong to conclude," Dr. Nourse said in alluding to this plan, "that we can, without concern, add these expenditures, whatever they are, to the present budget items for national security."

Does that answer the question of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, if I understand correctly—and I ask the Senator if this coincides with his interpretation—a review should be made, with the idea of examining the complete set-up and taking funds here and funds there, adding them together, and not going beyond the danger point suggested by Dr. Nourse as being recognized by him.

Mr. KEM. There can be no other conclusion. The article continues:

Additional taxes or deficit financing would follow such a budget increase, he said. Nourse added—

I ask the Senate to attend particularly to this language—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. Did the Senator make a request?

Mr. KEM. No. I saw the attention of the Presiding Officer was engaged, and I waited as a matter of courtesy until he was free.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator. The Chair was engaged momentarily, but he should not have been. The Chair sometimes is engaged in fighting off Senators who want to engage the attention of the Chair.

Mr. KEM. The article continues:

Nourse added that the basic issue is—

"Does the North Atlantic Pact increase our national danger and therefore require us to make additional outlays to restore the proper measure of military security? Or do we propose, by joining in a plan of mutual assurance, to lessen the danger to each of the parties, and particularly to ourselves as a prime target of possible aggression?"

Nourse agreed with the latter and went on to say:

"Under this integration we expect to buy better security at the same cost or even, in due time, at lower cost than would otherwise be required."

Nourse also said that Marshall-plan funds must be regarded as an integral part of the plan of American security. He continued:

"The relative parts to be played by military and by industrial preparedness in each of the participating countries, and the relative roles to be played by each arm of the military service at the most effective points must be reexamined in the light of the new strategic concept and with no dangerous backward look at traditional positions of prestige, historical rolls, or impressive trappings."

"We cannot afford to make the costs of its implementation a simple addition to other military plans as they stood before the new alignment."

So, Mr. President, it seems that what has been said on the floor of the Senate, perhaps in some detail and perhaps with some repetition, in regard to the ECA program, by those who are seeking to have the present appropriations reduced, is not without recognition in the very highest councils of the administration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Vote!

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator for his courtesy, but I shall continue to speak until I have expressed my view in much more detail than may be agreeable to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator I thought he had concluded. I meant no discourtesy whatever.

Mr. KEM. I shall make it clear to the Senator from Texas, by resuming my seat, when I have completed my remarks.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course. I do not deny the Senator's right to do that. I meant no discourtesy. I thought the Senator had concluded his remarks. I apologize if he took any offense. It was not so intended.

Mr. KEM. I should like to say to the Senator from Texas, if he thinks by performances of that kind he can in any way intimidate the Senator from Missouri or curtail the remarks he otherwise may make, he is very much mistaken.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for the cordial way in which he accepted my apology and my explanation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do accept the apology of the Senator from Texas. But may I indulge in the hope that during the course of the debate he will not repeat the practice which he has started.

In addition to repercussions felt here in Washington, it is apparent that the effect of what has been said on the Senate floor has been felt abroad. On the first page of the New York Times this morning there is a very interesting dispatch from Geneva. I quote:

GENEVA, April 6.—The ground work is being laid for a complete revamping of the Marshall plan soon after Congress completes action on next year's appropriations.

Separate strands of the ideas growing in Europe and in top Government circles in the United States are being pulled together in preparation for a drastic new action to make European economic integration a reality instead of just so many words. One big idea for 1950 already deeply implanted in the convictions of top United States and European officials responsible for directing the recovery program is that the time has come for both Europeans and North Americans to take some risks on creating a permanent economic union in western Europe.

On the European side it is now recognized that the United States Congress is unlikely to

appropriate huge amounts for a third year of the Marshall plan on the basis of a dated-up version of the same recovery story. To come back again with nothing more to report than greater output, improved exports, better balanced budgets, and frustrated Communists, the Europeans realize, will fail to impress either Congress or the United States public. That story is true and important, but it has been told too often.

Straws in the wind are reactions during this year's hearings on the Marshall plan of individual Congressmen who are favorable to aid to Europe but nervous about the lack of progress toward what looks like something durable in the way of a more viable economic system. At least as important is the pressure from continental countries, particularly Belgium, for some progress toward the goals of freer trade, greater convertibility of currencies, and the opening up of long-barricaded market avenues.

The article concludes with this interesting statement:

Continental economists do not believe that Britain can or should join any tight European economic union; complications of Britain's position as the center of a world-wide currency system of her own are too great. What they hope is that Britain at least will not seek to prevent some risky experiments in unity on the Continent. The British record in the European economic organization does not give them much hope that this will be the case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles from which I have read, one from the Washington Post and the other from the New York Times, be incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 7, 1949]

COST OF ARMING EUROPE MAY CURTAIL DEFENSE AND ECA SPENDING—ECONOMIC CHIEF'S WARNING SERVES TO COMPLICATE SECURITY SET-UP

(By John G. Norris)

America's current security programs—defense and ECA—should be trimmed to offset at least part of the cost of sending arms to Europe, President Truman's chief economic adviser declares.

This warning from Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers—delivered at the Pentagon with Mr. Truman's advance approval—had immediate repercussions throughout Washington.

It certainly would influence the forthcoming Senate fight over ratification of the North Atlantic Pact, as Members had already been asking questions about the cost of implementing it with arms.

CERTAIN TO AFFECT ECA BILL

The ECA appropriation authorization bill, now before the Senate, was certain to be affected.

Further, the job of whipping the administration's military aid bill into shape for presentation to Congress and the course of that legislation on Capitol Hill was further complicated.

And Nourse's suggestion of further cuts in America's armed forces caused not only concern at the Pentagon, but promised to affect plans of the House Appropriations and Armed Services Committees.

The former was reported early this week to be ready to boost Air Force appropriations by some \$800,000,000, through trimming Army and Navy funds. Many members of the House Armed Services Committee plan amendments to increase the latter outlays

also when the armed forces spending bill reaches the floor next week.

MORE TAXES OR DEFICIT

Dr. Nourse's warning that an arms-for-Europe program "would contribute to the need for additional taxes or to the making of a budget deficit" was made Tuesday. He spoke before a closed session of top defense officials and prominent civilian guests attending the Second Joint Civilian Orientation Conference. Nourse made the statement public yesterday.

The impact of his address was particularly felt, as officials previously had indicated that the military-aid program could be piled on top of the President's defense budget and ECA spending plans without economic trouble.

The Nourse statement came as military leaders delivered a series of Army Day addresses, emphasizing that America must prepare to hold western Europe in the event of war, and not count on defeating an aggressor in Europe by atomic attack from the air.

Army Secretary Kenneth Royall said that if an aggressor is allowed to overrun Europe, the war will last 10 to 20 years or even longer. Former Under Secretary of the Army, William H. Draper, declared that American strategy must contemplate indefinitely a retention of strength on the continent of Europe.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Army Chief of Staff, set the pace for the Army Day speeches in an address in New York Tuesday night. He firmly backed arms aid to western Europe, declaring that we would be foolish to follow any strategy of letting an enemy overrun the Continent and attempting to come back later.

Their statements were regarded as the opening guns of the administration drive to ratify the Atlantic Pact and back it up with arms assistance. Legislation now being readied for Congress is reported to total \$1,800,000,000 for arms shipments—including continuation of Greek-Turkey aid and the value of supplies sent to western Europe from current American stocks.

"It would be wrong to conclude," Dr. Nourse said in alluding to this plan, "that we can, without concern, add these expenditures, whatever they are, to the present budget items for national security."

Additional taxes or deficit financing would follow such a budget increase, he said. Nourse added that the basic issue is:

"Does the North Atlantic Pact increase our national danger and therefore require us to make additional outlays to restore the proper measure of military security? Or do we propose, by joining in a plan of mutual assurance, to lessen the danger to each of the parties, and particularly to ourselves as a prime target of possible aggression?"

Nourse agreed with the latter and went on to say:

"Under this integration we expect to buy better security at the same cost or even, in due time, at lower cost than would otherwise be required."

Nourse also said that Marshall-plan funds must be regarded as an integral part of the plan of American security. He continued:

"The relative parts to be played by military and by industrial preparedness in each of the participating countries, and the relative roles to be played by each arm of the military service at the most effective points must be reexamined in the light of the new strategic concept and with no dangerous backward look at traditional positions of prestige, historical rolls, or impressive trappings."

"We cannot afford to make the costs of its implementation a simple addition to other military plans as they stood before the new alignment."

[From the New York Times of April 7, 1949]

ERP GOAL SHIFTED TO ECONOMIC UNION—WESTERN NATIONS, WITH TOP UNITED STATES BLESSING, CONSIDER UNIFORM MONEY AS A FIRST STEP

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, April 6.—The ground work is being laid for a complete revamping of the Marshall plan soon after Congress completes action on next year's appropriation.

Separate strands of the ideas growing in Europe and in top Government circles in the United States are being pulled together in preparation for a drastic new action to make European economic integration a reality instead of just so many words. One big idea for 1950 already deeply implanted in the convictions of top United States and European officials responsible for directing the recovery program is that the time has come for both Europeans and North Americans to take some risks on creating a permanent economic union in western Europe.

On the European side, it is now recognized that the United States Congress is unlikely to appropriate huge amounts for a third year of the Marshall plan on the basis of a dated-up version of the same recovery story. To come back again with nothing more to report than greater output, improved exports, better balanced budgets, and frustrated Communists, the Europeans realize, will fail to impress either Congress or the United States public. That story is true and important, but it has been told too often.

PRESSURE OF CONGRESS IS FELT

Straws in the wind are the reactions during this year's hearings on the Marshall plan of individual Congressmen who are favorable to aid to Europe but nervous about the lack of progress toward what looks like something durable in the way of a more viable economic system. At least as important is the pressure from Continental countries, particularly Belgium, for some progress toward the goals of freer trade, greater convertibility of currencies, and the opening up of long-barricaded market avenues.

On the United States side, the feeling is that, having made irrevocable commitments in the military sphere, it is time for western Europe to make irrevocable commitments in the economic sphere. It is felt that little more can be gained from more planning, more committee meetings, more long-term projects. This feeling is shared by the highest officials of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, who see the workings of European cooperation from the inside.

One such unity measure now in high favor is to establish now, while United States aid is still available, a complete currency union in western Europe. This means not just removing exchange controls and restoring the prewar freedom of convertibility but literally having the same colored paper, bearing the same pictures, circulating throughout the area. This is the kind of step that brings a host of the other measures of coordination in its train, not as a matter of mere good intentions but as a matter of inherent necessity from which national governments cannot escape.

RISKS ENTAILED FOR UNITED STATES

To establish a uniform currency now would entail great risks for all the participating countries. Some would suffer unemployment in industries now protected by exchange control regulations; others would have to impose new taxes or forego popular social progress.

The step would also entail risks for the United States. Instead of allocating dollars, the United States role would become that of underwriting the dollar deficit of the participating countries. For some time the

whole area would have to adopt some controls to keep dollar expenditure within bounds.

The immense advantage over the present system, however, would be that European business could at last begin the painful process of adapting itself to competitive conditions. Ultimately, continental experts feel, this would bring about such an improvement in productivity that Europe's inferiority to United States industry would be reduced to unimportant differentials.

Some of the keenest European observers of United States congressional and public opinion believe that it is in the nature of the North American character to be prepared to take a considerable risk in exchange for certain achievements of a broad political ideal—and Europe has finally recognized that the United States desire for European unity is a basic American urge.

The Benelux countries already have begun to plan for the inclusion of western Germany in a western European economic union. The logic of incorporating west Germany in any such plan is that it is better to have a rapidly growing German industry under the same roof than to deal with it as foreign competition.

Continental economists do not believe that Britain can or should join any tight European economic union: the complications of Britain's position as the center of a world-wide currency system of her own are too great. What they hope is that Britain at least will not seek to prevent some risky experiments in unity on the Continent. The British record in the European Economic Organization does not give them much hope that this will be the case.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, we have been admonished and criticized rather consistently, supposedly for delaying tactics in connection with the Marshall plan. It has been stated several times that many extraneous matters have been injected into the debate. I rise for a moment to explain my position. I did make one extended speech on the subject in the past 2 weeks. I think I took approximately 2½ hours of the Senate's time. During the 2 years and 3 months in which I have been a Member of the Senate, I have used very little of the Senate's time. I thought I made my position clear. I admit that in my remarks I talked about the North Atlantic Pact and other projected pacts; I talked about our domestic problems; I talked about our great national debt; I talked about our taxes and the proposed increase in taxation.

It is my sincere belief that because the Marshall plan is a piece of legislation to be considered at this time, we cannot completely isolate it and separate it from the other great problems which confront us, both in connection with our foreign policies and in connection with our domestic policies.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. Then the Senator does not agree with the tactics which have been employed in the past few years with reference to each one of these matters, the Marshall plan, the ERP, the ECA, all one plan, referring to them as legislation to meet a great emergency; and he does not agree that the trade agreements extension bill is to meet a great emergency, or that the International Trade Organization matter, which will level the living standards of this country with those of

Europe, is a great emergency, standing by itself. Or does he believe, in view of Sir Stafford Cripps' remarks this morning in a newspaper interview, that America must be educated along the lines of lower tariffs and import fees so that British products can more easily enter the United States, that there should be some general plan of operation?

Mr. JENNER. That is what I was trying to make plain to my colleagues. I do not think we can consider any one of these programs and isolate it, and say we will talk about the ECA program, then we will talk about reciprocal-trade agreements, then about the North Atlantic Pact, then about the labor bill, then education for the people of the United States, then about reclamation for the benefit of the people of the Nation, and then about taxes, as isolated matters. I do not think that can be done. I have tried to make my position plain.

I am not trying to delay the business of the Senate. It is my honest belief that we cannot accomplish all the things we need to accomplish at home, and all the things which may be necessary in the world at large, and still remain an economically and militarily strong Nation. The Marshall plan itself may be fine; the North Atlantic Pact may be fine; I think all these things may be necessary, but if the ultimate end means bankruptcy for the Nation, then we shall have destroyed the last stronghold of freedom in the world.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it the Senator is not implying that the North Atlantic Pact is a necessity or that it is advisable. Is that correct?

Mr. JENNER. I am not. All I am trying to do is to make my position clear. It is not easy for a Senator to take the position which I take in the Senate. He is lost in a hopeless minority. A Senator who takes the stand which I take is branded as a know-nothing, an isolationist, and a reactionary. It is not easy to be in a hopeless minority, as has been evidenced by the vote on my amendment. I offered an amendment to the bill, and it was rejected. Knowing that agriculture is one of the basic industries of this Nation, knowing that we had had approximately 7 years of bumper crops, and that another bumper crop was in prospect, I offered an amendment which merely provided that when the American farmers have raised a surplus of key crops, such as cotton, wheat, corn, rye, soy beans, and so forth, the Administrator of ECA should not be permitted to take the American taxpayers' dollars and purchase such products in a foreign country, such as Canada, as was done last year. The Administrator purchased \$354,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat at a time when we had 360,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat. On the 360,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat a subsidy equivalent to the parity price had to be paid. My amendment received 32 votes out of a possible 96 votes.

What I am trying to say, Mr. President is that it is not easy to fight for what one honestly believes in, when he is

in a hopeless minority, and when all these various proposals are put together and coupled up with the other problems confronting our economy. The propaganda has already started on the North Atlantic Pact, and it is a 100-to-1 bet that it will be ratified by this body.

The pact itself, standing by itself, might be all right; I am personally inclined to think it is; but when we put the price tag along with the pact, we must reflect that we are going to assume to rearm Europe, that we are to commit ourselves to arm for a ground war in Europe, at a probable cost of around \$20,000,000,000. Certainly we start with \$1,800,000,000, but that is merely the ante in the poker game. Twenty billion dollars is a truer figure than \$1,800,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in my impression, however, that notwithstanding the Senator's remarks about the Atlantic Pact as a separate entity, he is holding his mind open to hear all the arguments on the Atlantic Pact before he arrives at a final conclusion?

Mr. JENNER. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. He is not intending to state to the Senate that he has arrived at the conclusion that the Atlantic Pact is either necessary or desirable, is he?

Mr. JENNER. No; I have not arrived at any final decision. I merely say that the pact itself, just a piece of paper with the 12 names written on it, probably means that the American taxpayer will have to spend a tremendous amount of money.

Mr. DONNELL. It may mean, however, may it not, that the American Government is obligating this country to go to war in the event of certain contingencies, and without requiring the approval of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. JENNER. It may mean that, but my personal reasoning is that we have gone to war in Europe twice when there was no pact in existence. As a matter of fact there were neutrality laws in which we took the exact opposite view from that reflected in the pact. Therefore I would assume, the American people being what they are, wanting liberty and freedom preserved throughout the world if possible, that they would probably go to war a third time pact or no pact. What I am trying to show, and I think what the debate has brought out, is that when we take a 42 or 45 billion dollar budget for the costs of the Federal Government; then include five or six billion dollars, the cost of the Marshall plan; include another billion dollars for the cost of the occupation of Germany and Japan; include, in addition, probably \$600,000,000, or perhaps more, for Greece and Turkey; include, to begin with, a \$1,800,000,000 for the North Atlantic Pact, with a projected figure of probably nearly \$20,000,000,000; and when we include the possibility of lend-lease with which to do the same thing we are doing in the North Atlantic; then include a Pacific pact; then bring in all the domestic problems, and

consider that we now need \$12,000,000,000 to rebuild and bring up to par our national defense and strategic materials; and when we think of the fact that there are 6,000,000 children in this country who have to go to school in the next five years, and there are not sufficient physical facilities to enable them to attend school, which will mean the expenditure of a billion or two billion dollars to bring the school facilities up to what they should be, unless we are to raise a Nation of hoodlums; when we think of the old people in this country, with whom we play politics in each election, who are getting the miserable pittance of \$21 a month; and when we think of the old age group increasing in number all the time; when we think of the problems of power and reclamation; when we think of the problems of conservation; when we think of the fixed obligations of the Government—when we consider all these things, I say we can not isolate the Marshall plan and talk about it exclusively.

When we couple with all this the projected Fair Deal of Mr. Truman, which it is estimated will take another ten to twenty billion dollars a year, I say we cannot take seventy or eighty billion dollars out of the American economy and continue as a strong, solvent, free Nation. That is why I oppose the New Deal and Fair Deal. I do not think it is the sincere purpose of their proponents to preserve a free and strong economy in this country. I think they are gradually, step by step, through hopping from one emergency to another emergency, from one crisis to another crisis, deliberately leading this great free Nation into socialism.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a document which is being circulated among Government employees, not down on Pennsylvania Avenue, but here in this very Capitol, here in the very shadow of the Senate Chamber. Let me read parts of it; it is too long to take up the time of the Senate to read it all, and I do not care to be accused of delaying tactics, but I am fearful we are being led to overextend ourselves, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has said, and when we overextend ourselves and head into bankruptcy, then we are going to lose our liberties, we are going to lose freedom in this country, and then who is going to be the great leader we are now supposed to be in the world?

I ask Senators to listen to this. It refers to an ADA study trip to Britain in the summer of 1949. This has been circulated among Government employees here in the shadow of the Senate Chamber. Worse than that, it has been circulated to young boys, 15, 16, and 17 years old, here within the shadow of this very Senate Chamber. Do we hear talk about preserving freedom and liberty? Listen to this:

This is a summer trip of 1949 under the auspices of the Americans for Democratic Action.

Oh, Mr. President, how the word "democratic" has been abused and perverted. One would think we were a democracy. If you want to sell a program to the American people, call it democratic.

Mr. President, we are not a democracy. We never were intended to be a democracy. This Nation is a Republic, a representative Republic, and there is no reference in the Preamble, in the Constitution, in any of the debates at the Convention which framed the Constitution, or in any of the sacred documents of this great Nation, which calls us a democracy. But we are fast getting to be a democracy, because we are becoming a government of organized gangs.

Here, circulated in this building, is this pamphlet from the Americans for Democratic Action. The address of this organization is 1740 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. The telephone number is Executive 8160. The officers are listed, headed by one of our distinguished colleagues from Minnesota, Mr. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. He is the national chairman of this organization, and the other officers are listed. I do not care to read all this, but let me read portions of it so that Senators may see what is going on.

ADA has a deep and sympathetic interest in the program of Britain's Labor Government. ADA has held that what Britain is accomplishing may be one answer to the challenge of communism. For here freedom and planning—

Both those words are underlined, Mr. President—

are essentials of a mature and vigorous democracy.

There is that word again.

Britain has lost none of her democratic practices with the planning she has had to do to rebuild. In fact she has added new privileges of citizenship with the broadened participation required by her health, housing, town and country planning, and other social welfare legislation.

Let us stop right there. Britain has lost none of her freedoms. Those who prepared this document are writing to our young men, employees, if you please, of this very Senate, urging them to go to England and study the great British Labor government, when we are today spending billions of dollars to keep that great British Labor government on its feet.

They have lost no freedoms over there. My wife was born in that country. Her relatives are still in that country. I know from first hand information that if a man is a coal miner and wants to quit his job and go into some other industry he cannot do so without receiving permission. He must go to the bureaucrats to receive permission.

By the way, there are more bureaucrats in England today than there are in this great country, but there are only 45,000,000 people in that country, whereas there are 145,000,000 people in our country.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator from Indiana if the language which he has quoted in regard to Great Britain has a very striking similarity to the language

which occurs in the speech of Christopher Mayhew, Member of Parliament, to the United Nations Economic and Social Council on Wednesday, February 23, as follows:

The years since the war have seen a great ferment of ideas and social experiment in Britain. We have set in train a great expansion of education—including technical education—a unique system of national insurance, linked with a comprehensive system of industrial injury insurance and a complete national health service, great plans for town and country planning—

I pause to ask the Senator: Is not that a program for town and country planning contained in the document which the Senator has just read?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; of course.

Mr. DONNELL. I continue reading from Mr. Mayhew's statement:

And the reorganization of our key industries and services under public ownership. Some have asked if we can afford all this. They have missed the point that these developments are an integral part of our great economic expansion.

Does not the Senator think that the language and the sentiment expressed both in the document he has read and the statement of Mr. Mayhew are strikingly similar?

Mr. JENNER. They are very similar. This thing, Mr. President, is going on in the shadow of the Capitol. From my background I suppose I should be one of the great give-away boys, because my generation has not been a very happy one. We came through one great world war, and then we lived through an economic catastrophe in this country for about 10 years, and then our generation ended up in the middle of a second world war. So it would be easy enough for people of my age and my understanding to be numbered among the great give-away boys.

But think of men circulating in this very Senate Chamber to young boys like the page to whom I referred telling 15-year-old boys to try to go to England to look over the great privileges offered by that great Labor Government, under which a man cannot work where he pleases, under which he must obtain government permission to get a job, or to change from one job to another—a country the government of which tells a man where he shall live, how much he shall pay for his quarters, what he may buy, where he must line up to obtain almost everything he needs and which issues a man a \$50 toupee paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, and when it is found that a \$50 toupee is not good enough, says "We will call back the \$50 toupee and give you another one." And we in this country suffer heavy taxes to pay for such damn foolishness.

Of course, Mr. President, I shall take all the time I want to talk about these things.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Inasmuch as an organization with which I am affiliated

and of which I serve as the active national chairman, has been brought up for discussion on the floor of the Senate I should like to ask a few questions pertaining to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Indiana. Did I understand you to say that democracy was nothing more or less than an organization of gangs?

Mr. JENNER. I said the type of government we are getting in this country is organized gang rule. If you have the biggest gang if you wield the biggest political club, you are going to have the biggest power. I say we are intended to be and always were intended to be a representative republic, and I hope and pray to God that we do not degenerate into having gang war and being dominated by organized gangs. This organized gang situation weighs on my mind. They do not care what happens to America. It is time somebody stood on the floor of the Senate and denounced all gangs. It is time somebody stood on the floor of the Senate and stood for America regardless of his political future. What will anyone's political future amount to in this body if we lose our freedom, if we lose our liberty and if we lose the greatest country under God's sun. I am not going to have a part in bringing about such loss.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield further to the Senator from Minnesota for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was wondering whether the Senator in discussing what he calls the rule of gangs was again trying to identify the rule of gangs with the concept or principle of democracy. I gathered that from his remarks.

Mr. JENNER. If you want to get into what I think is a true definition of democracy, I will say true democracy exists when the people themselves actually run the government. That is not the intention of our Government. We did not become this great Nation under a democracy. We became this great Nation as a Republic in which the people exercise the right of a free ballot, in which the people of a district elect a Representative to Congress who speaks for them. If the people do not like their Representative they can recall him. But the idea of the people, the gangs, dictating the laws and the legislation is what I am objecting to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to understand—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield for a further question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to understand that you are opposed to the people dictating—using your words—the laws of this country?

Mr. JENNER. I do not want the people as a gang dictating the laws. I want the people to elect their representatives and then let their representatives in Congress speak and represent them as they honestly think is best. If the people do not agree with the thoughts of their

representatives they have the right, in the case of a Representative in Congress, to recall him within 2 years; yes, even sooner than that, because the primary comes earlier in the year; and if the individual is a Senator the people can recall him at the end of his term.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield for a further question?

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator will find within his understanding of the term "democracy" such basic freedoms as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly? Would you find those factors—

Mr. JENNER. I find all those factors incorporated under the Republic of this country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator find all those within his understanding of the concept of democracy?

Mr. JENNER. I find all those incorporated, I answer the Senator again, under the Constitution of the United States, which created the Republic:

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect—

Not democracy, but a more perfect republic.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota for another question?

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the Constitution says "in order to form a more perfect union?"

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not a republic; a more perfect union.

Mr. JENNER. In order to form a more perfect union and in order to establish and retain this Republic.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not possible for us to have a republic which is a structure and a form of government which utilizes the procedures and the structural organization of government within the spirit, within the concept of what we call democracy?

Mr. JENNER. Not if organizations such as the ADA, of which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is the national chairman, go around trying to get young men 15 or 16 years old to go to London, England, this summer and study the great progress of the British Labor Government. No; we will not stand for that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to interpret from the Senator's remarks that he does not believe that people ought to have the privilege or ought to enjoy, let me say, the opportunity to study forms of government and political organization by visiting our neighboring countries, our allies?

Mr. JENNER. Let me read again the purpose ADA has:

ADA has held that what Britain is accomplishing may be one answer to the challenge of communism. For here freedom and planning are essentials of a mature and vigorous democracy. Britain has lost none of her democratic practices with the planning she has had to do to rebuild. In fact, she has added new privileges of citizenship with the broadened participation required by her health, housing, town and country planning, and other social-welfare legislation.

I do not know what town and country planning means, but I was over there. I visited some friends, a man and his wife, who had a son and a daughter. It came time to go to bed. There was one bedroom. The little girl was about 15 years old. I said to my friends, "Where do we sleep?" They said, "Well, if you do not mind, you will have to sleep with the children." I, a grown man, slept with a little girl 15 years old and her brother. The mother and the father slept in the other bed.

I said, "Why does this situation exist?" They said, "Well, the city of Kirkcaldy, Scotland owns this housing project, and we have to live in a one-bedroom apartment until Mary is 16 years of age. Then the government will give us an additional bedroom."

Mr. President, I do not want that kind of a government, and I do not think it is a good idea for the boys and girls of this country to be spending their money to go to England to see what broad additional privileges the great socialistic experiment has given the people of England.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator of the mind that any government which may be termed a labor government is ipso facto undesirable and unworthy of our consideration, our study, and our concern?

Mr. JENNER. What are you trying to do, put me on the political spot? Are you playing to the gangs again, young man?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I ask a further question?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask that the rules of the Senate be observed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must admonish all Senators that they are prohibited by the rules and by immemorial practice from addressing one another in the second person.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is that the Senator from Indiana has the floor, and he has yielded to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question only.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator be kind enough to read us the names, one by one, of the other officers of ADA, which he says are on the document?

Mr. JENNER. I shall be glad to do so. I read the name of the Senator from

Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the national chairman. The other names are: Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., chairman of the executive committee; George Edwards; Hugh Ernst; Paul A. Porter; Emil Rieve; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., vice chairman; Louis H. Harris, treasurer; David Ginsburg, Secretary, National Board; James Loeb, Jr., national executive secretary; Mrs. Frances Adams, study-trip director, 3720 Thirty-ninth St. NW., Washington, D. C., Woodley 1754; Fritz Mondale, executive secretary, Students for Democratic Action; and David Williams, director of the London office.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. I am wondering if the Senator has any information as to whether or not the David Williams mentioned is the labor member of Parliament from the Neath Division of Glamorgan.

Mr. JENNER. It may appear in this mimeograph circular. The circular was handed to me by one of the pages this morning. It enraged me to think that here in the Chamber of the United States Senate, in this great free country, organizations are stimulating young men and women to go abroad to see the progress of the socialistic experiment in England which we as taxpayers are paying for through the legislation which is before us at this very moment.

Mr. DONNELL and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator know if Paul A. Porter, to whom reference is made, is the same Paul A. Porter who was formerly Deputy Administrator in charge of the Rent Division of the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. JENNER. I am not sure, but it would be a natural connection, I should say.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. Can the Senator tell me whether or not the name as it appears on his document is "Paul A. Porter"?

Mr. JENNER. It is "Paul A. Porter."

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. JENNER. I have read only the first short paragraph, and I should like to proceed and read some more of this very interesting circular:

ADA's purpose in organizing a group of its active members from all parts of the United States for summer study in Britain is to forge a stronger link between our two great English-speaking democracies—

There is that word again—

as well as to give the participants an opportunity to study at first hand just what have been the accomplishments of the Labor Government since 1945.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question. I should like to read a little more of this, so that we may know what we are discussing. I yield for one further question.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator know that Paul Aldermandt Porter, whose name is listed in Who's Who in America, was the campaign publicity director of the Democratic National Committee in 1944?

Mr. JENNER. No; but I would surmise it.

I read further from the circular:

We believe that this summer will be particularly interesting in view of the planning which will be going on for the general elections of 1950.

Transportation will be via planes which have been procured at special student rates by Youth Argosy, Inc., "an educational, philanthropic, nonprofit making and tax-exempt organization cooperating with mutually interested groups and individuals which exists for the following purpose: To provide safe and inexpensive transportation for all worthy young people to the ends that they may find friendships that will link youth with youth the world over; may enjoy the educational and cultural benefits of travel; and may come to have a greater knowledge, understanding and love of the world." Departure date will probably be some time around the second week in July. You will be advised as soon as we have definite confirmation, as to date, time, and point of departure.

The group will be composed of undergraduate and graduate students who are affiliated with SDA and persons past college years who are active in civil, labor, religious, political, and other community activities. All members will be carefully selected and will be required to present a written report on the summer program when they return in September.

The group will be provided with reading lists and will be expected to study this source material before they come to Washington or New York for orientation. The orientation program will be given during 2 or 3 days preceding the date of embarkation.

The orientation program will tackle the dual job of (1) preparing the group for England to help each member get the most out of the experience, and (2) to help each person be a more effective ambassador of good will for the United States. To this end, the group will meet with British people from the Embassy, the British Information Service, British newspaper offices, and others. On point (2) the group will meet with ADA and SDA officials as well as representatives from the labor movement, from the ECA and from Government agencies such as the Department of State and the Department of Labor, which are particularly concerned with projects of this nature. The students will be expected to focus their own projects and aims during this period of orientation, and a syllabus containing the kind of questions to which the summer should provide the answers will be prepared. The 8 weeks in England will be spent at summer sessions of the Labor Party, Fabian Society, Workers Education Association, and Trade Unions Congress.

Mr. President, I believe the Fabian Society was originally organized by George Bernard Shaw.

I read further:

In addition, there will be trips to industrial and rural areas.

On arrival in England, there will be further preparation and orientation before the students go out to the summer sessions. ADA's London representative will work out several seminar sessions where the group will

meet Government, labor, and educational officials who will help to guide them in their studies. The group will be housed in London on a low-cost basis, and headquarters will be maintained during the 8-week period so that those who are not out at sessions will have a home base in London.

Following is an estimated cost for the project.

Then it goes on to tell about the program in England and about the Fabian schools that will help them study, and about the Labor Party schools, the League of Youth Rally, the Workers Education Association, and the Trade Unions Conference. Mr. President, I should like to have this circular printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

ADA has a deep and sympathetic interest in the program of Britain's Labor Government. ADA has held that what Britain is accomplishing may be one answer to the challenge of communism. For here freedom and planning are essentials of a mature and vigorous democracy. Britain has lost none of her democratic practices with the planning she has had to do to rebuild. In fact she has added new privileges of citizenship with the broadened participation required by her health, housing, town, and country planning and other social welfare legislation.

ADA's purpose in organizing a group of its active members from all parts of the United States for summer study in Britain is to forge a stronger link between our two great English-speaking democracies as well as to give the participants an opportunity to study at first hand just what have been the accomplishments of the Labor Government since 1945. We believe that this summer will be particularly interesting in view of the planning which will be going on for the general elections of 1950.

Transportation will be via planes which have been procured at special student rates by Youth Argosy, Inc., an educational, philanthropic, nonprofit making and tax-exempt organization cooperating with mutually interested groups and individuals which exists for the following purpose: to provide safe and inexpensive transportation for all worthy young people to the ends that they may find friendships that will link youth with youth the world over; may enjoy the educational and cultural benefits of travel; and may come to have a greater knowledge, understanding and love of the world. Departure date will probably be sometime around the second week in July. You will be advised as soon as we have definite confirmation, as to date, time, and point of departure.

The group will be composed of undergraduate and graduate students who are affiliated with SDA and persons past college years who are active in civil, labor, religious, political, and other community activities. All members will be carefully selected and will be required to present a written report on the summer program when they return in September.

The group will be provided with reading lists and will be expected to study this source material before they come to Washington or New York for orientation. The orientation program will be given during 2 or 3 days preceding the date of embarkation.

The orientation program will tackle the dual job of (1) preparing the group for England to help each member get the most out of the experience, and (2) to help each person be a more effective ambassador of goodwill for the United States. To this end, the group will meet with British people from the Embassy, the British Information Service, British newspaper offices and others. On

point (2), the group will meet with ADA and SDA officials as well as representatives from the labor movement, from the ECA and from Government agencies such as the Department of State and the Department of Labor, which are particularly concerned with projects of this nature. The students will be expected to focus their own projects and aims during this period of orientation, and a syllabus containing the kind of questions to which the summer should provide the answers will be prepared.

The 8 weeks in England will be spent at summer sessions of the Labor Party, Fabian Society, Workers Education Association and Trade Unions Congress. In addition, there will be trips to industrial and rural areas.

On arrival in England, there will be further preparation and orientation before the students go out to the summer sessions. ADA's London representative will work out several seminar sessions where the group will meet government, labor, and educational officials who will help to guide them in their studies. The group will be housed in London on a low cost basis, and headquarters will be maintained during the 8-week period so that those who are not out at sessions will have a home base in London.

Following is an estimated budget for the project. It is understood that this represents the most accurate estimate possible, but should living costs in England exceed the amount, members of the group will be required to pay any additional costs. On the other hand, should costs be lower than estimated (and we have tried to make maximum allowance for all items) the saving will be refunded at the end of the trip.

Each member of the group will be required to pay \$640 before leaving the United States. This will cover the following budget:

Round trip flight via Youth Argosy planes	
8 weeks' lodging (this will include board, room, and tuition at school sessions, and board and room in London and visits to other parts of England)	\$379
Registration and leadership fee (not returnable in case of cancellation for reasons beyond our control)	240
	21
Total	640

To be noted:

1. This does not include train fares in England and other out-of-pocket expenses. These will vary depending on the program selected by student.

2. A small number of students may defray a portion of their expenses as much as \$50 weekly by electing a week of work in harvest camps.

3. Persons who wish to spend 1 or 2 weeks of the time on the continent will be refunded the amount which is not used for board and room in England.

4. Low-cost accommodations will be arranged for the 2- or 3-day Washington or New York orientation period and are not included in this budget.

5. Each person making the trip will be required to make his own arrangements for the following:

- Trip to orientation headquarters.
- Passport and visas.
- Vaccination and inoculation.
- Insurance.

PROGRAM IN ENGLAND

Each member of the group has the opportunity to make his own program insofar as is practical. Sometimes he will have to accept his second and third choices, but his wishes will be our guide in planning his summer program. He may elect the number and type of summer sessions, amount of time to be spent in London, or in the field, or any combination thereof. He may also elect harvest

camps, visits to Birmingham, Manchester, mining, and rural areas.

LONDON

London will be headquarters, and there will be a program including visits to Government ministries, the Parliament (insofar as circumstances permit) conferences, housing projects, community centers, and other activities including a recreational and cultural program.

FABIAN SCHOOLS (FROM THE FABIAN APPLICATION FOLDER FOR 1949)

Ever since the early days of Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb, the annual summer schools of the Fabian Society have been a special feature in the calendar of the British labor movement. What happens at a Fabian summer school? You will find a hundred or so Fabians in a large house in the country, at Cirencester in Gloucestershire, or Beatrice Webb House, near Dorking, in Surrey. At the Beatrice Webb House there will be a lecture each morning by some celebrity, such as a Member of Parliament. After lunch you can swim, play tennis, walk, talk, or sleep. After tea there are discussion groups which you can join or not, according to your fancy. After supper there may be a debate or brains trust or dancing or a visit to the local pub. At Cirencester the program will be similar, but there will be more study-group periods instead of lectures. There is great value in the informal discussions which are encouraged by the free and friendly atmosphere of the schools. You could not find a better introduction to the British labor movement than a week spent at a Fabian summer school. If you would like to spend one or more weeks at a Fabian summer school you would be made very welcome.

The Fabian Society will be holding five schools in 1949. Three weeks will be spent at the Beatrice Webb House, Pasture Wood, near Dorking, Surrey, in lovely wooded country. At the first week (July 23-30) the lectures will deal mainly with the Labor Party election program for 1950; at the second (July 30-August 6) the lectures will cover a variety of home and international subjects; and the third (August 6-13) will be devoted to international, including commonwealth, affairs.

Two weeks will be spent at the Royal Agricultural College, Cirencester, in the famous Cotswold country. Here the study-group method will be applied first to Labor's Election Program (August 13-20) and then to the problems of Socialism and the Individual (August 20-27).

LABOR PARTY SCHOOLS (FROM 1949 FOLDER)

The 1949 series of national summer schools, the last before the general election, will be held at the centers:

Oulton Hall Hotel, Clacton-on-Sea, from June 11 to 25; at St. John's College, University of Durham, from July 2 to 16; and at Beatrice Webb House, Leith Hill, Surrey, from August 27 to September 17.

Key workers are given valuable training and experience to fit them for competent and responsible leadership in their local parties and trade-union branches. This year the approach of the general election lends a new perspective to our educational activities and makes it more vital than ever for the party to have as many active and well-informed members as possible.

The educational program: At each of the schools there will be a number of general lectures by authoritative speakers including members of the Government and the national executive committee. In addition, students will be divided into groups to make a more detailed study of particular subjects under the guidance of expert tutors.

At Durham and Beatrice Webb House, there will be courses in local government as well as the general-election program, and electoral organization and publicity.

A fourth subject, International Policy, will be available at Beatrice Webb House during the 2 weeks beginning August 27 and September 3.

Social and recreational activities: These activities are a most important feature of the summer-school program, and full advantage will be taken of the excellent facilities provided at the various centers. Students are encouraged to make their own program of entertainment during the week and are asked to come prepared with suggestions and to take active part in the social arrangements.

LEAGUE OF YOUTH RALLY (FROM 1949 FOLDER)

This will be a get-together for the youth division of the Labor Party. Classes will be arranged on home policy, international affairs, and local government as well as individual lectures on topical subjects. There will be classes in public speaking, as well as the finals of the national contest.

This will be the first annual rally of the Labor League of Youth at Butlin's holiday camp at Fliley, Yorkshire, for 1 week, from September 17-24, 1949.

WORKERS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

A joint committee representing labor and academic thinking have made plans for a series of summer sessions to be held at several universities. WEA courses deal with a variety of subjects, some aimed directly at labor education, others of a cultural nature, and others with emphasis on contemporary affairs.

TRADE-UNIONS CONFERENCE

TUC schools are particularly concerned with labor problems, labor law, and other areas of particular interest to the trade-union member. This summer's sessions will also take up organized labor's part in the election program for 1950.

HARVEST CAMPS

The British have organized camps where participants help with the harvest. There is opportunity to see life in rural areas, as well as to earn something toward the trip.

INDEPENDENT PROJECTS

To provide for persons who would like to make other plans for housing and study in England but whose general purposes are in keeping with those of the group, a limited number of students with their own project plans will be permitted to join the group. Each of these students will be required to submit a detailed project plan which must be approved by the selections committee. Cost for these students will be air fare plus registration fee.

ABOUT THE DIRECTOR

The project director attended summer schools in Britain last year and was so enthusiastic about them and about the Labor Government's program, that she proposed making such a trip possible for other ADA members at as low a cost as possible.

Mrs. Adams is a graduate of the University of Minnesota. After a stint as director of research for a Chicago advertising agency, she and her husband went to Mexico. Later they worked in Ecuador where Mrs. Adams was radio representative for Nelson Rockefeller's Office of Inter-American Affairs. As consultant to the Inter-American Institute of Education, she organized special educational projects, and was also active on the coordination committee which was charged with responsibility for inter-American cultural exchange including exchange of persons. She is particularly interested in the exchange of peoples between nations as a means of building international understanding, and as a member of ADA believes that there should be more exchange of like-minded liberals throughout the world.

At present, she is active in the Washington chapter of Americans for Democratic Action as well as in other community activities.

Last summer she was recreation director (also assisting with orientation and evaluation) on the Tabinta and Volendam student ships.

ADA study trip to Britain, summer 1949, auspices of Americans for Democratic Action, Washington, D. C. Hubert H. Humphrey, national chairman; Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., chairman, executive committee; George Edwards; Hugo Ernst; Paul A. Porter; Emil Rieve; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., vice chairman; Louis H. Harris, treasurer; David Ginsburg, secretary, national board; James Loeb, Jr., national executive secretary; Mrs. Frances Adams, study trip director; Fritz Mondale, executive secretary, Students for Democratic Action; David Williams, director, London Office.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, again I wish to apologize. I did not intend to take more than a moment of the time of the Senate. But when this matter came to my attention this morning, I thought it sufficiently important to be presented to the Senate so that every Member of the Senate could know what is going on.

Mr. President, when we take all these proposals and add them together, the total is staggering. So I come back to my original proposition. I do not think it is possible to separate the Marshall plan from the North Atlantic Pact, from the other proposed pacts, from our great domestic problems, from the projected Fair Deal, from our already-existing cost of government. In other words, regardless of how beneficial or how good all these proposals may be, we come back to the one question which we must ask ourselves, namely, Can America afford it?

It is my belief that when we connect the programs of the ADA with the forthcoming agricultural program and the other proposals, we shall be staggered by the total. Apropos of the forthcoming agricultural program, Mr. President, let me say that I understand from a news article in regard to Secretary of Agriculture Brannan that today or perhaps tomorrow the story is to break about the forthcoming agricultural program. At the present time we do not know what it will be; it is very "hush-hush." But I am sure that when it comes to us there will be a great deal of favorable propaganda about it, both in the columns of the press and over the airwaves, and America will be "sold" overnight on the proposition that "This is it."

However, Mr. President, I venture to hazard the guess that, in line with the ideas of Socialist-minded persons who now are connected with our Government, the new agricultural program, as it is to be proposed, will tell the American farmer, "We will give you perhaps 100 percent of parity; but in exchange for that you are going to let the planners and the bureaucrats in Washington tell you how much you will plant, where you will plant, how much you will sell your crops for, and what you can grow on your own farm."

I say again that all such proposals cannot be separated from the consideration of the measure now before us, because the quicker we drag down our

economy the easier it will be for the Socialists and Communists, if we wish to say so, to fish in our troubled waters.

Mr. President, we have had troubled waters before, and we shall have them again. Dr. Nourse has told us now that there is a limit to the aid we can give. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has told us that there is a limit to what we can do. The time I have taken on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President, I have taken knowing that I would be laughed at and ridiculed and knowing that I was in a hopeless minority, but I have taken it because I know in the bottom of my heart that the future hope and future peace of the world are based only on the possibility of the preservation of a solid, strong, free America, not on any British labor socialism or any socialism anywhere or fascism or nazism or communism or anything else.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to say that the newspapers reported that at the signing of the North Atlantic Pact—this item strikes me as rather humorous—the Marine Band played I Got Plenty of Nothing, and that the great Marine Band also selected for another one of its numbers a piece entitled "It Ain't Necessarily So." Mr. President, I should like to know whether the playing of those numbers had some subtle connection with the bill now pending before us—the bill for the extension of European aid. Is the significance of those selections by the Marine Band on that occasion clear? It is not clear to me. Does the playing of the number I Got Plenty of Nothing mean that we are getting nothing in return for our aid to Europe, or does the playing of It Ain't Necessarily So refer to the jumbled information and double-talk we have received from the administration when we have asked for clarification and enlightenment?

In regard to the particular piece of legislation now before the Senate, Mr. President, if anyone could give us the assurance that at the end of its projected period it would have accomplished the things which it has been intended to accomplish; namely, the feeding of hungry people, the stopping of the spread of Communism, and the aiding of world peace, and if we could be assured that at the end of the 4-year projected period we would not have to continue to finance the deficit budgets of the countries of Europe and to finance socialistic experiments in England, we might feel differently about the requests which are being made of us. But after all, Mr. President, we have many people in our own country who need free hearing aids and free false teeth and free babies, and who would like to have free hospitalization; and some of them who happen to be unfortunate enough to have bald heads, no doubt, would like to have good toupees to keep them warm. Certainly the American people would like to have those things. We also have a school problem which we must face. We have the problem of the depletion of our own natural resources, which we must face. Secretary Krug says we are now a have-not Nation in respect to zinc, lead, copper, and oil; and he recommends the immediate expenditure of \$12,000,000,000 to bring our na-

tural resources up, in order to preserve our position in regard to national defense.

Mr. President, I honestly do not think we can do all these things all over the world and do all the things which are required here at home and not destroy the freedoms of liberties of our great Nation and not black out for 100 years to come the peace and the hope of the world, which must be maintained if we are to live in peace and be a prosperous and happy people.

THE FARM PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this morning Secretary of Agriculture Brannan appeared before a joint meeting of the Senate and House Agricultural Committees and set forth the Department of Agriculture's recommendations for a farm price-support program.

Mr. President, before I go further, I wish to say that I regard Secretary Brannan as a sincere, conscientious public servant. I do not in any way regard him as socialistic, and I would resent any implication that he falls within that category, any more than a good many persons who sometimes disagree with the great corporate interests of America should be classified as such. But this morning I find that I have to be critical of some of the recommendations which he made before the joint meeting of the Committees on Agriculture; and in doing so I am critical not only of a public servant who performs his duty as he thinks it should be performed, but of a personal friend, as well.

The recommendations of the Secretary merit the careful study of the Congress. With the objectives outlined in the recommended program there can be little dissent. We all want to prevent depression. We all want to maintain a farm production that will build markets and maintain employment. We all want stable high-level farm prices and reasonable prices to consumers. We all want to maintain our agricultural resources. We all want to maintain adequate reserves of goods which will protect the national security in event of crop failure; and we all want to safeguard our rural economic strength and stabilize the rural community.

No, it is not the objectives announced by the Secretary, with which we may dissent. It is the means which the Secretary proposes for attaining these objectives that should be carefully studied.

Most of the recommendations of the Secretary appear to be simply the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948 in a new dress. Stated briefly, the Secretary's proposals contain four radical departures from the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948.

One is the requirement that each farmer adopt minimum and sound soil-conservation practices in order to qualify for supports.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I would rather yield when I get through. I shall take only about 10 minutes in the presentation of my speech.

The second radical departure from the 1948 act is that supports are limited to the production of approximately \$20,000

worth of commodities on each farm, and will not apply to commodities produced in excess of that amount.

The third departure is that the new recommendations provide for what amounts to 100 percent of parity support for 10 major commodities. The fourth is that the income support standard formula veers somewhat from the parity concept as we have known it, but comes out with about the same commodity price figures as under the parity formula in the 1948 act. Therefore it may or may not prove to be a considerable departure from the standards which have already been approved by the Congress.

The direct effect of these four recommendations, if they are adopted, would be far-reaching Government control over the Nation's agriculture.

The recommendation for making payments to farmers as an alternative for purchasing or loaning on the crop is already contained in the 1948 act. This method of supporting prices, if used carefully, will permit consumers to benefit from bountiful crops and low prices without unduly penalizing the producer or the taxpayer.

The encouragement which the Secretary gives to an increased animal industry as a means of raising dietary levels and disposing of surplus grain meets with my full approval. This, too, simply accords with the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948.

The proposal to put supports on an income rather than a commodity pricing basis also is set forth in the 1948 act.

This means for determining what parity of income for farmers should be was not available at the time the 1948 law was written. There was incorporated in the 1948 law a definition of parity income.

Although this definition had no substantive value at the time, it was intended as a directive to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to seek a method by which parity of farm income might be determined.

The Secretary has now recommended such a formula to the Congress.

I have had time to give this proposed formula only cursory study. Certainly, we need to get away completely from the old type parity formula which gave definite advantages to the producers of certain commodities while keeping others at a disadvantage.

While I believe that the modernized parity formula provided in the 1948 act goes a long way in overcoming that difficulty, yet it is possible that the formula now proposed by the Secretary will not only provide a means for arriving at an equitable determination of parity income but also a fair determination of commodity prices as well.

I want to point out, however, that the income-support standard embodied in the formula proposed by the Secretary varies but little from the parity prices as figured under the modernized parity formula in the Agricultural Act of 1948. I shall give a few examples: The "income support standard," as the Secretary calls it, for corn, is \$1.46 a bushel; under the Agricultural Act of 1948, the parity price would be \$1.45 a bushel. The income-support standard for cotton would be 27.99 cents a pound; the parity price

under the 1948 act would be 27.3 cents a pound. And so on. There is almost no difference at all. Barley comes out the same, \$1.22 a bushel, no matter how it is figured. So it may be that this new proposal of the Secretary will be found to be an improvement, or it may be that it will not be found to be an improvement.

But the basic difference of opinion between those who believe in high rigid support prices coupled with Government controls, and those who believe in more moderate support prices and freedom of action for the farmer has not been cleared away by the Secretary's recommendations.

In spite of all the camouflage and avoidance of customary phrases and wording, the fact is that the recommendations of Secretary Brannan in the final analysis follow closely the high rigid support levels for the more important agricultural commodities and provide for far more rigid Federal controls over our farms than we have ever had up to this time.

The Secretary proposes 100 percent support for wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, milk, hogs, eggs, chickens, beef cattle, and lambs.

I agree with this regrouping of commodities in accordance with their importance, but I cannot agree with the recommendation that the Government guarantee what amounts to a fully satisfactory income to the producers of these commodities.

The proposal incorporated in the 1948 act that a support price guarantee should be such as to insure the farmer against disastrous price declines, while leaving him as free as possible to exercise his own initiative, would be done away with if the Secretary's recommendations are approved and put into effect.

Under the proposals of the Secretary, the farmer is required to comply with certain stringent conditions in order to receive the guaranteed income support.

These conditions would convey to the Federal Government much more complete control over the Nation's 6,000,000 farms than there has ever been before.

The Agricultural Act of 1948 permits the Secretary to require farmers to comply with acreage allotments and marketing methods and even marketing quotas as a last resort when voted by the farmers themselves.

The new proposals, made this morning, go much further than this and require the farmer to comply with the observance of—and I quote from the Secretary's statement—"minimum and sound soil-conservation practices." This means not only compliance with marketing regulations, but also requires him to use all his land in such a manner as may be approved by Federal officials.

This is a very high price to pay for a guaranteed income.

Furthermore, the requirement that the farmer must observe minimum and sound soil-conservation practices, as defined by Federal officials, might mean that while government undertakes to guarantee a farm income, it also assumes authority for directing how part of such income shall be spent.

The immediate effect of the approval of the Secretary's support-price program would be to put wheat, cotton, tobacco, corn, and small grains under complete and continuing controls; also the land which is taken out of production of such commodities.

After the program has been in effect a short time, controls would have to be extended to hogs, chickens, beef, lamb, pork, and dairy products. It would be a controlled economy with a vengeance.

We may have to come to it some day, but the fact remains that America today is far and away the greatest food-producing nation on earth and this enviable position has been reached through freedom to think and act on the part of the American farmer.

One weakness of the Secretary's recommendations is also found in the Agricultural Act of 1948.

Comprehensive means of supporting perishable and most of the nonbasic commodities are lacking in the new proposals.

The Secretary's recommendations, like the 1948 act, leave it optional to the Secretary, with such means as may be provided him by the Congress to support the price of these nonbasic commodities, from nothing at all up to 90 percent of parity or 100 percent of the income-support level—whichever you choose to call it.

Finally, we are confronted with the stark reality that the level at which support prices of agricultural commodities or farm income is fixed is a fundamental issue not only of economics, but of philosophy of government as well.

The level of support is a powerful force which can be used either to weaken or encourage farm initiative and individual resourcefulness.

A program to assure a high fixed standard of income could not stop on the farm.

If government undertakes to guarantee a satisfactory income to the producers of farm commodities, can we, with a clear conscience, deny the same guarantee of satisfactory income to other groups of our population? Where can we stop?

Admitting a definite and serious trend toward state controls throughout the world, it is, nevertheless, unmistakably clear that those nations which have resisted centralized government control are the most prosperous and happiest nations.

As I have stated, I agree with the major objectives for American agriculture as set forth by the Secretary, but I cannot agree that such objectives should be obtained at the price of a governmental guardianship over the 6,000,000 farm families of America.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAIN. Is it true that the Secretary's recommendations cannot become effective unless they are approved by legislation of the Congress?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true; they cannot.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of an address which I delivered at a

farm forum in Minneapolis on March 10, 1949, which develops considerably further my reason for being critical of certain points in the recommendations made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

Although I will discuss primarily the farm support price program today I do not want you to get the idea that I think a support-price program in itself constitutes a complete or well-rounded farm program for America.

Our aim should be to work out such a program that will minimize the need for price supports. Continuous research particularly in the field of distribution and marketing is needed. The development of marketing agreements and cooperative management, coordination of soil-conservation and soil-building programs, promotion of congenial surroundings for the farm home, a high level of diet among consumers, and fitting American agriculture into the world picture are all factors that enter into the programming of a healthy agricultural economy.

Rather than look upon price supports as a means of providing a Government market for farm commodities and the return of perfectly satisfactory prices to the producer I prefer to consider the support program as a means of providing consumers and industrial processors of an adequate supply of food and fiber, while insuring the farmer that he will not be courting disaster if he meets the needs of his country and a little bit more.

Our goal should be a fair price in the market place with a maximum degree of independence for the farmer in achieving this goal.

During the war and the years that have elapsed since the surrender of Japan in August 1945 our farmers have literally performed miracles of production. Under well-nigh perfect growing conditions farm prices and incomes have reached an all-time high. Industrial profits and the earnings of labor have also set new records. So has our national debt.

It was with the realization that wartime prices and incomes could not go on forever that in July 1947 both Houses of Congress authorized their Committees on Agriculture to make a study of the trends and needs of agriculture. The result of this study was the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1948.

Frankly the House and Senate committees did not see eye to eye and it was only in the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress that a compromise agreement was reached which permitted a permanent price-support program to be placed on the statutes.

The House part of the act provides for a 90 percent of parity support for the six basic and a few selected nonbasic commodities for the year 1949. The Senate bill is to go into effect on January 1, 1950, and is based on the major provisions of a new parity formula and a flexible range of price supports for all commodities. The Senate bill was supported by the three major farm organizations and the United States Department of Agriculture. Since the enactment of the law the Farmers Union has officially shifted its position in favor of higher levels of support.

Since at the present time a strong effort is being made to discredit the long-range provisions of the act, I welcome the opportunity to speak here and hope I may clear up some of the misunderstanding in regard to it.

There are some people who are opposed to any farm support program at all.

Those who believe in support prices are divided into two schools of thought. One group wants high, rigid supports. This group is making its principal appeal to the producers of cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and wheat. They express a willingness to accept

controls if necessary in order to get these high prices.

The other group endorses a flexible support-price program and is generally opposed to Government controls.

I am willing to assume whatever responsibility goes with identifying myself with the flexible-support school of thought. I am unalterably opposed to Government production controls, except in emergencies, for reasons which I will soon make clear.

I have no quarrel with those who advocate a 100-percent Government-guaranteed income for farmers, but personally I do not want to obtain such income at the price which their proposal would require us to pay. Allotments, quotas, controls, and penalties should be exercised only as a last resort and not be permitted to become the regular order.

If 100-percent-of-parity income guaranteed by the Government is the objective, then those who want this signed, sealed, and delivered guaranty should no longer beat around the bush, but should come right out in the open for a Government-controlled agricultural economy. In no other way can a 100-percent guaranty of price to farmers be made to work.

I, for one, do not want to see a controlled agricultural economy in which our responsibilities and our destiny as farmers are surrendered to the Federal Government. I want our people—and particularly our farmers—to have the fullest opportunity to exercise their initiative, manage their farms, and think and plan for themselves.

That is the reason I am opposed to a fixed, rigid guaranty of price for agricultural commodities in peacetime.

Above all else, I cannot believe it wise nor democratic to put the farmer in the position where his work is laid out for him and his efforts are directed by agents of the Federal Government, except on an emergency basis.

To presume that equality of income can be satisfactorily achieved by a federally controlled economy is to presume that all men holding positions in Government are capable, fair, and honest. Unfortunately, men in Government are subject to the same weaknesses as men out of Government.

The power to direct American agriculture also carries the power to dominate, and, in spite of the esteem in which I hold most of the officials of the Department of Agriculture today, I would rather trust the future to the combined judgment and cooperative effort of the 6,000,000 farm families of America than to a few men who might some day yield to the desire for more power or personal glory.

We are confronted with the stark reality that the level at which support prices of agricultural commodities is fixed is a fundamental issue today not only of economics but of philosophy of government. The level of price support is a powerful force which can be used either to weaken or encourage farm initiative and individual resourcefulness.

From this fulcrum of price support, the lever of control can operate to sway the destiny of our farm people.

It has been my belief, and it still is, that the support level for farm commodities should be just below a fair market price, thereby providing incentives for the development of new uses and markets, and for the conversion of crop production which will prevent the accumulation of burdensome surpluses or undesirable shortages. That is the reason I insisted upon giving to the Secretary of Agriculture a flexible range within which he can fix support levels.

One of the major provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948 is a new parity formula. This formula is intended to correct inequalities in the price relationship between agricultural commodities.

The original formula has become so badly outmoded that it is used for only about 40 out of 150 farm commodities today.

For instance, wheat growers know that there is a nice profit in producing wheat at 80 percent of parity, while dairymen know that 90 percent as computed under the old formula scarcely represents the break-even point in the production of dairy products.

By using a new formula which reflects conditions which have prevailed during the latest 10 years, each commodity is put more nearly in the proper relationship to all others.

The parity value of all agricultural commodities combined remains the same under the new formula as it was under the old formula which will go out of use on January 1, 1950. It is only the relationship between commodities that changes.

As a result of using this modernized formula which was endorsed by the major farm organizations and the United States Department of Agriculture, there will be a drop in the parity price of grain and an increase in the parity prices of dairy products, meat products, wool, poultry products, flax, soybeans, and others.

The end result of this change in the parity formula should be to encourage the marketing of a greater part of our grain crop in the form of animal products.

The effect of this will be to place the American consumer on a higher dietary level, to provide greater employment both on and off the farm, to encourage a greater production of soil-building commodities and to provide a far wider market for grain than would be the case if it were marketed in the form of cereal rather than animal products.

The time has come when the grain producer must look to expanding his market in the United States rather than to foreign countries as an outlet for his surplus production.

The framers of the Agricultural Act of 1948 believed that an increased animal industry in America would definitely improve not only our entire national and agricultural economy but would expand the grain market faster than any other means except, of course, the delivery of our surplus to foreign countries at our own expense.

I now wish to discuss the reports that the new law will reduce price support to 60 percent of parity.

The Agricultural Act of 1948 provides minimum levels at which the six basic crops—corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco must be supported. These minimums are based on the total supply of the commodity according to a formula incorporated in the act. Theoretically, supports might have a 60- to 90-percent range. Actually, this could not happen.

Although the act puts full emphasis on the avoidance of controls it does require that quotas must be voted upon whenever the total supply of a basic commodity reaches a certain percentage above a normal supply. In the case of wheat this is 120 percent. Whenever quotas are in effect a 20-percent premium is added to the support price.

If the producers of wheat vote for quotas when the supply reaches 120 percent of normal, the minimum support level would be 78 percent. The Secretary must then fix the actual support level somewhere between 78 and 90 percent unless the national security needs make a higher level necessary to get production.

In no case could the minimum support price of a basic commodity drop below 72 percent when quotas are in effect.

This is quite different from the 60-percent figure which has been so freely reported as the support level which would prevail. To assume even a 72-percent support is to assume that the Secretary would give the farmer the worst possible deal under the act.

The Secretary at all times has full authority to maintain a support level of 90 percent if in his opinion circumstances warrant it.

I have a great deal of confidence in our present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan. I feel that he will use the discretionary powers of this act wisely, nor can I conceive any future Secretary using this act to give farmers the lowest permissible income.

The law does not fix a minimum support level for the 150 nonbasic commodities, but it was made clear on the floor of the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture is expected to support the price of those nonbasic commodities which correspond closely to the so-called Steagall commodities such as dairy products, poultry, hogs, beef, and soybeans, at approximately the same level as the basic commodities are supported. For other more perishable crops the Secretary is authorized to support the price from nothing up to 90 percent.

After all, why should we put all emphasis on supporting the prices of a few basic crops when several nonbasic commodities are even more important in terms of farm and national income?

An amendment adopted on the floor of the Senate provides that potatoes shall be supported at from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

Another amendment provides that wool shall be supported at a level that will induce the production of 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool annually. This will doubtless mean 50 percent support for a few years at least.

Let us look now at the theory that high price supports and controls mean high incomes. This theory is untenable. High support levels involving reduced acreage do not necessarily increase or even maintain farm income. In fact, the result of quotas and controls will more likely be reduced incomes.

As acreage is reduced, the cost of producing a bushel of wheat or corn or other grains increases in proportion to the acreage taken out of production.

In this age of mechanized farming, with its high investment in tractors, harvesters, combines, storage bins, and other equipment and facilities, a large part of the cost of production is represented by fixed costs such as interest, taxes, repairs, depreciation, etc. These costs remain about the same regardless of the acreage planted.

The United States Department of Agriculture has worked out some very significant cost and income figures showing that on a farm of 605 acres, of which 276 is normally planted to wheat, that when acreage is cut 25 percent, the operating costs of the farm are reduced only 10 percent.

These Department figures show that a normal planting of wheat, selling for \$1.55 per bushel, will return a greater farm income than if the acreage planted is reduced 25 percent and the crop sold at \$2 per bushel.

This year's experience with high, rigid price supports is going to be costly.

There are heavy overplantings this year of certain commodities purely because of the 90 percent of parity guarantee for such commodities.

I make the prediction that should 1949 prove to be a good crop year, the total borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is fixed by Congress at \$4,750,000,000, will be pretty well exhausted by January 1, 1950. This situation will not make the farm-support programs more popular with either consumers, taxpayers, or the Congress.

Less than 20 percent of the people in the United States live on farms today.

Over 80 percent are employed in other occupations.

There is already increasing unemployment. Too high guarantees to farmers will result in increasing dissatisfaction in the cities.

The public will stand for a fairly high level of farm supports, but it will not tolerate cost-plus guarantees for farmers when other

people are down and out. It is not the small percentage of industrialists that always seem to make good profits that we have to think about, it is the great bulk of our population that will rebel.

Should the advocates of 100-percent support for farm commodities prevail with their views, I predict that the entire farm-support price program will collapse within a few years. I do not anticipate that their views will prevail, however.

I anticipate that the major provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948 will remain largely undisturbed in spite of political and group pressures which would overthrow them. I further predict that the Secretary of Agriculture will use the power vested in him by this bill to prevent agriculture from leading the way to another depression.

The support levels provided for in this act guarantee the producers against precipitous declines in prices.

Fearing major calamities, such as drought, the act will serve to keep the farmer from losing his shirt or undergoing losses such as prevailed during the depression of the thirties. This, of course, is quite different from guaranteeing him what he considers to be a perfectly satisfactory price and income.

I have heard many comments to the effect that we ought to have a law which provides for forward-pricing of farm commodities so that farmers can plan ahead.

The fact is, the Agricultural Act of 1948 does permit forward-pricing and the Department of Agriculture has so interpreted it.

The Secretary of Agriculture may announce in advance of planting the minimum level at which commodities will be supported. He has only recently used this provision of the long-range Farm Act to guarantee a 90-percent support price for hogs until April 1, 1950.

In return for support of nonbasic commodities, the Secretary of Agriculture may require compliance with production and marketing goals or even conformity to marketing agreements.

It would seem unreasonable to expect the Secretary to deal with thousands of widely scattered, unorganized producers of a perishable or semipermanent commodity.

When the bill was under consideration the question arose as to how the Secretary could bring about compliance with production goals.

This prompted the committee which sponsored the bill to write into it a provision that the Secretary could support prices through loans, purchases, or payments.

The provision for supporting prices through payments is new. It means that if producers fail to comply with the Secretary's request for reduced production or reduced marketing, he may direct all or part of the commodity concerned to be put upon the open market and reimburse those who do cooperate for the difference between the price received in the market and the support price.

Those who fail to cooperate would receive only the open-market price for what they produce. Cooperation in a support program is not compulsory. It will be up to each producer to decide whether to cooperate or not, but if he does not, he cannot be assured of the support price.

Had this provision of the law been in effect this year, the Secretary could have directed all or part of the huge potato crop to be put upon the market so that the consumer could have received the benefit of lower prices and better potatoes.

As it is, potatoes have been priced off the table in so many instances that we are actually consuming a smaller quantity than we did in prewar days, in spite of the large increase in population.

Government has in many instances bought No. 1 potatoes for use as cattle feed, while the low grades have been put upon the open market for human consumption. The costly debacle of the potato program brought on

purely by a 90-percent price guaranty would be multiplied many times over by a flat guaranty of 90 percent or more for all important farm crops.

In determining the amount of assistance which government should give to any class or group, let us remember this—government is not an institution possessing unlimited resources to be expended for our benefit.

When we get from government we must first put into government or else go in debt for it, as we have already done to some extent.

Government is an agency set up by the wise founders of our Nation which we as individuals or groups can use for the mutual welfare and protection of us all.

Government is no better than the men who hold positions in it. Therefore, let us think long and wisely before turning our personal destinies over to them.

There are good men and poor men in government.

There are men who make rash promises to get into government and thus put themselves in a position to exercise power.

There are men who today are advocating a largess for farmers far beyond our power to permanently sustain and, while they promise farmers high prices and high incomes, some of them also weep for the plight of the consumer whom they say pays too much for food and other living costs.

We must not be deceived by these protestations of concern—protestations of high prices for farmers and low costs for consumers.

Farmers cannot get high prices for what they produce unless city people pay well for what they buy. Unless farmers receive good prices for what they sell, city people will find themselves without a market for the industrial goods which they produce.

Very few of us in this world get something for nothing. Let us not be deluded now by the promises of those who offer high inducements to farmers to part with the most precious of all assets, their independence.

I reiterate—a rigid 90 to 100 percent price-support program must be accompanied by strict controls.

Once we start to apply controls and penalties in the Grain Belt, for example, there will be no end.

The acreage taken out of production will also have to be controlled or it will be used to produce other crops which in turn will create excess production of other commodities.

We may expect that such a process would go on and on until a fully controlled agriculture results.

The question is whether, for the sake of illusory increased incomes for a short time, American farmers are willing to surrender those rights for which their forefathers endured hardships—that we might know the meaning of freedom.

I do not mean to imply that government should remain aloof or indifferent to the needs of the people.

We need an efficient, democratically run government in this day of big business and a world made small by modern methods of communication and travel.

We need a government that lays down the rules of the game and enforces fair play; we need a government that protects the welfare of the needy and afflicted; we need a government that sees to it that our natural resources are developed and used wisely in the interest of the people, and a government that safeguards and maintains the Nation's security.

The thirty-odd-million persons who live on the farms of America constitute the very backbone of our democracy and of our free-enterprise system.

They are rooted in the traditions of self-reliance, honest work, and democratic processes. They are inheritors of the pioneer, progressive spirit of our forefathers.

The challenge now is to keep alive that spirit, and not let it be broken or weakened by false prophets or short-sighted promises, born of expediency and nurtured by illusionary gains. Our Nation was not built on paternalism; and it cannot endure on paternalism.

An agriculture under governmental guardianship cannot be a strong agriculture. A nation whose people are not free cannot be a happy nation.

I want to see agriculture and the Nation prosper on a sound and secure basis.

I want to see farm people and city people remain free—free from economic and political domination.

I want to see our country go forward in such a way that Americans can be masters of their own destiny.

We have shown to the world what a freedom-loving nation can accomplish.

We must demonstrate to ourselves and to the world that the torch of freedom is still alive and that we can keep our economic system of free enterprise in balance without jeopardizing our liberty.

To do this is the responsibility of all of us—farm and city people alike.

I have confidence that we will meet that responsibility through farsighted, united action.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in order that the remarks which I have just made may be more clearly understood by those who read them, I ask unanimous consent that the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture be printed in the RECORD in full at the close of my remarks.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I intended to make the same request.

There being no objection, the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE CHARLES F. BRANNAN AT A JOINT HEARING OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1949

This hearing deals with the heart of our farm policy.

The proposition with which I begin is that we are mutually devoted to the task of making our farm program the soundest, strongest and best that we can design.

We have already been dealing this year with a number of important items of legislation relating to agriculture: The Commodity Credit Corporation charter, some acreage allotment and marketing quota legislation, and the international wheat agreement, among others. And now we come to one which touches directly or indirectly upon all the rest.

It concerns our effort to assist farmers to maintain a reasonably stable income at a fair level—a level which is equitable to farmers and in the best interest of the other economic groups within our population.

The principal device authorized by the Congress for this purpose is commonly referred to as agricultural price support. It is, in my opinion, the most effective method yet suggested and must remain an integral part of our national economy until and unless a better method is suggested.

Some differences of opinion have developed about the exact formula and manner under which agricultural price supports should be made available. This is healthy and can only result in improvement if we all apply ourselves forthrightly to a solution of the issues.

One issue has been popularized as a simple clash over rigid support of prices at 90

percent of parity versus flexible supports ranging from 60 to 90 percent. That is an oversimplification.

The issue was not simple in the first place, and recent events have not made it simpler. In the last several months we have seen some of the effects of the bumper crops of 1948, and witnessed the planting of another gigantic winter wheat acreage. We have put into effect a new and lower support level for potatoes, yet find the Government still buying considerable quantities of surplus potatoes. We have come closer to the point where we seriously need some shifts in farm production if we are to avoid surpluses. We can now see some important economic trends that were not evident last summer.

Specifically, prices received by farmers have been coming down much faster than the prices they pay. In March of this year farm prices were 15 percent lower than they were at the beginning of last year, while prices paid by farmers were down only 2 percent from the peak reached last summer. In this period some industrial prices continued to rise. Farm purchasing power turned downward in 1948 and is now at the lowest level since 1942.

In short, some additional problems have come out of the realm of theory into the here and now. Hence the preparation of my first recommendations to the Congress on the important matter of price supports has required me to make a rather complete review of objectives, legislation, and alternative programs. In addition to considering simple revisions in present legislation we have taken a new look at various ways of measuring parity and just about all of the program suggestions that have been seriously considered in the past—two-price and multiple-price systems, forward pricing, automatic pricing formulas, compensatory payments, cost-reduction programs, and combinations of these alternatives.

The result of all this study is not likely to startle anyone. I have no revolutionary ideas to present to you. But I do have some definite recommendations for your consideration.

These recommendations are not advanced as the final and exclusive answers to our farm problems. I would much rather have a program that will work well in the immediate future than one which will partly do the job for 20 years. And frankly, I doubt our ability to provide so well for the future that future Congresses and administrations will have no changes to offer. We need to be clear about policy objectives, which apply to the long-time future as well as the present. At the very least our program must cope with problems now in sight. We proceed from where we are, not from a theoretical time and place. And the present economic situation is somewhat less favorable to farmers than at any time in recent years.

In view of the problems we face I am thankful that we have had a great deal of excellent legislation and much good experience on which to base an effective farm program. We can learn much of great value from the farm legislation and experience of the past two decades.

The programs we have had are the firm foundation on which we can build. We have learned in depression, in a defense period, in war, and in the initial phase of a new postwar period. Throughout this experience we have seen that the measures dealing with the selling prices of farm products and the incomes of producers are the keys to a successful program.

WHAT IS REQUIRED OF A PROGRAM

From our experience we can set up realistic criteria by which to judge and by which to guide our program. Prominent among the

criteria and requirements will be the following:

First, the program must effectively serve the farmer and his family. As an isolated individual the farmer has no control over the prices he will receive and no adequate way of adjusting the total market volume of his commodities to changing demand. After he has planted a crop he is at the mercy of weather, price, and many other forces with which he is powerless to cope. On many occasions in the past he has labored all season and produced a good crop only to find that, because of circumstances beyond his control, his labor would go uncompensated and sometimes his cash investment in seed, fertilizer, and other operating costs would be only partially recovered. A program to help him meet those basic difficulties is the very minimum for which we should strive.

Second, in serving the farmer the program must not discriminate unfairly against any group. It should be fair to consumers and to processors, shippers, wholesalers, retailers, and others in the distribution system. There is no real conflict between farmers and either consumers or business people. The customers of agriculture want plentiful and steady supplies, and they have a right to expect that a program supported by the public will help meet this need. Farmers want to furnish plentiful supplies regularly.

Third, the program must be efficiently operated and the cost must be commensurate with the benefits to the Nation.

Fourth, it must serve general policy objectives, including national security, the maintenance of high-level employment, and cooperation with other nations in the interests of peace and prosperity. It can do this by conserving and strengthening our basic productive resources, providing reserves against national emergencies, and encouraging free-flowing world trade by reasonably assuring sufficient products for export.

In short, the farm program must serve the best interests of all our people, and, in my opinion, that is the only kind of program the farm people want or expect.

Unfortunately, too many people still think of a farm program as some kind of class legislation. There is too little appreciation of the direct and definite ways in which it can benefit all the people and can help make this the kind of a country they want it to be.

Therefore, I want to list several ways in which we can expect an effective farm-production and price-stabilization program to serve the interests of all the people.

1. It can help prevent depression: Most depressions have been farm-led and farm-fed. Farm prices traditionally go down before, faster, and farther than other prices. On the downswing of the business cycle, farm people are the major early victims of a squeeze. As their income and, therefore, purchasing power is cut by low prices or production failure, industrial producers find a contracting market for their production. This throws workers out of jobs. They in turn spend less for farm products, which in turn further forces down farm prices, and farm purchasing power is further cut.

I don't mean to say that declines in farm prices are the sole cause of depressions, but they certainly contribute greatly and would do so more now than in the past because agriculture has become a bigger customer of industry.

Farm price supports cannot substitute for good markets that come with full employment and foreign demand, and, I believe, almost every farmer now understands the importance and relationship to farm prosperity of good wages for city and industrial workers. Supports are no substitute for city markets, but they can at least slow down declines in farm prices and provide stopping points so as to keep our fluid farm

prices from going rapidly into a worse and worse relationship with nonfarm prices.

2. A farm-production and price-adjustment program can help build markets for industrial goods and help maintain employment for labor: Industry today is dependent on the farm market to a far greater degree than it has ever been.

Let me illustrate this fact by listing some of the manufactured equipment that is in use on one particular farm today and which has been purchased since the last depression. This happens to be a Michigan farm—not fancy—just a good family farm. Here's the list: A combine, a corn picker, a portable elevator, one additional tractor with equipment to go with it (including a disk, drill, and corn planter), a feed grinder, a pick-up truck, motor and pump assembly for pumping stock water, an electric pump and pressure tank for running water in the house, electric refrigerator, electric stove, and electric hot-water heater. Think of almost any good farm, and you can make a similar list.

Back in 1929 there were only 827,000 tractors on American farms. At this time last year there were 3,250,000. In 1929 we had about 37,000 combines. Last year we had 540,000. The number of corn pickers has jumped from less than 9,000 to more than 800,000. These are only a few examples.

In 1929 less than 600,000 farms were electrified. Today the figure is more than 4,000,000.

Altogether the American farmer has lately been a \$30,000,000,000 customer of American business.

Even so, rural people represent a vast, untapped market for all sorts of goods. For example, half of the commercial family farms in this country are small, and in this group only 22 out of 100 homes have running water. For most of the other family farms, the comparable rate is 38 per 100, and in the top group, 58 per 100 have running water.

Farm people want to buy industrial goods, but when their prices go down in relation to the prices they have to pay, they have to cut their buying. Again let me illustrate.

A farmer on route 2, Defiance, Ohio, ordered a tractor last year priced at \$1,550. When it arrived at his dealer's, the price was \$1,950. His soybeans went down from \$3.47 in September to \$2.18 in March, and his corn went down in the same months from \$2 to \$1.23. He canceled his tractor order.

A farmer who lives on route 1, Crane Hill, Ala., ordered a tractor in 1945 at a price of \$1,500. It arrived last summer, priced at \$2,450. He felt uncertain at that time about the future of cotton prices and so, for the combination of reasons, turned down the tractor.

A farmer on route 1, Gettysburg, Pa., fed 40 steers for 157 days and lost \$3,000. He gave up buying a hay baler worth \$2,150 and building a machine shed on which he had planned to spend \$1,000.

It is important to all of us to maintain balance between farm and industrial prices. A program that helps to stabilize farm prices and incomes will help to stabilize markets for factory goods and will keep thousands and thousands of main streets busy.

3. Stable farm prices and incomes encourage high-level production with the greatest assurance of reasonable prices to consumers. This is one of the most significant lessons from our wartime experience. Without the cost-plus contracts and guarantees enjoyed by many industries, and with only reasonable price protection, farmers quickly made great shifts in the use of their productive resources to meet war needs. They supplied civilians with a fourth to a third more milk and a fifth more meat than prewar while they were meeting the needs of the armed forces and also sending large amounts of food to our allies. Farmers, like manufacturers, want to produce what their customers want. But usually it is only with advance knowledge

of minimum price that small individual producers, planning separately, can unify their efforts efficiently to increase the total supply of a particular commodity.

Furthermore, we know that American business depends on agriculture for raw materials, and business is starved if farm production goes down. About half of all the business done with United States consumers last year was based in one way or another on American farm commodities.

Price supports should be available at all times to assure the maintenance of this supply. If prices are allowed to remain too low too long farmers are unable to buy the machinery, fertilizer, and other materials which they must have to maintain high-level production.

4. A program that helps maintain farm incomes helps to maintain agricultural resources: City people, just as much as farm people, are concerned with the problem of conservation. Our soil, water, and forest resources must support a population that is still growing, and our objective is a higher standard of living for the people as a whole. Yet we are still losing productivity on hundreds of thousands of acres every year. Half of all our cropland is still subject to erosion. Obviously, conservation depends on something more than good farm prices. On the other hand, resources can be conserved and improved only if they are used profitably.

The depression taught us that hard times make poor farmers and poor land. Low prices force farmers to abandon their land-conservation practices in an attempt to make up for lower price by increasing acreage to get a greater volume. For the short pull, they will be able to pile up bigger production with less outlay. But only a few seasons need pass before even production will be decreased. The low wheat prices of the depression brought increased plantings, at great cost in resources. The dust storms in the Great Plains, as well as gullies and floods elsewhere, gave dramatic evidence that surpluses and low prices can lead a nation to ruin.

Price supports can aid conservation in at least two ways: (a) By bringing additional stability into the farm business so that farm people can enjoy a good standard of living without mining their resources and (b) by directly encouraging types of farming which naturally conserve resources.

It is generally believed that for the sake of keeping our resources permanently productive as well as to meet consumer needs, livestock production should be made a more important part of our agriculture. I agree with this. I also think the shift is not likely to take place as promptly and fully as necessary without the assistance of a well-adapted production and price-adjustment program.

5. An effective farm program is essential to our national security, will provide a reservoir of goods which protects the Nation against crop failure, and will assure supplies for an even flow of world trade: Reserve supplies above ground and their counterpart—reserve strength in the soil—are essentials of national defense. A large livestock population is also reserve strength. Before the last war, when we had to convert our Nation quickly into an arsenal of democracy, we were extremely fortunate in having large reserves of grain and cotton. Without having to wait for another harvest, we were able to start converting grain into the high-protein foods that were sorely needed by our friends abroad. Plenty of cotton was available for war uses. Several years of intensive soil-conservation effort had improved many acres of land which had suffered abuse.

Agriculture justly takes pride in the speed with which it converted to defense and war production. But agriculture is glad to share the credit with the people as a whole, for the storage and soil-conservation programs

were made possible by the general public—by a sharing of responsibility by farmers and the whole people. In terms of dollars alone, our prewar stocks proved to be a great investment.

Reserves also provide security against dangers other than those of war. Although we have never had a drought or other disaster that threatened us with famine or anything close to it, we have had shortages which severely disrupted our economy and caused a great deal of personal hardship. The results of the droughts of 1934 and 1936 are examples. Forced liquidation of livestock temporarily increased meat production and reduced prices, but in 1935 beef and veal production dropped 20 percent and pork production dropped 30 percent. There were further reductions in 1937. It was not until 1942 that cattle numbers came back to the 1934 level.

A more recent example was the short corn crop of 1947. Farmers had already been selling meat animals faster than they were replacing them. The short crop speeded up the trend, resulting in shorter supplies and higher prices of meat. We are still feeling the effects. Reserves will help us maintain livestock production from year to year and help prevent extreme fluctuations in price.

Adequate reserves are essential for still other reasons. We believe that free-flowing world trade is necessary to world peace. To the extent that we can, we want to discourage the tendency of some of our sister nations and traditional customers to return to nationalistic self-sufficiency with its artificial trade barriers and economic welfare. One means of doing so is to assure importing nations that they will have access to supplies they need year after year. That assurance on one commodity can be given through the pending international wheat agreement, and at the same time we and other exporters assure ourselves of regular markets. Wheat reserves will enable us to guarantee our commitments under the wheat agreement. Steady supplies of other export commodities can also be assured to importing nations by means of reserves.

It should also be remembered that a democracy with reserves and great productive power is a great comfort to nations fearing either famine or foreign aggression. Our practical ability to serve as a friend in need will determine how well we can meet our responsibilities of leadership—how well we can serve the cause of world peace and democracy.

Reserves of storable commodities are a natural adjunct of price supports. They are an aim as well as a result of the farm program. They represent an important part of the insurance which the public buys with the funds it invests in maintaining a healthy agriculture.

6. A price-support program which safeguards our rural economic strength can help stabilize the rural community and help maintain individual opportunity in our free-enterprise system: One bulwark of democracy may be found in the prosperous rural community mainly composed of economically strong families farming in the traditional American pattern. It is an ever present answer to communism.

We should be aware that for many years there has been a steady increase in the number of large-scale, industrialized type of farming unit. Many of these are absentee and corporate-owned. According to the 1945 census about 100,000 of the largest units—fewer than 2 percent of all farms—are selling products valued at nearly one-fourth of all the farm products marketed in this country. This is more than is sold in total by two-thirds of all our farms, including half of our family farms.

If we are to have stable and prosperous rural communities with schools, churches, health, and other facilities, it is plain that

many farm people need greater economic security and opportunity.

Price supports are the farmer's equivalent of the laboring man's minimum-wage, social-security, and collective-bargaining arrangements.

Of course, the price support does not meet the fundamental problem of the operator who cannot produce a large enough volume to make a good return at any price. But it does help on the price side of the farm-income equation. There are a great many farmers on the economic border line—they can make a fairly good living when prices are in reasonable balance, but a small drop cuts sharply into the income they have available for living expense and leaves only operating expenses or less. These people are a very considerable percentage of all the independent producers in our entire free-enterprise system. While price supports alone will not solve their problem, I see no reason to think it can be solved without some kind of a sound and effective program for maintaining stable and reasonable prices for the goods they produce.

MEASURING RESULTS

I have listed six ways in which a good farm income and price-support program can serve the interests of all the people. It can help do these things: Prevent depression, build bigger industrial markets and employment, maintain high-level production of farm commodities, conserve natural resources, maintain reserves for national security, and strengthen the rural community.

A program that will meet the test I have outlined will cost money, and the returns will have to justify the cost. We may not be able to set up a balance sheet in terms of dollars and balance it every year. But then, that is not the way we have measured the public cost and the returns from the tariffs with which we have protected various industries, the value of less-than-cost postal rates, the public investment and returns from the railroads, merchant marine and air lines, and the public cost and returns from the minimum-wage law and social security.

We do know that agriculture is a basic segment of the economy. It must be highly productive, and permanently so. It must contribute to the prosperity of the Nation, and in turn those engaged in agriculture must be able to share equitably in that prosperity.

I believe we can have that kind of an agriculture if we really want it. We won't get it easily or automatically. We won't get it all of a sudden. But we have already made great progress toward it, and if we will work together we can make more progress.

In my opinion, production and price adjustment with a definite income objective must be the core of our united effort, and although I will mention other measures I am concentrating at this time on the core.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Condensed into the fewest possible words, here are the proposals, each of which will be explained afterwards in detail.

Objective: The recommended program is intended to assure a volume of farm income and purchasing power which it is in the public interest to maintain for the reasons which have just been discussed.

The standard of support has been established with reference to income criteria rather than price criteria. A recent 10-year period has been selected as the base. Simplicity of computation and application has been a constant aim.

The recommended price support standard for any specific commodity does not represent a parity price nor does the composite average represent parity income as those terms are now statutorily defined or commonly understood. This income standard simply represents a realistic minimum below which it is not in the interest of farmers or consumers to allow farm prices to fall and

above which I would hope to find most farm prices most of the time. It is the minimum level from which we would be working toward narrowing, and eventually closing, the historical gap between farm and nonfarm income.

Formulas: As the start for our moving base, we have taken the average annual purchasing power of cash receipts from farm marketings for the years 1939 through 1948. From that, with the aid of the old parity index, we have moved first to an income support standard and then to a specific price support standard for the individual commodities.

Application of support: Loans, purchase agreements, production payments, and direct purchases should be available for use. These several methods would be used singly or in combination as experience and prevailing circumstances warrant.

Commodity loans and purchase agreements are probably the most effective and efficient methods for the commodities which do not appreciably deteriorate in storage and for those which should be held in reserve in appreciable quantities for production stability or against national emergencies.

Production payments, on the other hand, seem more adaptable as a method for supporting highly perishable commodities and those for which storage is too costly.

In the case of both perishables and storables, it may sometimes be desirable to remove surpluses or to obtain supplies for storage or collateral programs by purchasing directly from producers or intermediate processors.

Conditions of support: The availability of price support cannot be separated from the acceptance by farmers of reasonable undertakings to advance or accomplish the overall objectives of a sound farm program in the interests of the public and of their fellow farmers, such as—

(a) The observance of minimum and sound soil-conservation practices.

(b) Compliance with or adoption of whatever programs are found necessary to curtail wasteful production or disorderly marketing (such measures as acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and marketing agreements which may be adopted from time to time through referendums or by the authority of the Secretary under terms of specific legislation such as is now on the statute books).

(c) The limitation of eligibility for price support to a defined volume of production on each farm—a volume high enough to benefit most farms but one which will not encourage the development of extremely large, industrialized farming.

Those are my recommendations in brief. I have left out many significant details and comparisons which we can go back to, now that you have the over-all picture.

The income and price-support standards: If there is anything new in what is here proposed, it is the recommendation that we actually start our computations with an income criterion as the base on which price supports are determined. We have had income criteria in our laws—so-called parity income definitions—but, so far, we have not used them. Since income is what finally counts, I think it is time to start relating support prices to an income standard.

The factor which has discouraged real use of the parity income definition in the past has been the gap between farm and nonfarm income. This is so wide that a program based on real dollar equality looks unrealistic as an immediate objective. Under the old definition, for example, farmers last year received 160 percent of the theoretical parity income. But, actually, the average net income of farm people from all sources was only \$909 per capita, including the value of home-produced food and income from nonfarm sources, compared with the nonfarm

average of \$1,569. This puts the average farmer's income at less than 60 percent of his urban brother's income. Such a definition of parity seems to me indefensible.

The new definition in the Agricultural Act of 1948 defines parity income as that income which will provide farm people with standards of living afforded persons in other gainful occupation. This is undoubtedly valid as a concept and as a long-range objective which we accept as such.

In developing an income-support standard which can be translated into a price schedule, I start from the firm conviction that the particular formula or formulas should be based on recent experience and not related or chained back to some distant base period. Any such formula should reflect as far as possible the advancements in agricultural knowledge, facilities, and skills.

It is recommended that the income support standard for any year be defined as that level of cash returns from farm products which is equivalent in purchasing power to the average annual purchasing power of cash receipts from farm marketings during the 10 calendar years, 1939 through 1948.

As formulas go, this is quite simple. As the starting base, it takes the average annual purchasing power of cash receipts for the years 1939 through 1948, which figures we already have. This purchasing power is determined by dividing cash receipts for each year by the same year's index of prices paid by farmers for goods and services, including allowances for interest and taxes—that is, the "parity index" as we now know it. In terms of average 1939-48 farm-purchasing-power dollars, this base is \$18,218,000,000.

To calculate the income support standard, this base is multiplied by the current parity index. For example, parity as of March 15 was equal to an index of 144 (base 1939-48=100). Such an index would indicate an income support standard of \$26,234,000,000 (18,218,000,000 times 1.44).

Before going on to a discussion of the corresponding price-support standard, let me say a word about this income measure. It is not a parity income figure, but rather what I believe to be a minimum level which we should do our best to hold with the expectation that actual income would usually run higher. It is a level of income which I believe we can all agree should be maintained not only in the interest of farm people, but equally in the interest of all our people. It is calculated from a recent and fair base. True, 1939-48 does include some high-income years, but it also includes some low-income years starting with the very low year 1939. Furthermore, farm purchasing power has been above this suggested support level for six successive years.

Some people may object on the grounds that this formula relates to cash receipts rather than to net farm income. However, this has two advantages. The first is simplicity. As you will soon see, it is a very simple step from cash farm receipts to the support-price standard. Secondly, both the farmer and the American businessman are interested in the farmer's total purchasing power. Farm marketings must return enough to cover not only the farm family items but production expenses as well.

I am aware that this standard does not close the gap between average per-capita farm and nonfarm incomes. However, as I indicated earlier, one of our problems is to get something which will work here and now.

We contemplate that the base used for determining the income standard should move forward. I am proposing that this 1939-48 income base be used for 1950 and that thereafter the base should be the first 10 out of the last 12 years. In other words, there should be a 2-year lag between the base period and the year of actual operation so as to allow administrative preparation well in advance of operations and so that the

Congress may become aware of the effects of the moving standard before new calculations are put to use.

After determining the aggregate income standard for a year, the next step is the determination of a corresponding schedule of commodity prices. In doing this, average farm prices for the 10 immediately preceding years (or marketing seasons) would be multiplied by the ratio of (a) the current income support standard to (b) the actual average level of cash receipts from farm marketings during the 10 immediately preceding years. This formula will keep price relationships among commodities on a moving, up-to-date basis.

For example, the average cash receipts for the 10 years 1940-49 (using an estimate for 1949 in this illustration) is \$20,980,000,000, while the estimated minimum income standard for 1950 is \$26,234,000,000, assuming the parity index remains at its current level.

Since the support standard is 1.25 times the average cash receipts, the support price schedule would be determined by simply multiplying the 1940-49 average farm price for each of the several commodities by 1.25.

Now let us see how these formulas compare with the familiar parity price formula. So far as income and prices are concerned, the standards are about equal to what current marketings would bring if farm prices were to average the present parity level for 1949, but with the prices for the three great staples—corn, cotton, and wheat—averaging only about 90 percent of the old parity level. At the same time it follows that prices for a number of the other commodities, especially livestock and livestock products, would average above the current parity level. The method of calculating the income and price standards, as well as a number of price comparisons, are shown in detail in the accompanying tables (exhibits A, B, and C.)

Application to specific commodities: Our ultimate ability to assure these minimum income and price-support standards is of course dependent upon the availability of funds and specific authorization.

I recommend that the Congress designate those commodities which should have first priority on the funds available for price-support purposes. This list should include the agricultural commodities of prime importance, both from the standpoint of their contribution to farm income and their importance to the American consumer family.

This list should include, at least, the following commodities: Corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, whole milk, eggs, farm chickens, and the meat animals—hogs, beef cattle, and lambs.

I recommend that the prices or returns of these first priority, group 1, commodities be maintained at not less than the full support price standard. It should be clearly understood that the support price standard is not a ceiling.

Those commodities not included in the group 1 or priority list should be supported in line with or in relation to group 1 commodities, taking into account the available funds and authorities, the ability of producers to keep supplies in line with demand and other relevant factors. There will also need to be discretionary authority available for adjusting supports for these commodities in order to maintain desirable commodity relationships, especially in order to maintain normal feeding ratios or feed value relationships.

It may also on occasion, be necessary to recommend to the Congress certain adjustments in support prices for one or more of the group 1 commodities in order to maintain feed ratios or feed-value relationships.

The authority should be available to support any commodity at whatever level is required to increase supplies or meet national emergencies.

Price support methods: Commodity loans and purchase agreements are methods well adapted to the support of storable commodities which can be carried over without processing for a number of marketing years if necessary. Storables account for roughly 25 percent of our annual cash receipts from farm marketings and include cotton, corn, wheat, and other grains, tobacco, the oilseed crops, dry beans and peas, wool, and peanuts. These are not all equally storable, but experience has shown that loans and purchase agreements are effective for all the commodities on this list. Nevertheless, it would be desirable to have available, as a supplementary method, the authority to make production payments under certain circumstances.

The nonstorables—products which are either highly perishable or which can be stored only at heavy expense—include fruits, vegetables, meat animals, milk, butterfat, poultry and eggs, and account for roughly 75 percent of cash farm receipts. Production of these commodities is geared largely to domestic demand, and this demand fluctuates with employment, wages and other factors which change mass purchasing power. We can hope to increase per capita consumption of all or most of these products in a healthy economic climate.

When it is necessary to apply supports to any of these nonstorable commodities, I recommend that we rely mainly upon production payments.

The term "production payment" means exactly what it says—a payment to the farmer to go on producing to meet genuine consumer need, rather than restricting output short of that need.

Under this system the farmer would be paid in cash the difference between the support standard for commodities which he produced and the average selling price for those commodities in the market place. Because the payment would go directly to the farmer it would be an efficient support operation.

Another big advantage is that the system would induce efficient production and marketing, because any farmer who could exceed the average market price by quality of product or good bargaining would benefit to the extent that his selling price exceeded the average market price.

A third advantage of this system is that it would allow farm income to remain at a high enough level to sustain abundant production while retail prices sought their supply-and-demand level in the market place. This level is bound to be reasonable for consumers because of the larger supplies brought out.

It is obvious, of course, that the use of production payments must be qualified in such a manner as to avoid extremely depressed prices in the market place or a wasteful use of soil resources.

The payment method is not new. It has been used for various purposes before and during the war and we know it is administratively feasible. We know it is a method which not only protects farmers but gives consumers a real break.

I want to make it clear that I believe production payments should be used to encourage increased consumption as well as to support farm returns. Let me illustrate. In some of our larger cities, milk consumption per capita was much higher in 1947 than in 1940. The increases ranged from 15 percent to nearly 50 percent. Since 1947, in some of these same cities, the average person has been using less and less milk. Consumers have not simply decided they want or need less milk. The decision to buy less was forced upon them for the most part by the rising cost of the commodity. The result is bad for both consumer and producer.

Through production payments, we can keep the market price within reach of more people and maintain returns to the dairy farmers at

a level which will bring forth the necessary production. As we indicated in our long-range testimony in 1947, we should be producing and consuming 150,000,000,000 pounds of milk by now instead of something less than 120,000,000,000. If it is necessary to get milk down to the area of 15 cents a quart at retail in order to have maximum consumption, and use production payments to assure farmers of fair returns, I think both farmers and consumers will want to do it.

I believe the production payment authority should be so written as to allow it to be used as a supplement to our milk marketing agreements and orders.

The same principle should apply to other commodities to which marketing agreements and orders are adapted.

Parenthetically, I believe authority to support hog and milk prices through direct payments should be available before January 1, 1950. If it becomes necessary to support prices of hogs and milk this year as now required by law, authority to make payments will facilitate the job.

Another price-support method which should be available for use on perishable commodities is the direct Government purchase program. One of the biggest obstacles that fruit and vegetable producers encounter is a seasonal glut in markets. It may be local and temporary. Or it may be general and prolonged. There are times when marketing agreements and merchandising programs will not wholly meet the situation. On those occasions, it is necessary for the Government to make direct purchases and divert supplies from normal trade channels.

In preparing for this testimony, I gave considerable study to the possibility of using a "food stamp" or "food allotment" program as a price-support method. The attractiveness of such a program lies in the fact that it encourages increased food consumption and aids those consumers who are most in need. On the other hand, as we now see it, such a program would be administratively expensive, difficult, and would provide only an indirect aid to agriculture.

The use of an equal amount of funds in production payments or the other price-support methods would give farmers far more aid and at the same time benefit a wider group of consumers—in fact, all consumers of the commodity involved.

Conditions and limits: Now let us consider the practical conditions and limits for price supports.

Farmers consider themselves to be partners with each other and with other people in operating a program for the benefit of all. I believe they expect to and should accept responsibility. I do not believe that full benefits, if any, should be extended to producers who operate without regard to the welfare of the general public or of their fellow farmers.

As a result of increased yields, American farmers in 1948 produced the largest corn crop in history on the second smallest number of acres in 50 years. They produced the second largest crop of potatoes in history on the smallest number of acres in the past 70 years. Cotton, tobacco, wheat, and oats are among other major crops for which yields have been increasing.

There is good reason to believe that high-level production will tend to continue and that yields may continue to increase.

Even though economic activity in the United States continues at near-record levels and foreign demand for the products of our soil may remain large for some time to come, production of most agricultural commodities may easily out-run current high-level demand. Our experience in this country shows that full employment and high-level economic activity do not automatically provide a good market for everything our farms may produce. For example, with substantially full employment in 1923, our wheat prices were abnormally low because of for-

eign surplus production. In 1926, we had substantially full employment and a domestic surplus of cotton. In 1929, we had substantially full employment and were struggling to get rid of our large 1928 wheat crop.

Thus farmers have to prepare to moderate production of some items to less than maximum capacity.

Failure to provide for adjustments in production may result in burdensome surpluses as well as continued unwise use of much of our soil resources.

In view of the significant changes that have taken place in the total volume and in the pattern of agricultural production, there is a need to reexamine our adjustment policies and programs in order to insure that they realistically meet the problems that lie ahead. In making this reexamination, careful consideration must be given to providing a combination of production and marketing adjustment measures to balance supplies with demand, give producers an opportunity to contribute to farm income stabilization, and provide reasonable limits to the Government's financial assistance. My suggestions regarding these, by commodity groups, are outlined below:

Marketing quotas and acreage allotments should continue to be available or be provided for commodities such as tobacco, cotton, wheat, rice, corn, and peanuts, with improvements based on experience.

Whenever acreage allotments or marketing quotas are in effect on corn, acreage allotments and marketing quotas should be available for use on other feed grains and possibly rye. Such authorities are needed for additional commodities, such as soybeans, flaxseed, and dry edible beans.

The legislation should provide for acreage allotments, marketing quotas and marketing agreements, and orders for fruits, vegetables, and tree nuts. Producers of any one of these commodities should be provided with adequate tools to develop a program which would maintain or establish balance between supplies and demand, thereby providing a basis for price and income stabilization.

The time may come when marketing quotas or similar feasible devices may be desirable for meat animals, dairy products, poultry and eggs, although the need for improving the diets of consumers and for encouraging conservation farming would not so dictate at this time. For fluid milk, marketing agreements and orders should be continued.

Eligibility of a producer for participation in the benefits of any price-support program should be conditioned upon compliance with or adoption of applicable programs of production adjustment, marketing quotas or agreements, and the carrying out of reasonable conservation practice requirements.

Present legislation provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may invoke acreage allotments and marketing quotas in most instances on the basis of supply in relation to demand, and that producers determine in a referendum whether they will regulate themselves by approving the use of these devices. With respect to such storable agricultural commodities as soybeans, flaxseed, dry edible beans, and dry field peas, as well as the nonstorable crops, it is recommended that acreage allotments or marketing quotas should not be declared necessary until producers have been given an opportunity by the Secretary to vote on the question of invoking such measures in order to bring supplies in line with demand and to qualify for the price support requested.

A further limit on the extent of support is necessary if the public is not to provide financial encouragement for the continued development of extremely large-scale, industrialized farming.

The program I have presented is designed to raise the efficiency with which resources

are used in agriculture. But our emphasis upon efficiency must not be followed in disregard of maintaining a strong and self-reliant rural population in America. In my opinion, we would be wrong to allow our programs to operate in such a way as to encourage the concentration of our farm land into fewer and fewer hands.

As one means of implementing this conclusion, I suggest that the production of a farm in excess of a predetermined amount be not eligible for price support.

To determine the amount of commodities per farm eligible for support, it is suggested that we establish a common unit of measurement applicable to all agricultural commodities on which price supports may reasonably be expected at some time. I am suggesting a comparative unit, which would be equal to 10 bushels of corn, almost 8 bushels of wheat, or a little more than 50 pounds of cotton. The equivalent in other crops or commodities may be quickly computed by relating their value to the value of corn according to prices used in the price-support standard. This is elaborated upon in the attached table, exhibit D.

It is then suggested that not more than 1,800 comparative units per farm be eligible for support. The effect would be about as follows: The operators of all farms, no matter how large, would receive benefits of the price-support program to the extent of 1,800 units of the commodities grown on that farm. Farms which produce in excess of 1,800 units would not enjoy support on the excess. This would exclude part of the production on approximately 2 percent of the farms of the Nation.

I have arrived at this recommendation with considerable caution. If we are to encourage the initiative of individual farm enterprisers we must not set the eligibility point too low. As a matter of fact, we need to place it as high as possible and still preserve the essential rural values I have mentioned. The dividing point I am recommending has been determined on the basis of Census material relating to farms. This dividing point will provide support for just about the amount of production available for sale from our largest family farms. Such a large family farm would be a modern, mechanized, efficiently operated farm with some hired labor, particularly during peak work periods, but still a farm on which the farmer accepted full responsibility for the management and on which the farmer and his family did a great deal, if not the bulk, of the farm work.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Summarizing the suggested program methods, I would like to call your particular attention to these points:

1. We would base price supports on a realistic income standard, which is a more fundamental base than price alone, and yet we would continue operations in the price field. The economy would continue to have the same price-stabilizing benefits which have been important contributions of past programs.

2. This would not be just a support-and-control program. It would directly encourage the movement of greater volume of commodities for which demand is elastic in relation to price, as well as hold down the production of surpluses. This will enable the public to realize more direct benefits.

3. The recommended program makes definite provisions for support of nonstorable commodities, which represent about three-fourths of cash farm receipts and which have not been adequately covered before. Some of these nonstorables would be eligible for the same preferential treatment that storable basics have received. This enables the program to work more directly toward the development of a production pattern in line with people's needs and market demands.

4. The recommended program permits plenty of leeway for enlarging farms in the

interest of efficiency and better living standards, but it does not encourage the concentration of production on extremely large farms.

5. This program provides a closer tie between price supports and other parts of the farm program and increases the responsibility of farmers for carrying out the objectives of national farm policy.

6. The suggested methods of operation are not new in principle, and few are new in practice.

So much for the program methods.

In the final analysis, a program cannot be judged by its aims and methods alone, but by actual results. I believe the recommended program will measure up to the standards I mentioned in the beginning. It provides farm people with price and income supports and the general economy with a large measure of stability. It provides for ample reserves of storable commodities needed for national security and for carrying out our foreign policy. It is reasonably simple and thereby subject to efficient administration. It seeks not only in general but in certain specific ways to assure the general public with abundant food at reasonable prices and thereby offers them direct and tangible returns for money spent.

Having pointed out certain advantages of the program, I also want to call attention to some of its shortcomings.

In the first place, this program does not close the gap between farm and nonfarm income. It offers a realistic beginning.

In the second place, the price and income supports I have suggested, in common with all other price-support systems, falls short of meeting the needs of those operators who lack enough good land and enough capital to produce the necessary volume with the necessary efficiency for a good standard of living. For those operators and their families, an expanded Farmers Home Administration program is a basic need. We should also remember that opportunities in agriculture are becoming more limited in number, both for operators and labor.

We need a program of job training and placement and some definite means of encouraging the development of industries in underdeveloped areas if we are to avoid a long-time problem of relief for those who are crowded out or only partially employed.

I also call your attention to the fact that neither a price-support system nor prosperity itself will assure the conservation of agricultural resources on which we as a people depend for our very lives. With the best possible price-support system, we still need an expanded soil-conservation program.

Price supports, of course, do not take care of the problems of community services such as electrical and telephone services and health and education facilities. They do not affect our need for research and education in agriculture and home economics, for cooperative credit, or for various regulatory and service functions.

The school-lunch program is also a continuing need. This program is somewhat related to the price-support program. As long as it appears necessary to make direct purchases of commodities for the purpose of maintaining farm returns, we should plan to dispose of what we acquire in constructive ways, which certainly include school lunches. Only about 6,900,000 children—approximately a fourth of those now in school—are now benefiting from the program, and on a fourth of the lunches the program provides for milk only.

These are the facts we should keep in mind when we are considering outlets for farm production, as well as when we consider the primary purpose of the lunch program—the welfare of the children.

Another program very important to maintaining farm income and a continuity of

production is crop insurance. Price supports are of no immediate importance to a farmer who, because of natural hazards, is unable to produce anything to sell. The crop-insurance program is designed to help the farmer get back his seed, at least, enabling him to get by until his next crop can be harvested and sold. Without protection of his investment the farmer who suffers a crop disaster loses not only the benefit of the current price support, but also a part of his previous profits.

I am glad to note a few days ago that the House Committee on Agriculture reported favorably on the Department's recommendation to expand this program. I also share the committee's enthusiasm for extension of the multiple-crop-insurance system by which a producer of diversified crops can buy a simple policy to cover at least part of his investment. The multiple-crop system fits right into our aims for price support and other programs. I hope that the sound operating experience of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation in recent years will allow it to grow until crop insurance is available to every farmer.

In general, I would reemphasize the recommendations made by the Department of Agriculture in 1947 with regard to the programs needed in addition to price supports.

All of these matters have their individual places in our total agricultural policy of abundance. Price support is not the only matter that requires our attention. However, it is the most immediate, pressing problem. And I would say, further, that it must be the heart of our policy, for it will determine to quite an extent how successful the rest of our programs can be. One thing is certain: It would do little good to have a power line to the farmstead or a hospital in the community if the crop produced will not return enough money to enable the farmer to use the available services.

In the final analysis, of course, the best basic economic aid for agriculture is a fully employed labor force at good wages. But labor is not likely to be fully employed and industry is not likely to be expanding production when agriculture is in economic trouble.

Agriculture is not merely a recipient of good fortune but a partner in the making of prosperity.

I am confident that by working together we can develop a production and price-adjustment program that will actively and positively serve the best interests of all the people.

EXHIBIT A

PROVISIONAL DEFINITION OF INCOME-SUPPORT STANDARD

The income-support standard in any year shall be that level of total cash returns from farm marketings which is equivalent in purchasing power to the average purchasing power of cash receipts from farm marketings during the 10 calendar years 1939 through 1948. Purchasing power in any year shall be measured in terms of an index of prices paid by farmers for goods and services, including interest and taxes.

The following table and calculations show how 1939-48 average purchasing power would be calculated and adjusted to give an income figure for 1950:

TABLE 1.—Cash receipts from farm marketings: Calculations of average purchasing power, 1939-48, and of income-support level for 1950

Year	Cash receipts from farm marketings ¹	Parity index (1939-48 average=100)	Purchasing power of cash receipts in millions of 1939-48 dollars (column (1) × column (2))
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Millions of dollars		
1939.....	7,877	73	10,790
1940.....	8,364	73	11,458
1941.....	11,181	77	14,521
1942.....	15,372	88	17,468
1943.....	19,434	95	20,457

¹ Excluding Government payments. Cash receipts for 1949 were estimated at \$27,500,000,000.

EXHIBIT B

(Work table: Illustrative calculations only; shows probable relative differences for 1950)

Specified commodities: Illustration of calculation of price-support standards for 1950 based on parity index for Mar. 15, 1949, and estimated average prices received by farmers, 1940-49

Commodity (grouped according to present legislation)	Unit	Income support standard 1950 ¹	Average cash receipts from farm marketings 1940-49 ²	Adjustment factor, column (1) ÷ (2)	Average prices received by farmers 1940-49 ³	Price support standard, column (4) × (3)
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Basic commodities:						
Wheat.....	Bushel	26,234	20,980	1.25	1.50	1.88
Corn.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	1.17	1.46
Cotton.....	Pound	26,234	20,980	1.25	.2239	.2799
Rice.....	Bushel	26,234	20,980	1.25	1.81	2.26
Peanuts.....	Pound	26,234	20,980	1.25	.0756	.0945
Tobacco:						
Flue-cured.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	.394	.492
Burley.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	.397	.496
Specified Steagall commodities:⁴						
Butterfat.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	.535	.669
Milk, wholesale.....	Hundredweight	26,234	20,980	1.25	3.38	4.22
Hogs.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	15.20	19.00
Eggs.....	Dozen	26,234	20,980	1.25	.366	.458
Chickens.....	Pound	26,234	20,980	1.25	.232	.290
Flaxseed.....	Bushel	26,234	20,980	1.25	3.44	4.30
Soybeans.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	2.03	2.54
Beans, dry edible.....	Hundredweight	26,234	20,980	1.25	6.76	8.45
Potatoes.....	Bushel	26,234	20,980	1.25	1.27	1.59
Other commodities:						
Cattle, beef.....	Hundredweight	26,234	20,980	1.25	13.50	16.90
Lambs.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	14.70	18.40
Oats.....	Bushel	26,234	20,980	1.25	.69	.85
Barley.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	.975	1.22
Apples.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	2.09	2.61
Wool.....	Pound	26,234	20,980	1.25	.398	.493
Oranges.....	Box	26,234	20,980	1.25	1.57	1.96

¹ Estimated.

² Cash receipts from farm marketings for 1949 estimated at \$27,500,000,000.

³ Prices for 1949 estimated basis current prices and announced or mandatory support levels for 1949.

⁴ Sweetpotatoes, dry field peas, American-Egyptian cotton, and turkeys are also Steagall commodities.

TABLE 1.—Cash receipts from farm marketings: Calculations of average purchasing power, 1939-48, and of income support level for 1950—Continued

Year	Cash receipts from farm marketings ¹	Parity index (1939-48 average=100)	Purchasing power of cash receipts in millions of 1939-48 dollars (column (1) × column (2))
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Millions of dollars		
1944.....	20,360	99	20,566
1945.....	21,520	101	21,507
1946.....	24,864	113	22,004
1947.....	30,186	135	22,360
1948.....	31,019	146	21,246
1939-48 average.....	19,018	100	18,218

1. 1939-48 average purchasing power, in millions of 1939-48 dollars... 18,218

2. Prices paid by farmers including interest and taxes, basis parity index for March 15, 1949 (1939-48=100)..... 144

3. Equivalent 1939-48 purchasing power at March 15, 1949 prices... 26,234

The support-price standard, or prices corresponding to the income-support standard, would be calculated by multiplying average farm prices for the 10 immediately preceding years by the ratio of the income standard to the average level of cash receipts from farm marketings during the 10 immediately preceding years, as follows:

4. Income-support level (at March 15, 1949, prices)..... 26,234

5. Estimated average cash receipts from farm marketings, 1940-49... 20,980

6. Ratio of income-support level to 1940-49 average cash receipts... 1.25

At the March 15, 1949, level of prices paid by farmers, the adjustment factor to be applied to 1940-49 average prices would be \$1.25.

EXHIBIT C

(Work table: Illustrative calculations only; shows probable relative differences for 1950)

Specified commodities: Estimated alternative support standards for 1950 based on parity index for Mar. 15, 1949, and estimated average prices received by farmers, 1940-49

Commodity (grouped according to present legislation)	Unit	Income-support standard ¹	90 percent current parity	Support range, title II, Agricultural Act of 1948 ²		
				60 percent	72 percent	90 percent
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Basic commodities:						
Wheat.....	Bushel.....	Dollars 1.88	Dollars 1.95	Dollars 1.24	Dollars 1.48	Dollars 1.85
Corn.....	do.....	1.46	1.42	.90	1.08	1.35
Cotton.....	Pound.....	.2799	.2745	.1739	.2087	.2603
Rice.....	Bushel.....	2.26	1.80	1.31	1.58	1.97
Peanuts.....	Pound.....	.0945	.106	.0672	.0806	.101
Tobacco:						
Flue-cured.....	do.....	.492	.405			.422
Burley.....	do.....	.496	.393			.434
Specified Steagall commodities:³						
Butterfat.....	do.....	.669	.582			.584
Milk, wholesale.....	Hundredweight.....	4.22	3.55			3.70
Hogs.....	do.....	19.00	16.10			16.60
Eggs.....	Dozen.....	.458	.476			.453
Chickens.....	Pound.....	.290	.252			.252
Flaxseed.....	Bushel.....	4.30	3.74			3.74
Soybeans.....	do.....	2.54	2.12			2.21
Beans, dry edible.....	Hundredweight.....	8.45	7.46			7.37
Potatoes.....	Bushel.....	1.59	1.62	1.16		1.74
Other commodities:						
Beef cattle.....	Hundredweight.....	16.90	12.00			14.80
Lambs.....	do.....	18.40	13.00			16.00
Oats.....	Bushel.....	.825	.884			.840
Barley.....	do.....	1.22	1.37			1.30
Apples.....	do.....	2.61	2.12			2.28
Wool.....	Pound.....	.498	.405	.289		.434
Oranges.....	Box.....	1.96	3.32			3.16

¹ 1940-49 average prices times 1.25. Prices for 1949 estimated basis current prices and announced or mandatory support levels for 1949.² Based on parity revisions title II, Agricultural Act of 1948, including transitional parity prices which are 95 percent of present parity. Transitional parity prices are for wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, eggs, oats, barley, and oranges.³ Sweetpotatoes, dry field peas, American-Egyptian cotton, and turkeys are also Steagall commodities.⁴ Not more than.

EXHIBIT D

Selected list of commodities showing quantity equivalent to 1 unit (10 bushels corn) valued at income-support standard prices

Commodity:	Quantity equivalent to 1 unit
Wheat (bushels).....	7.77
Corn (bushels).....	10.00
Cotton (pounds).....	52.16
Rice (bushels).....	6.46
Peanuts (pounds).....	154.97
Tobacco:	
Flue-cured (pounds).....	29.68
Burley (pounds).....	29.44
Butterfat (pounds).....	21.82
Milk, whole (hundredweight).....	3.46
Hogs (hundredweight).....	.76
Eggs (dozen).....	31.88
Chickens (pounds).....	50.34
Flaxseed (bushels).....	3.40
Soybeans (bushels).....	5.75
Beans, dry edible (hundredweight).....	1.73
Potatoes (bushels).....	9.18
Beef cattle (hundredweight).....	0.86
Lambs (hundredweight).....	.79
Oats (bushels).....	17.70
Barley (bushels).....	11.97
Apples (bushels).....	5.59
Wool (pounds).....	29.32
Oranges (boxes).....	7.45

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I wish to say a word regarding the importance of our present price-support program. It has laid a good foundation for a fuller and a more modern support program. A modern price-support program, which provides for adequate reserves, is as essential to our defense as are modern airplanes, tanks, guns, bombs, and a stock pile of strategic materials.

The income-support standard, as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture, is a compromise between supporters of prices at 90 percent of parity

versus supporters of the flexible supports ranging from 60 to 90 percent.

I have reviewed the recommendations of Secretary Brannan during the past 2 days and am in full accord with his objective. I agree with Secretary Brannan that—

We need a realistic minimum below which it is not in the interest of farmers or consumers to allow farm prices to fall and above which I would hope to find most farm prices most of the time. It is the minimum level from which we would be working toward narrowing, and eventually closing, the historic gap between farm and nonfarm income.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of such an objective.

The Secretary proposes a more modern and simplified formula than is the parity formula heretofore used. The application and administration of supports can be effected more easily and promptly. The farmer will know the minimum support level and will not have to guess whether his crop is supported at 60 percent, 72 percent, or 90 percent of parity.

As soon as a bill is presented, incorporating the recommendations of Secretary Brannan, I shall ask the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to hold hearings, giving all interested parties full opportunity to present their views. We do not want this bill rushed through the Congress in the heat of an election or just before adjournment, as happened last year. I shall do everything in my power to see that it receives careful and deliberate consideration and passage through the Senate during this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I understand that the full report to the Secretary of Agriculture has now been made a part of the Record.

CONFIRMATION OF ARMED SERVICES NOMINATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now consider various nominations for promotion in the armed services, which I have today reported. I ask that the nominations be confirmed and the President immediately notified. These are all routine nominations, and there is no objection to any of them from any source whatsoever. They come from the committee with a unanimous report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Reserving the right to object, I take it that the Senator does not intend that these names be included on the roll call of this morning. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. These gentlemen will take their places in that illustrious roll call which includes the names of men who wear the uniform of our country and on occasion defend it from enemies who attack.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified at once.

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to have an opportunity to make a few remarks in reply to the comments of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] in his reference to the organization known as the Americans for Democratic Action and his reference to the affiliation of the junior Senator from Minnesota with that organization, as well as his reference to a project which the

organization has undertaken for the encouragement of travel on the part of young Americans to Great Britain.

Just so that we may have it clear in the RECORD, I wish to read from the program of the Americans for Democratic Action as adopted on March 29 and 30, 1947, in the first organizational conference in the city of Washington, D. C. I read:

GENERAL PURPOSES

As Americans for Democratic Action, we hold with the Declaration of Independence that the purpose of government is to secure to men the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We fight today in the spirit of those who, through the course of American history, have fought to enlarge and vindicate these rights. Our objective is to raise again the banner of progressivism in America, the only banner under which the free peoples of the world can be rallied against totalitarianism.

It is our conviction that bread and freedom are ultimately interdependent. Our program is directed toward this one goal: a society in which each individual enjoys the highest degree of liberty compatible with justice and economic security for his fellows.

By liberty we mean the fullest assurance of those traditional rights which are based on a profound belief in the dignity of the individual: equality before the law and freedom for all persons to speak, to write, to worship, to vote, and to assemble as they choose, without regard to race, creed, color, national origin, or economic status.

By economic security we mean freedom from want and a fair distribution of the fruits of labor. More concretely, we mean the guaranty of full and steady production and employment; the protection of labor's right to organize democratically and bargain collectively; fair levels of income and security for the farmer; assurance to genuinely competitive business of fair opportunities for efficient production and expansion; protection of the people's inheritance in natural resources against waste and monopolistic exploitation; and a system of minimum wages and social insurance broad enough to maintain adequate standards of nutrition, education, medical care, and housing.

Mr. President, I put this into the RECORD because I do not hesitate to say that the Americans for Democratic Action represent some of the finest traditions, the hopes and aspirations for political freedom and economic security, by the American people.

There may be Senators, there may be those in the House of Representatives, and others throughout the country, who are in disagreement with many of the programs and objectives of Americans for Democratic Action. We in this country always reserve for ourselves the right to disagree, to have honest differences of opinion. But I want no one to feel, because of the remarks which have been made on this floor, that this organization is anything but a deeply sincere, patriotic, liberal, American, freedom-loving organization of people who are by their own talents and their own achievements fine representatives of this Nation. I will exclude from that group the acting national chairman [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. This is not in any sense designed as a reflection, but merely as a matter of identification. Will the Senator be kind enough to tell us, if he will, whether David Williams, director of the London office, is the same David Williams who is listed in the British Who's Who as David James Williams, member of Parliament, Liberal Neath division of Glamorgan, since May 1945?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know, but I shall be more than happy to afford the Senator the information, and it shall be presented to him in his office.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator be kind enough, as I read the names, if he can, to tell us who these gentlemen are?

Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., chairman of the executive committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall go into the matter of the personnel, without being too extensive in my remarks, in order to give some idea of the leadership and the affiliation of the individuals connected with the Americans for Democratic Action. I should like to continue my remarks, and I am sure that in what I say I shall be able to answer the penetrating and sincere questions of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

The first national chairman was Wilson W. Wyatt, the distinguished ex-mayor of the city of Louisville, Ky., who was a distinguished servant of his Government as the National Housing Expediter.

The chairman of the executive committee in the early days of this organization was a well-known and eminent economist, one who performed distinguished service for his Government during the period of the war, Leon Henderson.

The secretary of the national board, about whom the Senator from Missouri has inquired, is a young attorney in the city of Washington, D. C., who at one time I believe worked in the Office of Price Administration, and also with one of the housing programs of the National Government.

The gentleman who is known as the national executive secretary has for many years been affiliated with liberal and progressive organizations, such as the Union for Democratic Action, which preceded this organization. His name is Mr. James Loeb, Jr.

I should like to call to the attention of Senators some of the distinguished members of this body and of the House of Representatives who are proud to affiliate with the Americans for Democratic Action.

I first refer to the new Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the former president of the great University of North Carolina, the man who was so eloquently, and, let me say, so righteously defended on the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from the State of North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], is a vice chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JENNER. Is not the gentleman the Senator just referred to also a member of 18 Communist-front organizations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall reply to the question from the Senator from Indiana by saying that I know of no man in the United States of America who has a more distinguished, a more honored, and a more desirable and worthy record for public service and for devotion to democratic principles and to the highest ideals of this Republic and of this Nation than the junior Senator from the State of North Carolina. I am honored to serve in the same body with him.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator think it is highly desirable and patriotic to lend one's name to organizations that are known in this country and classified by the FBI and the Department of Justice as Communist-front organizations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would reply to the Senator's question that I am not going to involve myself in connection with a further attack, such as has been conducted on the floor of the Senate, upon the splendid reputation, the noble character, the fine mind, and the excellent person known as the junior Senator from North Carolina. I think it is beneath the dignity of this honorable body to engage in such debate. His service to his country is so outstanding that we should stand here and give thanks to Divine Providence that the distinguished Governor of that State saw fit to appoint him to this body to fill the vacancy which occurred because of the passing of our late lamented friend, Senator Broughton, of that fine State.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I continue with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask if the Senator will yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to my friend from Missouri, yes.

Mr. DONNELL. My inquiry is this: I understood the Senator to say that the first president of the organization was Mr. Wilson Wyatt?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. And that Mr. Leon Henderson was connected with this organization.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. Leon Henderson was the OPA Administrator?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, he was.

Mr. DONNELL. And I believe the Senator said that Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, the chairman of the executive committee, has also been connected with the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not certain of that.

Mr. DONNELL. I thought the Senator so stated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is a capable attorney in the city of Washington, and it is my understanding that he had at one time an affiliation with that Administration.

I will now proceed, Mr. President.

Mr. DONNELL. I am sure the Senator would not object for another inquiry if he knew the object of the inquiry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I also ask if Mr. Paul Porter was not connected with the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He was, as I understand, appointed by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and served with the Office of Price Administration, and, as reported on the floor of the Senate a few moments ago, he did serve as publicity director for the Democratic National Committee, and did serve likewise as Special Ambassador to the Greek Government following the action of the Congress of the United States on the Greek-Turkish loan. He has served in many distinguished capacities, and we feel highly honored to have him as a member of our organization.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. That is the same Paul Porter who served on OPA, and in other governmental organizations, and is now a member of the board of Americans for Democratic Action?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator permit the question as to whether or not Mr. David Ginsburg, the secretary of the National Board of Americans for Democratic Action, is the same Charles David Ginsburg who is listed in Who's Who in America as having been assistant to Commissioner Leon Henderson? Am I correct in that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe he was.

Mr. DONNELL. Are there any other members of the board who are connected with either Mr. Leon Henderson or the OPA, of whom the Senator knows?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know, except I would point out that the distinguished Governor of the State of Connecticut, the Honorable Chester Bowles, is a member of Americans for Democratic Action, and, of course, lest anyone have any doubt that the list of individuals was composed of none but Government officials, I would point out that the very distinguished and honored clergyman, from, I believe, the State of Missouri, if I am not mistaken, Bishop Scarlett—

Mr. DONNELL. Yes; indeed he is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Served with distinction as a member of the board of Americans for Democratic Action. I would point out that the able theologian of world renown, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, serves on the board. I would point out that the able junior Senator from the State of Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is a member of this organization. I would point out that not only—

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not only is the junior Senator from Illinois a member, but let us go to the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. DONNELL. Just a moment. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will not the Senator from Minnesota yield for just one question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not yield. Continuing my remarks—

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will not the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I do not yield, Mr. President.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask if the Senator will not yield for just one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator will be kind enough to yield if he understands the object of the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I shall not yield for questions for the moment. I should like to point out—

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair repeats that the Senator from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will not the Senator yield so I may ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has declined to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I am asking the Senator from Minnesota if he will yield for one further question. I do not think he will have any objection to yielding if he knows the purport of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has declined to yield. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to yield at a later moment. I do not want to deny my friend the distinguished Senator from Missouri the opportunity to interrogate me, but I want to continue because there has been some reflection cast upon this organization.

I point out that the distinguished and able Congresswoman from California, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, is a member of the Americans for Democratic Action. The able Representative from Wisconsin, ANDREW J. BIERMILLER, and the able Representative from Kansas City, Mo., Mr. RICHARD BOLLING, are members of this organization. Representative YATES, of Illinois, and Representative HOLFIELD, of California are members of this organization. These are, to mention but a few, individuals who are dedicated to what? Who are dedicated to the principle of political liberty for the American people, with the hope of being able to assist the rest of the world in the securing of political freedom and some semblance of economic security.

Now, without any further remarks as to the nature of the organization, of which I am very proud to be the acting national chairman. It is an organization which includes some of the distinguished labor leaders of this country, men of character and above reproach. It is an organization which includes members of the clergy, of the business community, outstanding educators, professional people. It is an organization which has dedicated itself to one thing—to ally itself with groups of independent people

in this country, progressive liberal-minded people who are unalterably opposed to any kind of totalitarianism, whether from the left or from the right. It is an organization which sees communism and fascism as twin brothers, as equal evils. It is an organization which recognizes that we do not fight communism and fascism just by saying we are against it; an organization that recognizes that communism and fascism are the end products of a decadent, degenerate, and broken-down political and economic society.

The Americans for Democratic Action is determined to do its little part—and I say little part because it is a small organization—to bolster up in this Nation and in other nations those democratic forces which believe in human liberty so that they can withstand the onslaughts of the viciousness and the villainy of totalitarian forces within our own country as well as totalitarian forces outside our country.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I decline to yield at this time, Mr. President.

I listened today to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] in which he said that he was perturbed and disturbed because here was an organization which was suggesting to young people, young Americans, that they take a trip, that they go to England and that when there in England they study the Labor Party, which is the majority party in England; that they study the Workers' Education Association, which has had a long history in Great Britain, an organization which has had a longer history in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark; that these young people when they go to England should view and study and be brought into contact with the Trade Union Congress. This is nothing more or less than the great labor movement of Great Britain. It is suggested that they should be brought into contact with and should have the opportunity to learn about the Fabian Society.

Mr. President, I submit that the best way we can build international good will and the greatest means we can use to build peace and understanding in this world is to know each other.

Not only do I encourage young Americans to go to England; not only do I encourage them to study the Labor Government of England, but I encourage them to study the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party. I encourage them to go to Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, western Germany, and Italy. I encourage them to become citizens of the world. They can become citizens of the world only if they have an opportunity to learn about the world in which they live. If it is wrong to encourage young men and women to inform themselves, to open up their minds, to see how other people live, and to form judgments on the basis of their own experience, I stand eternally condemned as being consistently and perpetually wrong.

In my judgment, commerce between the nations promotes peace. Cultural interchange among the nations promotes peace and understanding. I only wish that every young American could come to Washington and study his Government. I wish we could recognize that we are living in one world, and that sooner or later every young American should have the opportunity to study the kind of world in which he lives, the world which will affect the future course of his life.

Why is it considered that there may be danger in the program of sending young men and women to England? Because the Labor Government is in power. Lest anyone misunderstand my remarks, let me make my position clear. I do not believe in socialism. I do not believe in any type of collectivism. I believe in free enterprise. That is the kind of life in which I was brought up. That is the kind of background from whence I came. However, I believe that the purpose of economic institutions is to serve the people. Not long ago I heard the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] state on the floor of the Senate that the reason some countries were turning to socialism was that the old systems were not meeting the needs of the people. I point out that perhaps one of the reasons they are turning to socialism is that the old systems simply do not give the answer to the human needs. In the so-called good old days, the coal miners of England did not have their needs met. The people of England did not have opportunity for health services, educational services, and the other things they needed. They turned to a different economic system.

I remind my distinguished colleagues that we ought to get down on our knees and thank God that Great Britain today is a nation which has dedicated herself to the continuance and preservation of the great traditions for which she is so well known.

What traditions? Free speech, for one. Remember that out of Britain came the Magna Carta. Another tradition is freedom of the press. Others are freedom of religion, freedom to worship, freedom to assemble, freedom to petition, and freedom of political action and participation. In every newspaper we hear about Britain and her new experiment. We read that an election is coming on. The British pioneered democratic processes.

I have been reminded by the junior Senator from Indiana that democracy is apparently something that we do not have; not only is it something we do not have, but that there is danger of democracy degenerating into gang rule. I do not wish to misrepresent the remarks which have been made on the floor of the Senate today, but I ask Senators to look at them in the RECORD.

I admit that democracy is not a form of government. Democracy is a spirit of government. Democracy is the spirit of human personality. It is something which may be classified as intangible. It is a basic, fundamental belief that every human being is worthy of respect and of dignified treatment. It is a basic realization that we are created in the

image of our Maker, and that there is something very precious about human life, the human soul, the human mind, the human body. That is what we mean when we talk about the spirit of democracy. It means the dignity of the individual, and respect for his personality. It means the freedom of conscience to seek the truth, so that the truth may make us free.

We who believe in the democratic spirit also believe that there is a fraternity of mankind, and that all men are equal under the law and in the eyes of their Maker.

In the spirit of democracy we have many forms of government. We have a republic with a federal system, such as exists in the United States. A republic is a structure of government; but I submit that a republic without a democratic philosophy could be tyrannical. It is the spirit of democracy which gives to it the kindly touch, the human element of understanding, and the characteristic of decency. England is living within the democratic tradition, yet her form of government is that of a king and parliament. Norway is a kingdom, as is Sweden; but I ask my colleagues, Would any Member of the Senate rise and say that Norway is not democratic, or that Sweden or Denmark have not aspired to the highest traditions of democracy? Yet they are not republics.

How do they live? They live in the spirit of mutual respect for fellow citizens. They recognize that the only justification of any kind of institution is what it does to promote the welfare of the people, and to enrich the lives and enlighten the mind of every human being. That is what we mean when we talk about democracy.

I submit that Britain stands today just as she stood in 1940 after the terrible disaster at Dunkerque. Britain stood her ground then and now as one of the main bulwarks against the forces of darkness in Europe. Even as we were making up our own minds about our foreign policy she did not turn to communism. She did not turn to fascism. She turned back into the richness of her own experience and her own understanding of her own problems. Out of that decision came a Labor government. I am proud to say that it is one of the greatest tributes to working men and women that they could provide for Britain a government of their own—a free government for a free people.

The Labor Party includes professors, doctors, lawyers, bankers, and businessmen. The Labor Party of Great Britain is not made up solely of members of labor unions.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I decline to yield at this time.

The Labor Party of Britain is made up of a broad cross section of its people, as is the Labor Party of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden. Even kings have learned to work with and to admire, respect, and pay tribute to the great leadership which comes from the Labor Party ranks. Since when did we become so fearful of free labor? When did we

become such highbrows? This country is made up of descendants of the embattled farmers who stood at Lexington and Concord, and of the workers. Practically every Member of the Senate points with pride to the days when he worked for a living. We still work for a living—lest anyone misunderstands my remarks. We point with justifiable pride to the fact that we came up the hard way. There were no silver spoons in our mouths. But while we talk about the dignity of labor, we are unwilling to recognize it when the name of labor is attached to some political organization which may be successful.

Mr. President, it would be a good thing for thousands of Americans, both young and old, to visit Britain. Perhaps it is not our youth who should take the trip. Possibly the trip should be taken by adults, so that we may better understand what is happening in that great country.

Mr. President, I did not intend to say a word in this debate over the continuance of the authorization for the Economic Cooperation Administration. I recognize that possibly I am a little out of line in even rising at this point; but I felt that there was involved a question of personal privilege. I cannot sit silently in my seat and hear an organization with which I am closely affiliated brought under attack. I must rise to its defense.

I do not say that it has all the answers. It is attempting, in the democratic American way, to find the answers through political education and understanding.

I stated that I did not intend to interfere any of my personal opinions with respect to the continuation of ECA, but I shall do so. I believe in it. I believed in the Marshall plan when it was first enunciated by General Marshall. I believed in it when the Eightieth Congress passed an authorization and passed an appropriation. The debate in this Chamber has indicated, without the shadow of a doubt, its success. Those who attack Britain for her weaknesses and her failures when young Americans plan to go there and learn about the British Labor Government are the same ones who a short time ago were showing how Britain had increased her production under the Labor Government. They are the same Senators who said no longer do the great British people need any American help, because, as has been said, the British economy had recovered. They say coal production has increased, they point out that steel production has increased. These same gentlemen say the British are doing very well.

I should think that young Americans would like to see such genius at work and see such great ability pouring out the treasures of the earth in the form of the finest products of the British factories.

Oh, no, Mr. President; ECA is working, but it is now at its critical point. Just as war appropriations were made, so it is that peace appropriations need to be made. This great body appropriated \$450,000,000 in 5 years for the prosecution of the world's greatest war—and for its successful prosecution. I submit to you, Mr. President, that when victory was within our grasp in 1944,

when the enemy was on the retreat, when the Nazis had been stopped on the cold plains before Stalingrad and when the Japanese were being pushed out of their strongholds in the South Pacific, when victory seemed in our grasp, did the Congress of the United States say, "Let us cut down the appropriations now; it looks as if we will win the war, let us take it easy and go slow on the spending of money"? No, Mr. President, not at all, not on your life, because that was a fight to the death; it was the battle of the century. I submit to you that at that time the Congress continued to appropriate vast sums of money to win the war. The action of the Congress was wise then—it will be equally wise to authorize the peace program of ECA.

Mr. President, we have a war on our hands, and it will not be won by false economy. It is a cold war, and it can be won only by the warmth of democratic ideas and performance coming from this Nation—the ideas of democratic living, backed up by the substance for which this Nation is so well known—backed up by its money, its diplomatic pledges, its political genius, its industry and scientific accomplishment. I submit that we would be making a tragic mistake if in any way we were seriously to amend the proposal of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate which provides that we should go ahead. Yes, Mr. President, go ahead with the renewal of authorization for ECA. We must understand the kind of world we live in as we expend this money. We must understand that the hope for freedom in the world does not lie in the debunked, bankrupt, morally degenerate leadership of the past in Europe or in Asia. Nor does it lie in any type of streamlined brutality such as communism. The hope for freedom and peace in the future lies in people such as those in the British Labor Party. It rests with people in the Social Democratic forces of western Germany, not in the cartellists or the monopolists or the old aristocrats of privilege who were the "big shots" of the pre-Hitler or Hitler days. The hope for freedom rests with the untapped resources of young men and women rising above the miseries of World War II. It rests with the labor and cooperative organizations of Europe and Asia. It is to be found in the natives in colonial areas who are aspiring for the freedom which I heard the distinguished Senators from Oregon and Maine [Mr. Morse and Mr. Brewster] speak for so eloquently.

Yes, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota holds those same beliefs. He does not believe there can be nobility of democratic purpose in Europe and at the same time an underwriting of the most miserable type of imperialism and colonialism in Asia. It is about time that we made our position clear, Mr. President. We cannot be for freedom in Europe and colonialism and enslavement in Asia. This is one world. It requires one foreign policy.

Yes, we may be winning the war for recovery in Europe, but we are losing the minds and souls and hearts of millions and millions of backward peoples who are aspiring to be free men and women, on

the continent of Asia and in many other areas of the world.

So I wish to have the ECA authorization provided; yes, indeed, I do, Mr. President; but I also want full appropriations made for it; and then I want the kind of humanitarian administration and policy not only from ECA, but from our State Department and from this Congress, so that the people of the world will understand, as they may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if they do, or as their leaders may read it, that here there is no spirit of denial of opportunity. Here in America we believe that the little people should have an opportunity to become big people, that we would like to see opportunity provided for every person in the world to make something out of his life. I want our policy to carry forward the democratic hopes and aims of our people.

A utopian dream, you say? I agree, Mr. President; but it is about time that we realized the crucial situation that faces us. It is about time that we realized how important a man Pandit Nehru is, in India—a great believer in freedom; and we cannot afford to wait until we have another conflagration on our hands, before we come to the rescue. Mr. President, we have had fire-department tactics for far too long—tactics by which we wait until there is a conflagration, and then send for the foreign-policy fire department.

I think it is time that we move on the offensive—the moral, political, and economic offensive. The Marshall plan was an important step on that offensive. It was a step in the right direction; and it has worked. Now we need, not less of it, but more of it. Every dollar we spend will come back to us a hundredfold—back to us in good will, in security, in peace and freedom.

Mr. President, there are still some truths that need to be enunciated; there are still some things that need to be said. It is still better to give than to receive. It is more noble to serve than to be served. Those are basic truths that every one of us was taught, and I think it is about time that we applied them in our politics, in particular, international politics. It is in the field of our foreign policy that it will count most. Whether we have peace or war, freedom or enslavement, does not depend just on what we do in our domestic policy, although that has its effect. It depends in a great part upon what we do in our foreign policy.

Mr. President, I commend the Members of this body and of the House of Representatives who in the past voted in the affirmative, and will do it in the future, for the continuance and extension and broadening of the purposes and objectives of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. First of all, I wish to ask the Senator's pardon for my persistence a few minutes ago in asking him to yield. I thought the question I wished to ask him then was appropriate at that time, although of course it was entirely

proper for the Senator to ask me to postpone my inquiry.

I wish to say now that in addition to Mr. Leon Henderson, who was OPA Administrator and is connected with Americans for Democratic Action; and in addition to Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, whom the Senator from Minnesota thinks probably was with Mr. Henderson in OPA; and in addition to Mr. Paul Porter, who was connected with the OPA, I wish to ask the Senator whether Mr. Chester Bowles, whom I also mentioned as having been connected with Americans for Democratic Action, was also connected with the OPA?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed; he was.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask further whether the David Ginsburg who is listed in the pamphlet as secretary of the national board of Americans for Democratic Action is not only the same Charles David Ginsburg who was, as I said a moment ago, assistant to Leon Henderson—who was then, I may add, on the Securities and Exchange Commission—but is also the same Charles David Ginsburg who was general counsel of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is his very distinguished record, but only in part, let me say. His record is quite distinguished.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question in reference to the personnel listed in this document?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator know who George Edwards is?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do, and I am very happy to reply to the question of the able Senator from Missouri. George Edwards is president of the city council of the great city of Detroit, Mich. He is without doubt, in my opinion, one of the ablest young men in America, and I am sure he will be heard from in the not-too-distant future; in fact, if I may be permitted to say so, he may well aspire to a higher office in that great and beloved State.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator from Minnesota know who Hugo Ernst is?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do. I shall reply by saying that Hugo Ernst is one of the members and officers of the American Federation of Labor, a vital part of the greatest free labor movement in the world, and one of which we can justifiably be proud. Hugo Ernst is at the present time president of the International Hotel and Restaurant Workers, and he has an enviable reputation for sincere and constructive labor relations.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I further note in the list of officers of Americans for Democratic Action, the name of Mr. Emil Rieve. I ask the Senator whether he is the same Emil Rieve who has been president, and perhaps still is, of the Textile Workers of America, and vice president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was going to save the time of the Senator from Missouri by giving him a thumbnail character sketch of Mr. Emil Rieve, who is International President of the Textile Workers of America, CIO, and is well known in some of the New England States and some of the Southern States. I am quite sure that many of our colleagues hold him in the highest respect. He is, to my mind, one of the outstanding labor leaders in the free labor movement in America.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not think I asked the Senator about Louis H. Harris, who is listed on this publication as treasurer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is an outstanding businessman in the city of New York who, I understand, has done very well in this free economy of ours. He has continued on in the liberal tradition and with his liberal spirit has served very capably for more than 2 years as treasurer of Americans for Democratic Action.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me say that inadvertently I overlooked in the list the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., whom all of us know, and whose reputation stands without any comment of my own.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to make a comment. Mr. President, I think his reputation is of the very highest. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as all of us know, is the son of a very distinguished father. I think he will equally distinguish himself, and I am looking forward to the day in the not-too-distant future when he will serve as a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I believe the Senator said that he does not know whether David Williams, the director of the London office is the same David Williams who is a member of the British Parliament, and whose name I gave a few moments ago from the British list.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must reply to the Senator from Missouri that I do not know, but I may say I shall be more than happy to provide the Senator with that information. I hope that he is a member of Parliament because if he is a member, it would add greater stature to our organization.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the names of two other individuals listed on this document?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator be kind enough to tell us who they are, if he knows? One is Mrs. Frances Adams, State trip director, and Mr. Fritz Mondale, executive secretary?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mrs. Frances Adams, as I understand is a resident of the city of Washington, D. C., and her title is exactly as it is stated on the bulletin. She has worked with the local

chapter of the Washington, D. C., committee of the Americans for Democratic Action. In reference to Mr. Fritz Mondale, I may speak with a certain amount of State pride. Mr. Mondale comes from a very distinguished family residing in the southern part of Minnesota, a family residing on one of our fine Minnesota farms, in the richest farmland in the world. He was a student at Macalester College in St. Paul, one of the finest institutions of the arts and sciences in the Nation. He was a student at the time the junior Senator from Minnesota was professor of political science at Macalester College. I am happy to know I was sufficiently able to inspire him to enter into such political activity as that which he is now engaged. He is a field representative of the Students for Democratic Action—an affiliate of the Americans for Democratic Action.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the Senator's courtesy in answering the question. I hope the Senator again will pardon me for the interruption.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, I should like to ask him a question. But I will wait.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be more than happy to receive the Senator's question.

Mr. KEM. I merely wanted to say I have listened to the interesting and intelligent remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, and I should like to ask him, in order to keep the RECORD clear, whether during the period in which he held the attention of the Senate, he was disturbed by any calls for a vote, or other manifestations of impatience on the part of any of those who happen to hold views contrary to his, on some of the features of the pending legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to reply to the Senator's question by saying I have always been treated with the utmost courtesy by Members of the United States Senate. But I feel that the Senators who serve as members of the Foreign Relations Committee and those who are anxious to have this legislation voted upon could well have chastised the junior Senator from Minnesota for taking up this time, and I have noticed that some of them have become a bit restless, and well they may. I may say to them that the only reason the junior Senator from Minnesota rose to his feet today was to defend the reputation and the character of a splendid organization. I urge, and then I shall take my seat, that we carry on with the debate, come to a vote, and finally authorize the full amount for the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield further to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HUMPHREY. On the Senator's time, yes. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether he feels that the Senator from Texas or any other of the senior Members of this body are exempt from

either the rules of the Senate or the ordinary considerations of courtesy between gentlemen?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do not, Mr. President. I believe that every Member of the Senate is worthy of the utmost courtesy and fullest opportunity of extended debate.

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. LODGE addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator made two or three statements which particularly interested me. In a general sort of way, with respect to his general objective, I, of course, agree. But the Senator made the statement that the Marshall plan so-called, or ECA, was the first move and contribution this country had made toward world freedom and democracy. I wonder whether the Senator wants that statement to stand. Had we not taken other steps, prior to that, such as aid to Greece and Turkey, our action with respect to Bretton Woods, the United Nations, and many other things which were milestones in their day?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate, Mr. President, the opportunity which has been afforded me by the distinguished Senator to correct my statement. I should like to say that this Nation, since the time of World War II, has been in the forefront for the promotion of world understanding and world cooperation. I thoroughly concur in the leadership this Nation gave to the establishment of the United Nations, the World Bank, and the Bretton Woods Agreement. I believe we have done great things in the good-neighbor policy, and I believe we have done wonderful work in the establishment and promotion of world understanding through aiding in the establishment of many United Nations organizations. We made great progress in the case of the British loan. But I say the Marshall plan, the program for economic cooperation, has been the most successful and most brilliant chapter in American aid for world recovery and for the maintenance of the hope of freedom and security in the world. I think it has been our most brilliant chapter.

Mr. BRIDGES. The impression the Senator wanted to leave was that it is the most successful, rather than the only one, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do, and I appreciate the correction.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to suggest two other questions, if I may. The Senator referred to totalitarian forces in our country who were trying to destroy it. The Senator did not identify them. Would the Senator identify them?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am more than happy to identify totalitarian forces, because I think the only way we can do away with them is by way of accurate identification, by the kind of identification whereby we really put the label on people who deserve the label, and not promiscuously use a general plastering of labels which are so easily kicked

around. The Communist Party and its membership constitutes a subversive force in the United States of America, and the best way to thwart their activities or to demonstrate their ineffectiveness is by strengthening the American economy. The Communist part is but one of the subversive forces.

I should like to point out that I think there have been other forces that have been subversive, such as the Silver Shirts, the Ku Klux Klan, the Christian Fronters—Fascist organizations—and to me it makes no difference whether it be a dictatorship of the proletariat or a dictatorship of the elite, it is still a dictatorship. Whether elite or proletarian, they soon acquire the same beast-like habits once they obtain omnipotent power.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In that case, what does the Senator say about some of the people who are affiliated with his organization, if they are, who are members of Communist-front organizations, and so designated by the Department of Justice? The Senator just said the Communist Party is the greatest totalitarian threat to this country. What does the Senator say about some of the people who are associated with his movement if they are affiliated with Communistic forces? I am not charging they are, but I say, if they are.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I imagine that every American has made some political mistakes in his life. I imagine that every citizen and every man, woman, and child has not always lived a life without sin, and as is repeated so often, "There is more rejoicing in heaven over one sinner that repents," than there is sometimes over the 99 who have remained true and faithful. There have been people, innocent people, who have been sucked into Communist-front organizations by clever front operators, but I am happy to say that the Americans for Democratic Action more than any other single political group in this country has exposed the them for what they are. When a man front organizations and has exposed has at some time or another found himself affiliated with an organization which he later found to be unworthy of his support, and to be undemocratic and un-American and thereupon disassociated himself, he has exemplified great courage. He has admitted that it is possible to make mistakes. But he has braved the storm of rebuke and criticism and admitted his errors. He should be welcomed back. I should hesitate to go through the political, economic, social, and personal record of every person who belongs to the Republican Party or to the Democratic Party or is a Member of the House of Representatives, the Senate, or any other honorable body. I am sure all of us would find a few skeletons in our closet. What is important is, Where do people stand now? What are they thinking and doing today? Have they made up their minds that there is an irreconcilable ideological conflict in the world? Do they know their position? I know of no man who is a member of the board of the Americans

for Democratic Action who does not know what his position is, and I may say to the Senator that I surmise the members of that organization could detect a "commie" so much faster than some of the people who do all the talking about "commies" that it would be almost ridiculous.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. I noticed in the Senator's speech he did not refer to communism as being a threat. I am glad to have him identify it now as such.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, Mr. President, I think I should correct the RECORD. The junior Senator from Minnesota not only referred to communism as a threat, but he referred to all forms of totalitarianism as a threat to freedom, to peace, and to security. Let there be no doubt about that.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator will yield further, he has just now stated it, but I did not notice that in the main body of his speech he mentioned them specifically.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota mentioned them specifically. He has done so not only by speech, but as one person in the great ferment of American politics, he has urged that all of us make our contribution—and I have made mine—toward the exposure and the defeat of those who would ensnare people into the front organizations, and other organizations which would try to discourage and deceive the liberal democratic movement in this country. We have had some success, and if we can receive the cooperation of those who so willingly use the label and the brush of communism, and make sure they understand the identification, so they know of whom they are talking, I do not think we will have much trouble. The real problem is that communism can hide behind a great smoke screen, because too many unthinking people call other persons Communists without any appreciation or understanding of the term or the philosophy.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator said, in effect, that persons who have been sinners may dissociate themselves from a Communist organization, and he sees no harm in it, because it is better to have those persons back in the fold and to go along with those who are living a pure life. But if such persons do not dissociate themselves from Communist organizations, what does the Senator say about that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. What he has always said. It is time for the American people to make their choice; it is time to come clean. We cannot have half-baked ideas about being able to cooperate and work with those who do not believe in democratic principles. I mean the democratic way of life. I believe that people should stand up and be counted. I have said that a number of times. I believe that persons who are challenged as Communists should say one thing or the other, "I am not" or

"I am." That is all that is necessary. But I caution those who make the accusation, that when we steal a man's character we steal something which is very important; and before we start to defile character we should be extremely certain of our facts. We must recognize that while there may be an organization which has a taint about it, it does not mean that everyone within the organization is tainted. It may mean that someone has been led into a false path. It is our job to lead them out. I would solicit support for the organization of which I speak, Americans for Democratic Action. Let me point out that the only way we can deal with Fascists and Communists is realize their objectives and their tactics. The best way to answer them is to build a dynamic healthy society, which does not leave any potential converts for them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. If a man becomes associated with or a member of a Communist-front organization, who has the burden to dissociate himself? Is the burden not on the individual, and if the individual fails to dissociate himself, is it not reasonable to assume that there may be some tendencies in the man's character which would bear watching?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not care to read into anyone's character what may not be in it. I know the position I would take, and I think I am right. I believe the promiscuous calling of names and the use of labels in America has done more to foster the growth of communism in this country than has any other one single factor. I think the willingness to put the tag of Communist or Fascist on anyone with whom we do not agree has been a protective screen behind which the real Fascists and Communists can hide.

It is not very fashionable to talk about Fascists any more, but I should like to remind the Senate that there are Fascists who are just as dangerous as are Communists. It was the Fascists who precipitated the war and almost destroyed the world. Out of their folly and misery arose the threat of communism which we face today. I want people to dissociate themselves from any antidemocratic group, but I cannot tell a man that he has to dissociate himself from an organization to which he belongs. He has to live with his own soul and with his own conscience. I believe that every person in America has a right to live according to his own conscience. He has a right to join any church or any political party he may want to join. All I want him to do is to stand up and proclaim his affiliation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Can the Senator condemn communism, the Communist Party, and Communist-front organizations, and then attempt to close his eyes to a man's not dissociating himself from such an organization when the character of the organization becomes known to him?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that what may be known to the Senator sometimes is not known to others. I do not wish to use the personal reference. What may be known to one person may not be so clearly known to someone else. Sometimes it takes some persons a good deal longer to know. It takes some children a longer time to get out of the fourth or fifth grade than it takes others. It takes some persons a little longer to accumulate sufficient information to make them believe that a certain thing is true. I think we should weigh it on the side of toleration and give every man the opportunity to uphold his own dignity. I am sure the Senator and I both agree that we do not like Communists and Fascists, but I am wondering if we agree on what kind of society it is that can do away with the menace of totalitarianism. It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Minnesota that it is in unemployment, in lack of opportunity, in discrimination, in prejudice, in an economic society that is disintegrating and degenerating, that the Communist threat is really found.

I do not want America to try to reestablish in Europe some kind of a nineteenth century democracy saying all that is needed is free speech. No; we must have freedom of trade also. We must have economic security. That is why we not only have to carry our political message to the world but we should extend our technical know-how, our economical aid, to help them to raise themselves by their own boot straps. That is part of the answer to communism and fascism.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield. I do not want to continue to take the time of the Senate, but I do not want to deny others the opportunity to ask a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is proposing, through his organization, to send a group of young people from this country to England. He has said he admires the Labor Party of Great Britain and its accomplishments. Does not the Senator agree that the thing for which the Labor Party of Great Britain is most noted is the fact that its outstanding accomplishment, that which they brag about, is the socialization of the industries of Great Britain?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say to the distinguished Senator that what the members of the Labor Party most brag about, as the Senator puts it, is that they have begun to meet human needs; and it is on the floor of the United States Senate that we hear about socialism. It is in Great Britain that we hear about meeting human needs. I said I have admiration for the Labor Party, although I do not always agree with all its program, philosophy, and methods. Apparently, according to the adversaries of the ECA authorization, ECA has worked very well. It has worked so well that they want to cut down the authorization.

I point out that the immediate accomplishment of the Labor Party of England is the preservation of those basic, fundamental freedoms which are vital

to the democratic philosophy—free speech, free press, freedom of assembly, freedom of political participation. Get those things, and there is a chance for free men and a free world.

Mr. BRIDGES. We have all those freedoms in this country, have we not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, we have.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. We are sending young people from this country over there, and we have in this country all those things of which the Senator speaks. What do they have in Great Britain that we do not have here?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Westminster Abbey. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is perfectly correct, but there is also a socialistic program which has taken over one by one the industries of Great Britain. That is one of the fundamental distinctions, if not the great distinction, between this country and Great Britain. I am trying to find for what purpose the organization of which the Senator is the head is sending these young men to England. Is it to make them experts so that eventually they may come back and help socialize our own country?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I point out to the Senator that the junior Senator from Minnesota is not sending anyone to Great Britain. As a matter of fact, the junior Senator from Minnesota was even having a difficult time arranging for a short vacation for members of his own family. Americans for Democratic Action are arranging for a tour for young people, to study the economic, the political, and the cultural institutions of Great Britain.

The only fear I have, I must say, is a fear that has been brought about because of what I have heard from the opponents of the full authorization for ECA. I fear that these young people will find out of the great accomplishments of the British Labor Government. I was uncertain as to this achievement until I heard the senior Senator from Indiana and the junior Senator from Indiana, the junior Senator from Missouri and the senior Senator from Missouri, state the British had greatly increased production and they were doing very well. Yes, doing so well that it is now proposed that we should curtail the aid. Yes, according to the critics of ECA, the British socialistic ideas have increased production so much, that it might be something that would arouse the imagination of the young people, and they might come back with some ideas with which the Senators and I would not agree.

These young men and women study economics in the colleges and high schools, they study different philosophies of politics. The best way to be able to resist something is to know about it. The best way to be able to resist a disease is to know the full impact of it, and the best way to understand something that is good and wholesome is to witness it in operation.

I do not intend to make any prejudgment as to what these young men and

women may find. I know they will find Westminster Abbey, as I said a moment ago. They will find the city of London, and will see the shambles and the wreckage caused by war. I know they will find a Britain that is struggling hard to rehabilitate itself. I know they will find a proud people. I know that if they look through the London Museum they will find some of the great symbols of political liberty. I know that if they stay in England 2 or 3 weeks they will come back with a greater appreciation of the need for international cooperation and what should be the bonds of fellowship.

I have heard it said on the floor of the Senate that the free peoples should get closer together. I have heard those who attack the Atlantic Pact say that what we need is more United Nations cooperation, more interchange. I have heard criticism of the ECA because it did not promote unity. Yet, I think it was Aristotle who said that the way to bring about infiltration of ideas from one country to another was by commerce, the free flow of trade.

The first argument of those who are against ECA is that it is working. They are unhappy because Britain is producing. They say that if Britain is producing we should not give it any ECA aid. The fact is that ECA aid is why Britain is producing. ECA is working. So these gentlemen are not sure what program we should have.

The final blow comes in finding that things are so good, that ECA is working so well, that the Labor Government in Britain is doing so well, that we never should have our imaginative young Americans go over there and see what is happening.

I predict that they will come back and say, "God bless America." They will look at the Declaration of Independence, and look at our private enterprise, and say, "Give us America. It is still the best Nation in the world." And that is how I feel. But I want them to see what the people of the rest of the world are doing, and I want them to become acquainted with the British.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether he understood the junior Senator from Missouri to say that he was unhappy because England was producing goods in large quantities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understood the junior Senator from Missouri to say that we could well afford to reduce the authorization for ECA because Great Britain was doing so well—that the production was even above prewar levels.

Mr. KEM. Did not the Senator understand the junior Senator from Missouri to say that he was very much concerned about foreign competition because it was unequal competition; that when the American producer and the American workman were in competition with foreign industry subsidized by Marshall-plan money, and operated by the governments of these foreign countries themselves, it was an unequal competition, in

which the American workingman was very apt to lose in the end?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, why is it that on the floor of the Senate, where, on the one hand, we brag and beat our chests about Americans and American industry, which we have every right to do, and talk about the genius of our people, the skill of our labor, and the administrative ability of our management, all at once we become so frightened because we are going to have a little competition somewhere?

I submit that competition has never been able to destroy our markets. The only harm we have suffered in terms of our trade has been when the flow of commerce and the interchange of goods was diminished, not when it was accelerated.

I would point out also that we should not for a single moment think that the amount of production which may take place in any one of the numerous countries which are being aided under the ECA is nearly equivalent to what we can produce in this country. I stand forthrightly on the premise that American industry is capable of outproducing and outmatching, in terms of quality or quantity, any country or industry in the world, and we should not be fearful of competition.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator recall anywhere, at any time, in the long history of American industry, that American workingmen have been in competition with foreign-owned, foreign-operated, state-controlled industries subsidized with the money of American taxpayers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely have made no such observation. I should like to make a further comment now. The American workingman was led to believe for years that a high protective tariff was his friend. He learned, however, that it was in the interest of big business in this country.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me make one further observation. For every single American worker who has suffered, because of unfair competition from foreign industry, and has been exploited by foreign industry, I can find a much larger number of American workers who have suffered from exploitation in the past days of this Republic from manufacturers and industry within America. It was not the American worker in the forest who was paid 50 cents a day who suffered from foreign imports. He suffered because the barons of the lumber industry were unwilling to pay him a living wage. It was not the American workers in the coal mines of this country who in 1927 were receiving less than \$5 a day, and whose wages went down to as low as \$3.25 a day who were suffering from the importation of coal from abroad. They were suffering by reason of lack of organization in the mines, by reason of the exploitation of the mine owners.

Mr. President, we will not be fooled by any kind of economic argument that a little competition from Great Britain, from France, from Belgium, from Holland, is going to exploit the widows and orphans and the American workers. The

only ones troubled by any such competition are the monopolies which, as a result of such competition, will be obliged to produce with more efficiency and sell at reasonable prices.

Mr. President, I believe in competition. I do not believe in monopoly. I believe in competition for this country and I believe in competition between the countries. And I shall stand for that which is so American—the competitive enterprise system. I am amazed to hear people talk so much about competition who never want it when it really happens. I want to see it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the question I asked him, which was whether he knows of any time in the history of American industry in which the American workingman has been in competition with foreign state-owned industry financed or subsidized with the money furnished by the American taxpayers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know of such fact.

Mr. KEM. I should now like to ask the Senator a further question. Does he think that such competition is the kind of equal competition which is in keeping with the American tradition?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do believe that the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the money it expends for recovery in the free nations of the world, are 100 percent in the American tradition. I think nothing can be worse for American industry than to have a monopoly in the world markets. I think nothing could be worse for the American people than to find ourselves without any competition.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator look with equanimity and satisfaction to a period in which the American workingmen will be competing with industries employing low-cost labor, built with Marshall-plan money, and equipped through the Marshall plan with American technique and technology?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to submit to the Senator from Missouri that since he has such deep concern over low-cost labor, I want him to join with me and the British Trade and Labor Congress to promote better wages in Great Britain. I want him to join with me to help raise the wages of the unorganized people in America. American workers in this country are up against unfair competition from their own underpaid unorganized brothers. There are areas in this country that could give adequate testimony to that effect. I say to the Senator that if we are going to argue about the ECA because it is going to hurt America, then we have surely arrived at an argument that is without one basis in fact. One can argue that it does not work, that it is a foolish expenditure of money because it will not work in the long run. That is a matter of judgment. But to argue that it is working so well that it ought to be limited and checked is an

argument that the purposes of ECA have been and will be fulfilled. Recovery is being accomplished.

I yield the floor because the debate has continued too long, and I look forward to the opportunity of voting.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has yielded the floor.

COMMITTEE MEETING AND TEMPORARY LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit at 2 o'clock. The subcommittee is composed of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attending the session of the Senate at 3 o'clock, in order that I may attend the International Joint Commission Conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. BRIDGES. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. What committees now have permission from the Senate to meet? I want to know how many Senators may be absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Appropriations Committee and any subcommittee thereof.

Mr. BRIDGES. Any others?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. None others except as permission was just granted the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

EXTENSION OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May we have the pending question stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MALONE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MYERS. My reason for suggesting the absence of a quorum is that I believe it is fair to Senators who are absent to be given an opportunity to come to the floor of the Senate for the vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to know whether the yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hendrickson	Miller
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Brewster	Hoey	Mundt
Bricker	Holland	Murray
Butler	Humphrey	Myers
Cain	Ives	Neely
Capehart	Jenner	O'Connor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Connally	Kem	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Eaton	Lodge	Taft
Ellender	McCarthy	Taylor
Ferguson	McClellan	Thayer
Flanders	McFarland	Tobey
Frear	McGrath	Tydings
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg
George	McMahon	Wherry
Green	Magnuson	Williams
Gurney	Malone	Withers

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to make one or two observations in connection with the statement made this morning by my friend the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] in connection with a newspaper story purporting to attribute to Dr. Nourse a statement to the general effect that the program of military aid to Europe would necessitate alterations in the Marshall plan. I think that fairly sums up what Dr. Nourse said. I do not know what the motive was for making that statement, nor do I grasp entirely what Dr. Nourse's qualifications are for passing on a matter which is as complex and as fast-changing as this subject is.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Is the Senator aware that the report which appeared in the Post was incorrect, and that Dr. Nourse's remarks were correctly reported in the Times-Herald? He did not bring the Marshall plan into the discussion.

Mr. LODGE. I was not aware of that. I am grateful to the Senator from Vermont for calling my attention to it. The story which I read did not make sense in terms of what I believe to be the prospect with regard to military aid.

It is my understanding that it is not planned for the first year to encourage the development of armed forces in Europe which will take any more manpower away from industry and agriculture in Europe than is being taken away at the present time. Of course, we do not begin fundamentally to change the economic situation in a country until the national defense establishment gets to

the point where it does take manpower away from peacetime pursuits. When that time comes, if it does come 2 or 3 or 4 years from now, then unquestionably it will be necessary to make an adjustment so far as the Marshall plan is concerned. But I cannot see any justification for making an adjustment now based on assumption of change in occupation. I merely wished to make that observation in the light of what the Senator from Missouri said.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he believes that the appropriation for the Marshall plan proposed in the authorization, together with the other necessary and reasonable items in the current budget, can be made without an increase in the present taxes on the American people.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes. I am opposed, I say to the Senator, to levying any more taxes on the American people. In fact, I think one of the most effective steps we can take toward getting some real economy is to refuse to levy any more taxes until some economies have been put into effect.

I note in the report of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch, commonly known as the Hoover Commission, an estimate that \$3,000,000,000 can be saved. I also believe that if we get real unification of the armed services we can save a great deal of money. Certainly I am opposed to voting for the imposition of more taxes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, is the Senator equally opposed to deficit financing?

Mr. LODGE. I am, in the sense that I think we should begin to cut down on the national debt. But if it were possible to eliminate the whole national debt tomorrow, I do not know that I would favor doing that, because, if my recollection of history is correct, I believe I remember that the British piled up a large national debt after the Napoleonic Wars, and kept it all the way through, and the belief was expressed at that time that if the British had suddenly abolished their entire national debt, it would have created a severe national and international financial panic. But I am not at all an expert on that matter; the Senator from Vermont is an expert on it.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to increase the national debt?

Mr. LODGE. No. I have just said that I think it should be reduced. How far it should be reduced or what the rate of reduction should be, are matters on which I am not an expert.

Mr. KEM. Very well. The Senator from Massachusetts will agree, will he not, that the item now proposed—a billion and a half dollars—to arm the nations of western Europe who become signatories to the North Atlantic Pact, is not contained in the President's budget and is not allowed for by the anticipated revenues of the United States for the present fiscal year?

Mr. LODGE. No; I would not agree to that, because I do not know how much

of that figure represents existing stocks of materials which we have already bought and paid for, and I do not know how much of that figure represents rather arbitrary estimates which may be made on the value of a tank destroyer, for instance, which was bought and paid for 4 or 5 years ago. So I cannot tell about that.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator from Massachusetts agree that whatever may be the figure of the expenditure that is necessary for arming the nations of western Europe under the provisions of the North Atlantic Pact, it is not contained in the President's budget.

Mr. LODGE. I do not want the Senator to think that I am doing any petty-foggery or quibbling, but I point out that we do not arm the nations of western Europe under the North Atlantic Pact. We can arm them without the North Atlantic Pact if we wish to do so. But so far as I know, the estimate is not contained in the President's budget.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator from Massachusetts tell us where he proposes to find this billion and a half dollars, if we neither increase the national debt nor increase the present tax burden on the American people?

Mr. LODGE. I have tried to indicate that. First of all, I think there are a great many very large economies which can be effected in the operations of our Government, and which should be effected. Then I think we should ascertain whether the figure of a billion and a half dollars is the correct figure. At the present time we do not have any definite figure before us. I think we should ascertain to what extent that figure represents items which have been bought and paid for already, and to what extent it indicates or would require new orders.

I think we must make up our minds about how much we can afford to spend on Government in general without ruining our economy. Certainly I think nothing would be more disastrous, not only to the United States, but also to the nations of western Europe, if you please, who are so dependent on us, than to have the American economy break down; and I hope while the foreign ministers are here in Washington this week, that some one will tell them that, and will point out to them that they have just as great a stake in the American economy as we have.

The National Security Resources Board, as I understand, passes on the effect of all these programs on the American economy, so far as scarcities are concerned, and also passes on the question of whether these programs will require and consume too much of our supplies of aluminum, steel, and so forth, and whether they will involve or require priorities or rationing. But I do not know of anyone, either in the executive branch or in the Congress, who has arrived at a definite formula or a definite set of principles in regard to how far we can go in Government spending before we run the risk of bankrupting our country. Certainly I do not think we should do that.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me say that I think that formula is very simple.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can yield only for a question, without losing the floor.

Mr. LODGE. I am willing to yield the floor, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not possible that if we declare certain war equipment which we now have, surplus, and send it to Europe on the basis of a valuation of 10 cents on the dollar, the replacement cost to us, in our own defense program, will be much more than the anticipated billion and a half or billion eight hundred million dollars which we propose to spend in the next year on armaments?

Mr. LODGE. That is one of the possibilities which must be worked out. Another is the extent to which the nations of Europe can manufacture their own weapons. All those are things which, so far as I know, have not been settled.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator know that at the conclusion of World War II, we left with Great Britain approximately \$6,400,000,000 worth of tanks, jeeps, trucks, antiaircraft guns, and other war equipment, and that we settled with Great Britain for that \$6,400,000,000 worth of strategic war materials for an I O U of \$640,000,000?

Mr. LODGE. I did not know those particular figures; but let me say that I do not doubt that the general tenor of the question of the Senator from Indiana can be answered emphatically in the affirmative, because, as I have said many times before on this floor, and I repeat it now, I think the civilian branch of our Government was totally unprepared for the end of hostilities, when that time came; and that is one of the tragic episodes in our history. Due to that, we had the total demobilization of all branches of our armed services, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, as fast as demobilization could be had, and we got rid of all that equipment as carelessly as we did. I think that is just too bad; and when we have made a mistake of that sort, I think we should learn from experience, and not repeat the mistake.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts believe that the addition of a proposed plan of sending arms to Europe is inextricably confused or involved with the ECA plan; and does not the Senator from Massachusetts believe that when the other plan comes to us, it must be coordinated and worked out together with the ECA plan and program?

Mr. LODGE. I said, perhaps before the Senator from Ohio appeared in his seat, that when the military establishments of Europe reach a size where they are taking manpower from the normal peacetime pursuits of Europe, in both industry and agriculture—something which is not anticipated or planned, as

I understand it, for the next year—then of course the military-aid plan will have a very direct impact on the whole plan for the economic recovery of Europe, and the Marshall-plan figures will have to be readjusted.

But for the coming year I think it is not planned to increase the size of the manpower complement of the European military establishment, so I do not think what the Senator from Ohio has suggested will be true as of this year.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. If we are going to try to build up in the western European countries the military units which now exist, building them up with money and arms from the United States, does it not follow that Europe also will have to do a part of that job and will have to turn a part of its productive enterprises into the task of completely rearming its military units? Is not that inevitable? Therefore, are we to put up 100 percent of the materials and funds needed for that purpose?

Mr. LODGE. Let us talk about the first period, to June 1950. For that period of time I do not envisage any increased demands on the civilian population of military age in Europe at all. Nor do I think the production of weapons or the manufacture of weapons by the nations of Europe will that first year attain proportions which will be significant in terms of the economy of those countries. I think for the year after that the military program would have a very definite impact on the Marshall plan, because I think undoubtedly it will be thought generally desirable to have them manufacture part of this equipment. But there is yet another decision which we have got to make, let me say to the Senator from Ohio. We can take the view that we want to preserve our own resources, we want to keep our own manufacturing potentials here for civilian goods, for radios and ice boxes and so forth, or if we have a depression in this country, and we have unemployment, we may decide we want to fabricate the whole arms program here. Those are decisions we have not made yet, that we have to think over. On the basis of military efficiency, it is certainly desirable for the nations of Europe to make many of the things that they can make themselves, subject, of course, to as great a production of standard types as possible.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator will permit me to read briefly from the statement made by the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Nourse, as it appears in the New York Times, and see whether the Senator agrees with the conclusion there stated.

Dr. Nourse is quoted as saying:

In line with what I said earlier about the intermeshing of the military machine and the industrial plant and labor force, it is evident that ECA (the Economic Cooperation Administration) funds and administration must be regarded as an integral part of the plan of American security and sustained prosperity within the setting of the world economy—that is, the international economy of the free nations.

The relative parts to be played by military and by industrial preparedness in each of the participating countries, and the relative roles to be played by each arm of the military service at the most effective points must be reexamined in the light of the new strategic concept and with no dangerous backward look at traditional positions of prestige, historic roles, or impressive trappings.

We cannot afford to make the costs of its implementation a simple addition to other military plans as they stood before the new alignment. Rather must we rework the whole operation and financial plan so as to gain maximum security with minimum strain on our economy.

That I think is the essence of Dr. Nourse's speech. I wonder whether the Senator from Massachusetts agrees with that?

Mr. LODGE. On the whole, yes. I think the whole program will have to be reexamined. We must not shrink from reexamining the whole program. I think the whole program ought to be subject to continuous reexamination and analysis. I agree with Dr. Nourse that it is not a question of making a simple addition, and I think we must be prepared to rework the whole operation when it becomes necessary to do so. I was simply expressing my guess, just as one humble student of the problem, and I am not on the inside, and I have no secrets at all, that the program will not drastically affect the operation of the Marshall plan for this first year.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to inquire, in the form of a question, whether the Senator from Massachusetts would like to have me read another section of Dr. Nourse's address.

Mr. LODGE. I always like to hear the Senator from Vermont, whether he is using his own words or those of somebody else.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wanted to make sure that I was asking a question. Earlier in Dr. Nourse's remarks occurs a passage which I think throws light on the last passage read by the senior Senator from Ohio. Dr. Nourse said:

Legislation now being readied for Congress is reported to total \$1,800,000,000 for arms shipments—including continuation of Greek-Turkey aid and the value of supplies sent to western Europe from current American stocks.

"It would be wrong to conclude," Dr. Nourse said in alluding to this plan, "that we can, without concern, add these expenditures, whatever they are, to the present budget items for national security."

His plea as I read this statement, and as I am informed from his office, particularly related to the two items of military expenditure, and throughout his talk he was making the plea that the Atlantic Pact should in net result make it less expensive for America to maintain its defense than if we were doing the whole thing alone, and he supplements that conclusion by suggesting that the military appropriations should be made inclusive of European aid instead of having European aid added to it.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say in response to the Senator from Vermont that I think

of course this military-aid program is going to save us a great deal in the long run. I think it ought to cost us much less to do it this way than to try to do the equivalent all by ourselves. When I make that statement, I not only include weapons and munitions, which I do include, but of course I also include something that is even more precious and more fundamental to the welfare of the country, and that is our young manhood. I yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, will he yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. There has been some question about who Dr. Nourse is, and what authority he had. As I read the report—and I wonder whether the Senator read it—the observations of Dr. Nourse were made, were they not, with the full approval of the President?

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Nebraska asks me whether the President approves Dr. Nourse's statement—

Mr. WHERRY. I merely inquire, does the Senator know?

Mr. LODGE. I do not have the President's confidence, and he has not told me whether he approves it or not.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought the Senator was giving his interpretation of what Dr. Nourse said. I read the same article. I think it was placed in the Record, and I suppose it is the statement other Senators have read. I understood it was stated somewhere in the newspaper article that his remarks and observations were made with the full approval of the President of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I think I still have the floor. I want to respond first to the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor, and has been asked a question by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to respond to the Senator from Nebraska in my own way. I do not know whether Dr. Nourse's statement was approved by the President or not. I was drawing merely my own personal conclusions on the subject, which I reached by myself, without talking to anybody, I may say.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Dr. Nourse made the express statement that the President had seen the speech, but that the President had neither approved nor disapproved any of the features of the speech.

Mr. LODGE. I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN and Mr. WILEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I believe that especially under the present turn of our economy, and at all times, we have two overriding objectives to which all our programs must defer. One is to keep this country safe; the other is to keep it solvent. The two are interdependent. I agree entirely with the warning given us the other day by the

distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, that an increase in taxes at this time, or going into deficit financing at this time, might very well deliver a blow to the economy of this country that would be catastrophic. Either of these courses might very well plunge us out of our present recession or deflation or whatever we care to call our present economic condition into ruinous depression.

I supported the original full authorization for ECA, and I shall support this one in full. But from the very beginning it has been understood that the operation of ECA and the cost of it would not be allowed to jeopardize the economy of this Nation. Therefore I earnestly hope that the Appropriations Committee, if we are to have a North Atlantic Pact—and I suppose we shall have it—and if we are to implement it, and we may implement it, will offset against the appropriations under this authorization the amount of the implementation. I go further, Mr. President, and say that I hope it will make such further adjustments under this authorization and others before it that may be necessary to prevent increasing taxes or putting this country into deficit financing.

Mr. WILEY and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on the 30th day of March I had a few words to say on this subject, and I shall be very brief at this time.

One of the significant things with which I am impressed is the silent voice of the American citizen in this constitutional Republic on the issues which we are debating in the Senate. To me, it is a good omen. When I say that there has been silence, I mean that there has been scarcely a murmur of American opposition to the Marshall plan; and one can say that is substantially true in relation to the discussion of the Atlantic Pact; so far as it has been discussed. I am judging from my own mail, and I am trying to find the answer, because I still receive approximately 700 letters a day.

Why is the voice of the American people silent? I diagnose the situation to be as follows: There runs through the mixed strain of blood, which has made America, a strong ingredient of common sense. Lincoln thanked God for the common man, the man who had to work for his living, not the man who is the creature of synthetic education, or the beneficiary of mental and physical idleness, but the ordinary man who possesses common sense. So I think, contrary to the condition before we got into the Second World War when we received thousands of letters, the common sense of the American citizen has cut through all the maze, the haze, and the confusion; and what does he see? He sees that the world has turned a corner and that every nation is in every other nation's backyard, speaking literally and not figuratively. American invention and ingenuity have brought about that situation.

Readers of history realize that it was the small nations, such as Israel, Athens, Florence, Elizabethan England, which placed their stamp upon history

and put mankind in their debt. The big nations could not stand bigness. The big nations of the past were like Russia is today. They became autocratic. They stifled freedom and individual initiative; they rubbed out the advances of the race which the small nations had wrought; they crushed out the principles of justice and freedom. The American Nation has grown big, but it is not crushing out freedom. It is not asking; it is giving. Freedom and justice obtain in this Nation, and we are endeavoring to give them to others. Of course we are not trying to get for other nations anything but what we ourselves have. We are trying to extend freedom and peace to all peoples.

As I analyze the situation, Mr. President, we are living in a great time in the history of the world. It is worth while to be a part of this great adventure. The common man is not forgetting that we got into two world wars without any arrangements, without any treaties or pacts. We got into them after we had outlawed war in the Kellogg Pact and after placing an embargo on arms. We got into the Second World War after we had talked about peace and great principles. Somehow or other, the common man realizes that talk is not sufficient. I believe he realizes that talk is very cheap. He realizes, much more than do some leaders, that men must create circumstances. The common man realizes that, while circumstances alter cases, our job is to see that we make circumstances that do not alter our case so that we lose our freedom. I believe the common man realizes that the Atlantic Pact and the American commitments constitute a deterrent to Communist aggression.

I desire to speak a few words on a question which has been discussed freely and the economic principles which are involved. I refer to the obligation of the Appropriations Committee. We have the President's budget. That is not sacrosanct. There is not an item in it that should be so held. We have commitments under the Marshall plan. They are not sacrosanct, either. I want to repeat, in substance, what I said when I spoke on the 30th of March. I think this kind of repetition is wholesome, or I should not take the time of the Senate with it.

Mr. President, I want to say that authorization should never be the equivalent of appropriation. Under the circumstances in which America finds itself today, in which some persons say unemployment is steadily increasing and may mount into the millions, we are about to enter into a pact which will operate as a deterrent. This fact, together with the other circumstances I have mentioned, must be considered by the Appropriations Committee. I am not saying that going into the "red" will mean disaster. We have had to go into the "red" before. I am saying that the Appropriations Committee cannot "pass the buck" in this case, because every Member of the Senate who has spoken has been emphatic to the effect that that is his conviction. Personally, if given an opportunity when the time comes, not to consider the matter piecemeal, but to consider the over-all economic implications

of this vast program upon which we are entering, I shall be very happy to appear before the committee and give my own judgment. I realize it is not very significant, and yet, Mr. President, I represent 3,300,000 persons who know how to build a State, men and women who have made out of forests and prairies a State, which is 50 percent industrial and 50 percent agricultural, men who have never discounted the fundamental principle of Franklin that they should save, that a stitch in time saves nine. Yet those people, many of whom have Germanic background, according to the FBI, provided the cleanest State in the Union from the standpoint of saboteurs, and so forth. That is my State.

Representing those people, Mr. President, I repeat that I think the Appropriations Committee must consider a number of things:

First, fluctuations in cost and the value of the dollar. I am talking now about the time that has elapsed between last November, and June and July, when we will get the final figure as to what we are going to spend.

Second, the possibility or likelihood of fluctuations in respect to the needs of the recipient countries. It is strange, Mr. President, but I happened to open today one of the reports from Washington which just came in, and I ask Senators to listen to this:

Top financial men of the American ECA missions abroad are being ordered to Paris to discuss the proposed revision of the European payments plan and other fiscal matters. It has already been publicly announced that Tasca, who is alternate American Executive Director of the monetary fund, will also be in attendance.

Mr. President, I believe the discussion here, if it shall accomplish else, will have impressed upon all of us the seriousness of the economic situation as it appears now, and as it will continue to appear.

Another proposition I suggest is the fluctuation in American revenues. A man with a big balance can afford to be liberal. A man without a balance in the bank has to think about himself and his obligations to his own. I say this is a tremendously important item.

Another item is fluctuations in the revenues within the recipient countries. We do not know what those countries are going to do within 6 months. We do not know what their revenues will be. We note that in the sterling area they are doing a good business, and that England particularly has a balance in her favor in dealing in the sterling area.

Another item which we must consider, and which was so graphically pictured this morning by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], is America's need. That is an element in determining how much we can spend. We have a multitude of needs which must be considered. I shall not delineate them. Senators will remember that he who does not look after his own is unworthy.

Another item which must be considered in the whole economic problem is the world picture. What do I mean by that? Suppose conditions in Europe become worse; are we going to say that we cannot afford to aid her economically? Of course not. We never did

that; but we know that the political situation in the world tomorrow will be one of the great imponderables in determining the course we shall take, not only politically but economically.

Another factor is the North Atlantic Pact, which has been discussed in the Senate. As I entered the Chamber today I heard some comment in relation to Mr. Nourse's statement. How much can we afford to appropriate in view of the political situations as they exist when we appropriate the money? We might ask, Will the signing of the pact, the continuing of ECA, operate as a deterrent? If it does, that is an element to consider when we are asking how much we shall appropriate in June or July, considering our own economic needs and our own wants.

Mr. President, I shall not go into another problem which I think we should ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to discuss at some time when we are considering the pact, namely, the currency problem in Europe. The exchange of currency is one of the basic factors.

Much is being said as to devaluation. In reading one of the reports today I found that it was stated that our own businessmen, who were trying to do business in Europe, were very much concerned about devaluation. Washington is flooded with protests from American businessmen to the effect that currency valuations in Europe, with their various restrictions, are operating as a discrimination against them. So long as there is a world sellers' market, this does not matter much, but the discriminations become a factor of vital importance in a buyers' market.

Mr. President, all those factors must be considered in determining what we are to do in respect to the amount of money we are going to spend. I repeat, we are the masters of what we spend, not the President in his budget, and we must not get into the habit of passing the buck to the President, and especially now, if we are going into a little tailspin economically, we must consider how much of the money that is going to Europe, whether it be in preparation for defense or in relation to contributions under the Marshall plan, is to be spent to create jobs and to promote production in America.

I covered that subject in my previous remarks, and I shall not repeat, except to say that last year, in November, that was not so significant as it is now. Therefore I only say to the Administrator, "This imposes an additional burden on you and your associates, Mr. Hoffman, because now the call is coming from America." Yet we do not want to enter upon another WPA program, creating useless jobs. If we are going further into a tailspin, we want to build constructively, we want to build values, we want to construct things like the St. Lawrence waterway, in connection with which we are asked to make a loan, and not spend money which we will not get back, but which will produce wealth, jobs, and income, and increase and strengthen the economy of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). The question is on agree-

ing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like very briefly to discuss something which occurred on the Senate floor yesterday. I particularly call the attention of the Senator from Texas to this.

I might say, first, that last year we developed a very healthy habit of depending to a great extent upon the Committee on Foreign Relations. We knew that when we submitted an amendment to any legislation which was before that committee, the then chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], would carefully scrutinize the amendment, that he would submit it to the very able staff which he had, and we knew that if he then opposed the amendment his opposition was based strictly on the merits, and on nothing else.

Unfortunately, this year we cannot indulge in the same assumption. Yesterday, for example, we were discussing an amendment designed to prevent discriminations against American nationals in French Morocco, discriminations not in favor of the natives of French Morocco, but in favor of European nationals, and the able Senator from Texas said:

Mr. President, I should like to take about two minutes of the Senator's time. I have a list of the old companies that have been in Morocco doing business for years, who are not complaining about this matter at all. The list is as follows.

Of course, all of us who were listening to the Senator from Texas, knowing that he has been working on this matter for months, assumed that he was referring to American companies. We had no reason to assume that he would list for our benefit a group of French companies. He read this list. I have in my hand a statement handed to me by Mr. Robert E. Rodes, who was commander of the American Legion in French Morocco. Mr. Rodes is also a reserve officer in the Corps of Army Engineers. He is a man who did a great deal of work, as the Senate knows, in preparing for the American landings in French North Africa. This is what Mr. Rodes has to say:

The undersigned heard a list read of American firms who were engaged in business in Morocco and who had not complained of treatment there. Most of the names read are well known to the undersigned. They are not American firms but French firms or Moroccan corporations of French ownership who represent American products. Several of them have strong French political backing. Even if they wished to complain the reprisals to which they would be exposed would render this unwise.

To the best of the undersigned's knowledge only two companies in the list would be eligible for membership in the American Trade Association. These are the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. and the Texas Co.

I may say that I do not think the Senator from Texas was attempting deliberately to deceive the Senate. I am sure he was not. I am sure that it was not an attempt to deceive the Senate, but was the result of a bad memory, because these letters have all been brought to his attention previously. I have the letters before me, letters which were written to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I continue to read from the letter:

While these companies are too dependent on their relationship with the petroleum control authorities to make strong official protests, the undersigned knows that when he left Casablanca paint badly needed for maintenance by the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. was being illegally held by custom authorities in Casablanca and that the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. lodged a complaint about this. The Socony-Vacuum Co. has paid under protest taxes which their legal advisers and United States diplomatic authorities consider illegal.

This is referring to one of the companies which the Senator from Texas told us was perfectly satisfied and had no complaint.

To the best of the undersigned's knowledge and belief, with the exception of these two oil companies, there is only one other eligible concern in Casablanca that is not a member of the American Trade Association. It is repeated that American firms represented or managed by foreigners are not eligible.

The inclusion of Coca-Cola in the list is particularly ironical. Coca-Cola is produced and distributed by a Moroccan corporation, largely financed with French capital and with strong political backing from Paris. Arrangements are being made even to furnish the sirup from France. This company was able to receive official exchange for many articles that were merely incidental to its operation and large rations of dollar value sugar while the undersigned was denied exchange for rock bits needed for mining. When an American veteran wanted to start a Coca-Cola plant in the city of Fez he was told that he would have to have 75-percent French ownership.

I call this to the attention of the Senator from Texas with the hope that he may tell the Senate that he was mistaken yesterday when he gave us a long list of French companies and mistakenly represented to the Senate that they were American companies.

I should also like to refer briefly to a statement made by the Senator from Texas as it appears on page 4054 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We were speaking of the discrimination against American veterans of World War II in French Morocco. We were referring to the practice of the local Vichy officials to try and put Americans out of business with American dollars. I quote the Senator from Texas:

But let us not interrupt the work of the ECA simply because some individual may find a single complaint involving one little incident. The chief difficulty complained of is in connection with the sale of automobile tires. I do not know the details, but apparently the complaint is that the agents for some of the automobile manufacturers cannot sell as many tires as they would like to sell.

I shall repeat that, in view of the letter which the Senator from Texas had in his possession at that time. I repeat the statement he made:

I do not know the details, but apparently the complaint is that the agents for some of the automobile manufacturers cannot sell as many tires as they would like to sell.

At the time the Senator from Texas made that statement he had in his possession, or at least had received—and again I say I am sure he was not deliberately trying to deceive the Senate; I am sure it was merely the result of a

bad memory—he had in his possession a letter setting forth in detail the situation in regard to the sale of tires in French Morocco, a situation which had been brought to the attention of the State Department, a situation which the State Department recognized was very, very bad, a situation set forth in the letter of January 5, 1949, in which the Senator was notified that the French customs officials—and I again call that fact to the attention of the Senators—the French customs officials, the port-control authorities, are in many cases the identical Vichy authorities who were in charge at the time we made our landings at Casablanca.

For the benefit of Senators who were not present yesterday, I will say that in that particular case one of the officers of our American Legion post in French Morocco, a World War II veteran, had been jailed by a French official at the time we were making our landings, jailed because he was active in the preparation of those landings. Of course, he would have been shot had we been unsuccessful. Our landings were successful and he was released. This young veteran now must go to that Vichy official who had him jailed while we were making our landings, and try to get some satisfaction from him.

As I told Senators the other day, when our consul goes down and says to this man, "Release this material which you are holding illegally; you cannot charge a 'take' of 150 percent," he will say, "Well, try and do something about it. Your Army is not here now and your Navy is not here now."

I call attention to the fact that this was all brought to the attention of the Senator from Texas in a letter written on the 5th of January 1949, in connection with the statement he made on the floor. Senators will understand that what I say is not intended to be a criticism of the Senator from Texas, but I think it is highly important for the reason that the Senate must be able to depend upon the word of the chairman of the committee. When the chairman of the committee rises on the floor of the Senate and tells the Senate that a certain fact is true, even though the Senator does not intend to deceive the Senate, and if it is the result of bad memory, the end result is that it is just as bad as though he were deliberately trying to deceive us.

I am going to read another letter in connection with the Senator's statement that he knew of only one minor incident resulting in complaint. I read a letter, a copy of which was sent to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, on February 17, 1949.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will not yield until I finish reading the letter.

Further to my letter of today concerning the new and illegal sanctions which are being applied to Americans in the empire of Morocco by the French protectorate government, I wish to bring to your attention my personal difficulties that are a result of this situation, and which are very typical of the difficulties experienced by all the Americans in business in Morocco today.

I am a resident of the city of Rochester, N. Y., a veteran of 5 years in the United States Air Forces during the war, 2 years of which were spent overseas, and after my discharge I came here to Casablanca, Morocco, to build my own business. For the last 2 years I have worked hard to create something for myself that I could call my own and be justified in the normal pride that I feel in the results of these efforts.

During this period I have succeeded in setting up an excellent bus line between the cities of Casablanca and Agadir which runs approximately the full length of Morocco in the French zone along the coastline. These busses are GMC coaches, which are exactly the same models used by the Greyhound Lines in the United States. Obviously, with material and equipment of this sort, my bus line is the very finest that can be seen anywhere in Europe, and especially north Africa. It is not possible to exaggerate the service that these busses render the Moroccan public, and certainly so, when any kind of comparison is made between my own line, Les Pullman du Sud, and the ancient, creaking firetraps of the French government-owned vehicles of the CTM (Compagnie des Transports au Maroc), of which there is an absolute government monopoly (as everything is nationalized and government-owned), which has set out to sweep any other existing lines off the Moroccan highways.

Now that this bus line is running smoothly and with every trip in itself meaning excellent publicity for American technique and know-how, and with the complete approval and appreciation that the Moroccan public has granted it, this new French coup d'état has fallen on my own and other American businesses, setting off confusion and chaos.

My busses are American built; therefore, this means that I must maintain spare-parts supplies from the factories in the United States. Recently I ordered certain spare parts that I needed most urgently, requesting that they be forwarded to me by air. This was done, but in the meantime, upon arrival at the airport in Casablanca, the French customs officials refused to deliver me these goods on the grounds that the protectorate government has stopped all importations, especially from the United States, and that all I need do is to "send them back to the United States." Upon this flat refusal and definitely unfriendly and belligerent attitude of the protectorate government, I sent the following cable to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington requesting their aid and investigation in this matter:

"Spare parts for bus line operated by undersigned veteran arrived by air being held illegally by French. Please have State Department cable instructions and please answer American Legion's reply paid cable of January 29.

"CARL HUMPHREY,
"Usamo Casablanca."

Obviously, if this illegal blockade of American goods and capital continues, my large and long-term financial investment in this country and my bus line are doomed to crumble into dust, just as the rest of the American interests which are caught in the same impossible straits as my own.

I cite my own case; however, this is representative of the same situation for every American in business in Morocco, and our Government must not ignore our appeals for their help in this time when the French are throwing all agreements and treaty rights that we have enjoyed for over a century in this country right out of the window.

The letter continues, citing other instances.

Mr. President, while I am not at this time asking for reconsideration of the vote yesterday on the amendment re-

lating to this subject, I strongly feel that had the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee taken the time to study this amendment, had he refreshed his memory on the situation, had he, instead of telling us yesterday that a list of French companies which he read were American companies, that they had not objected, and therefore we should not adopt the amendment, gone into the subject in detail and found that the French Vichy officials are using American dollars to put Americans out of business in Morocco, I do not believe he would have made the mistake he made yesterday. Had he not made that mistake, I feel that the amendment would have passed.

Mr. President, I feel that it is extremely unfortunate that we must write legislation on the floor of the Senate. When we attempt to do so without being able to depend on the chairman of the committee, we get bad legislation. I know that last year we went along with the idea that we had a very competent Foreign Relations Committee. I know from personal experience during the Eightieth Congress that we could submit any amendment to the chairman of the committee, and the amendments were accepted or rejected solely upon their merits. Much as I dislike to bring up this question today, I think it should be brought to the attention of the Senate. Because of the bad memory of the Senator from Texas, or for some other reason—and I wish to emphasize that I am sure that he did not try deliberately to deceive us—we have an end result which is the same as though he were trying deliberately to deceive us.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to reply in kind to the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin. He accuses the Senator from Texas either of ignorance or misrepresentation, neither of which happens to be the fact in this case.

The Committee on Foreign Relations went out of its way to give attention to the complaints about which the Senator from Wisconsin is talking. I talked with Mr. Rodes, to whom reference has been made, and who has been haunting the galleries and the committee rooms for a long time. We took him into the committee room after the hearings were concluded and introduced him to the Secretary of State and the Assistant Secretary of State. He told them about this complaint. They took him to the State Department, and he talked with a number of persons in the State Department.

The facts which I stated are taken from a printed House committee report. The companies which I mentioned are American companies. Of course they have some French employees, just as other concerns have French employees.

Mr. President, I do not care to pursue the subject further. The Senator from Wisconsin has had his day in court. He had the opportunity to debate this question endlessly, and the Senate rejected his two amendments overwhelmingly.

With that I rest the case.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I will not yield. The Senator would not yield to me. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas declines to yield.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Texas would not yield to me, I claim the floor in my own right.

I suggest to the Senator from Texas that in fairness to the Senate, if he is not convinced at this time that the list of companies which he gave us yesterday, allegedly as American companies, are operated with French capital by French boards of directors and presidents, he should at least check into the situation and come back and tell the Senate what the situation is.

Yesterday the Senator from Texas told the Senate that he knew of only one complaint from French Morocco. Those of us who have been checking into this question know that there is a whole series of complaints, extending over a year or a year and a half. As of today, the French in French Morocco are putting Americans out of business with American dollars. If they want to wreck American businessmen by using their own money to do it, that is all right; but I believe that when they are using American ECA funds to wreck American businessmen, especially World War II veterans, and when we have a chain of documented cases, it is unfair to the Senate for the Senator from Texas to say that he knows of only one minor case. If as of this time he does not know of the chain of circumstances, in view of the important position which he holds in the Senate, I urge that he go into the subject and tell the Senate exactly what the situation is. If he will do that, then I shall move for reconsideration of the vote on my amendment, and I am sure that it will be adopted unanimously once the Senate knows the extent to which we are going in French Morocco, using roughly \$3,200,000 a month to wreck American business.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas will undertake to guide his conduct by what he thinks is right. The Senator from Texas has no commission from the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, not only have we referred this question to the State Department, but the facts which we have cited are based upon a committee report from the House of Representatives and upon information which we obtained from the State Department. If any additional information comes to my attention, I have no disposition to withhold it from the committee.

Mr. President, this question has been disposed of. We had a day's debate on it. Two amendments were offered, and the Senate overwhelmingly rejected them both.

I do not care to give any more of my time or attention to the subject at this time.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to state that I have been informed by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] that he, in turn, has today been informed by some London newspaperman or representative of a London newspaper that the Mr. David Williams mentioned on the document from which the junior Senator from Indiana read earlier in the day is not the Labor Member of Parliament to whom I referred. The Who's Who applicable to Great Britain indicated a David Williams, with an initial which did not appear on the document. The question which I asked, both of the Senator from Indiana and of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as to whether the two names represented the same person was based upon the similarity of names.

I wanted that information to go into the RECORD as soon as I learned it from the Senator from Indiana, which was only a few minutes ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MALONE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we have already had a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What was the decision of the Chair on the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I inquire if any business has been transacted since the previous quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No business has intervened since the previous quorum call.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EASTLAND (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is absent on public business. If the Senator from South Carolina were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is necessarily absent and is paired on this vote with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], who is detained on official business at one of the Government departments. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay" on this amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 72, as follows:

YEAS—10

Bricker	Jenner	Wherry
Butler	Kem	Williams
Capehart	Langer	
Eaton	Malone	

NAYS—72

Alken	Holland	Murray
Anderson	Humphrey	Myers
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	O'Connor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Kefauver	Reed
Cordon	Kerr	Robertson
Donnell	Kilgore	Russell
Douglas	Knowland	Saltonstall
Downey	Lodge	Schoeppel
Ellender	Long	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	McCarran	Sparkman
Flanders	McCarthy	Stennis
Frear	McClellan	Taft
Fulbright	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
George	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Green	McKellar	Thye
Gurney	McMahon	Tobey
Hayden	Maybank	Vandenberg
Hendrickson	Miller	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Wiley
Hill	Moore	Withers
Hoey	Mundt	Young

NOT VOTING—14

Baldwin	Graham	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Byrd	Lucas	Tydings
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Gillette	Martin	

So Mr. MALONE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEM, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the senior Senator from Missouri, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may yield the floor.

Mr. KEM. I do not want to yield the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may without prejudice yield to the senior Senator from Missouri for the purpose of making a short statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONNELL. I merely desire to make a correction.

Mr. KEM. I yield to the senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire, with reference to the David Williams to whom I referred a few moments ago on the floor as a member of Parliament, to state that the full name of Mr. Williams, as it appears in the British Who's Who for 1948, is David James Williams. I thank the Senator.

NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I call up my amendment G to the pending measure, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, between lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Section 111 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) No assistance shall be furnished under this act to any participating country, the government of which shall undertake, after the date of enactment of this subsection, to acquire and operate, in whole or in part, the iron and steel industry of such country or any other basic industry thereof."

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to prevent the money of American taxpayers being used to finance and implement the experiments in socialism in Europe. I explained the amendment in some detail last week, but a number of the Senators who are now present were not on the floor at that time. I should like to summarize briefly what I had to say at that time.

INCONSISTENT TO SPEND BILLIONS TO STOP COMMUNISM AND AT THE SAME TIME TO SPEND BILLIONS TO SUBSIDIZE SOCIALISM

It is inconsistent for the United States to be spending billions of dollars in order to stop the spread of communism in Europe, and at the same time to spend billions of dollars to subsidize socialism in Europe. Communism and socialism are the fruit of the same tree, and the tree has its roots in the theories of Karl Marx. Their ideologies are the same with one distinction. The Communist seeks to reach his goal, which is the abolition of private property and the nationalization of the means of production, if necessary, by revolution and violence. The Socialist, or national Socialist, as he is sometimes called, seeks to reach the same goal, the same identical objective, by so-called democratic methods.

The other day I quoted Mr. Churchill in regard to the objective of these Socialist Parties on the continent of Europe and in the British Isles. Mr. Churchill said in effect that the Socialist Parties in Europe, are the handmaids and heralds of communism and prepare the way at every stage and at every step for its further advance. Communism is the form of Marxism developed in Russia. The Government of the U. S. S. R. is controlled by members of the Communist Party. Socialism, or national socialism, is the form of Marxism developed in England, and the Government of England is controlled by members of the Socialist Party in that country. They have made a great deal of headway in England. The other day I set out in my

remarks a list of 10 of the principal industries of England that have already been nationalized, that are already owned and operated by the Socialist government. I also at that time set out in my remarks a list of 23 of the basic industries of France that are now owned and operated by the Government of France. The majority leader referred the other day to France as the weakest link in the Marshall plan chain.

Mr. President, the process of nationalization or socialization has been accelerated by the use of Marshall plan money. The latest project pending in England is the seizure by the Government of the basic iron and steel industry. But that is not the only industry the Socialist Party in England has in mind taking over and operating. The other day one of the leaders of the English Socialist Party was a visitor in Washington, Prof. Harold J. Laski, reputed to be the head of the Brain Trust of the English Socialist Party. Mr. Laski said the Socialist Party had in mind taking over three of the principal industries, adding very significantly, "Nothing but force will make me tell what they are."

So, Mr. President, the American taxpayer is not only buying into a pool of socialism, but, to a large extent, he is buying into a blind pool. He knows not what he does.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Did Mr. Laski indicate why he was so secretive with reference to these particular industries? The statement is so interesting and challenging that I would like to have some amplification of it.

Mr. KEM. He did not say. But he is a very intelligent man, and he undoubtedly knew the present measure was pending in this body at the time of his remarks.

Mr. President, all these industries which have been nationalized or socialized in England, I think, without exception, have been unsuccessful from a financial standpoint in their operations. The British Transport Commission announced that for the first fiscal year there would be a loss of \$112,000,000. That is the dollar shortage which I suppose will be made up by Marshall Plan money, if the pending amendment is rejected.

During the first year after socialization, the coal industry lost \$94,000,000. That is another dollar shortage.

Civil aviation—and I shall have more to say regarding that in a moment—lost \$100,000,000 in the first 14 months of operation.

Electricity, in the first few months after it had been socialized, lost \$28,000,000.

It is interesting to note particularly the experience of the British Government in coal production. During 1938, the last year before the war, the British coal industry, which was not then socialized, produced 227,000,000 tons. The first year after socialization, production dropped down to 208,500,000 tons. So it goes—

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator give us the amount of production last year?

Mr. KEM. The actual production, as I understand, was 208,500,000 tons, although 8,000 more men were employed than were employed in 1938 under private operation.

There is an interesting comparison between that record and the record of the steel industry, which has remained under private ownership. During the period in which the coal industry was losing ground the steel industry was gaining ground. The steel industry was called on by the British Government, under their plan, to produce 14,500,000 tons. Under private ownership they actually produced 14,900,000 tons.

What we are being asked to do, Mr. President, is to send to England, to be used in financing these experiments in socialism, money of the American taxpayer, earned under a system of free enterprise and personal initiative.

I quoted a day or two ago an American businessman who is now domiciled in Europe. He had this to say:

We are showing these Europeans that we have a h— of a lot of money and d— little sense to go with it.

PRIVATELY OWNED BUSINESS WILL COMPETE WITH GOVERNMENT-OWNED ENTERPRISE

Mr. President, I want to invite the attention of the Senate to what are some of the most serious aspects of this subject, namely, that we are taking the money of the American taxpayers and building up government-owned industry in Europe which will compete with American industry in the markets of the world and also in many of our own markets in the United States. The American businessman has always prided himself on his ability to compete. Our standard of living is higher; our wages are higher. American industry had some tariff protection in the past, but, generally speaking, the American businessman feels that with an even break he can hold his own with producers anywhere. But, Mr. President, there is no even break when he is called upon to compete with a government cartel, a government operation which enjoys freedom from taxes, a government operation which enjoys innumerable special advantages, and, beyond all, has been financed with money gathered by the tax collector in part from American producers themselves. The plain fact is that the moneys of the American taxpayers are being used for that exact purpose. It will have three serious effects on our economy, in my judgment. In the first place, it will put the American producer at a distinct disadvantage, as I have said. In the second place, it will progressively cut off the flow of raw materials from foreign countries and their colonies into American enterprise. In the third place, as we have already seen this process taking place, it will invite American companies to establish factories in those foreign countries where they can enjoy the relatively cheap labor enjoyed by government-owned enterprises.

I shall not take the time of the Senate in discussing this subject in great detail.

I set it out in some detail in my remarks last week. But I want to invite the attention of the Senators who are present to one situation in connection with civil aviation.

The British Overseas Lines, which is rendering service between the British Isles and America, is owned by the British Government. It recently announced that it was purchasing a considerable number of Boeing Stratospheres at a cost of \$15,000,000. Of course, it is perfectly obvious that the \$15,000,000 for that government enterprise comes from American taxpayers. There is no other place from which the money can be had, if we are to judge from the figures given us here. The American company, which is privately owned, and which is engaged in the same business, flying from New York to London, is required to compete with the government-owned industry. What about the financing of our American competing company? It is called American Overseas. Until recently it was a subsidiary of the American Air Lines, Inc. American Air Lines, Inc., announced recently that it had disposed of its overseas subsidiary, and it gave this very striking reason, which appears in the annual report of the American Airlines recently published. I read from the report the other day, but I shall read it again:

American Airlines has no additional funds for the purpose of investment in Overseas Airlines, and presently has no source from which it can secure such additional capital.

In other words, the experience of the private line in competition with these government-owned lines has been bad. They have shown deficits instead of profits which does not induce private investors to risk their money in competing with these government-owned lines.

To the same effect we see that the Belgian line has announced the purchase of some great Convairs, the very latest ships, which as I understand cost \$450,000 apiece, the kind of ships which the lines operating in my State as a rule cannot afford. The Belgian line is a beneficiary under the Marshall plan.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator realize that the British Government has thought it prudent not only to provide the assistance, as the Senator said, covering an annual deficit of around \$40,000,000, and approximately \$15,000,000 more required to purchase these 10 stratospheres from Boeing, but has also allocated \$600,000,000 to establish the supremacy of British commercial aviation around the world, in direct competition with our own air lines, which are struggling vainly to meet that competition with the limited Government aid which we have found it possible thus far to provide?

Mr. KEM. I did not know that. The situation is worse from the standpoint of an American than I had anticipated.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the Senator will read the British white paper of 2 years ago, he will find the plan and the commitments outlined and a very similar

analogy prevails in the expansion of the British merchant marine to a point considerably in excess of its prewar scope.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I hope those figures will be brought to the attention of the Administrator of ECA. Surely, he does not know of them. It would seem that we have had less sense than I thought.

THE INTERFERING IN THE INTERNAL ECONOMY OF ANOTHER COUNTRY ARGUMENT

I now wish to address myself to the argument which has been used against my amendment by several of the proponents of the ECA program with whom I have discussed it. They have said, "Of course we believe in free enterprise, we believe in private initiative and the American way of life, but we do not feel that we should interfere in the internal economy of another country."

Mr. President, with all due respect to the Senators who have made it, I think that argument is wholly unsound. The whole ECA program is an interference, on a gigantic scale, with the internal economy of 16 countries in western Europe.

(A) THE ECA ACT AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO PLACE CONDITIONS ON THE GRANTS OF AID

The bill itself provides that the Administrator may make bilateral contracts with the countries with which he deals, in which he may lay down certain conditions with which they must comply in order to get funds under the ECA plan.

Mr. President, I wish to ask this question. If it is not interfering with the internal economy of a country for the ECA administrator to lay down a condition, why does it become an interference with the internal economy of that country for the Congress itself to attach a condition as to how our funds are to be used?

A few days ago the senior Senator from Ohio, in a very fine address, in effect said that he thought we could carry through and find out what was being done with our money. He said:

I do not want to cut Great Britain off because she is adopting a Socialist form of government.

Mr. President, I do not want to do that either.

I agree that she can adopt any kind of government she wishes, but it does not follow that American money should be used by the English to finance their experiment in socialism.

It would be one thing if this were a case, as the lawyers say, of first impression, and for us to adopt, from this point on, a program of noninterference in the internal economy of other countries. That is not the case. But from the very inception of the program we have been interfering in the internal economy of other countries.

(B) WE HAVE INTERFERED IN THE ELECTIONS OF ITALY

Let me point out just a few instances. One of the great accomplishments of the Marshall plan is generally considered to be the carrying of the Italian elections last April. In the campaign leading up to the elections the American Ambassador made a number of speeches

in which he urged the Italian people to stand against communism, and urged the ECA program as a reason why they should do that.

The Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Tom C. Clark, a few days before the election addressed the Italian people over the radio, and made very strong representations to them that they should vote as he thought they should vote.

Mr. Zellerbach, in his testimony before the committee, laid particular emphasis on the fact that the use of ECA funds had resulted in what he regarded as a favorable vote in the election.

Mr. President, I do not want to say for a minute that I criticize what Mr. Zellerbach did, what Mr. Clark did, or what Mr. Dunn did, but I do desire to say that it is entirely too late for us to hold up our hands in pious horror and say, "Of course, we will not interfere in the internal affairs of any nation."

(C) OUR AID IS SUPPORTING A SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND

Mr. President, there is just one more case of interference which I wish to point out, namely, that the Marshall-plan money is being used as a great slush fund to influence the next election in the British Isles. We are told that the Socialist government is paying in Great Britain today benefit payments to the old people and the needy considerably in excess of what our Government feels it can afford to pay to the old people of our country. Clothing has been derationed by the use of Marshall-plan money. Sugar has been derationed by the use of Marshall-plan money. And so it goes.

We have Mr. Churchill's word that the Socialist government in England "is living from month to month and from hand to mouth" on the United States. As I have said, Mr. President, there are two ways of life competing in the world today. There is the American way, based on free enterprise and individual initiative. There is the Marxist way, which has as its objective the abolition of private property in the means of production.

What the ECA is doing now is taking money of American taxpayers, earned under the American way, and using it to subsidize the socialist way. I believe that to do so is against the interests of the United States. I believe it is contrary to the interests of Americans to take their hard-earned money to support and maintain a political ideology totally foreign and repugnant to their way of thinking.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have been somewhat confused by what the Senator has just stated. Did I understand him correctly to say that Mr. Churchill said that the money we send over there is being used for the farmer-labor party of England in the election?

Mr. KEM. I believe there were numerous quotations in my remarks a few days ago to that effect. Let me see if I can locate them.

This is what Mr. Churchill said in the debate on the bill to nationalize or socialize iron and steel:

This measure cannot wholly be judged on its merits or demerits, if such there be, except in relation to the general economic life of Britain and our position in the world, and also in relation to the United States on whom the Socialist Government and Socialist policy are living from month to month and from hand to mouth.

Again in the same debate, Mr. Churchill said:

When a measure of first-rate importance is presented to the House of Commons it is always necessary for us to ask the question, Is it going to help the country or is it a partisan maneuver? Is it progress that is sought or is it faction? This is certainly the time to apply that test, because on the morrow of our greatest victory we are living on subsidies by loan or gift provided by taxes on the hard-working and heavily burdened people of the United States. I have always thought that we should need their help after the war, but it should be a point of honor with us, irrespective of party nostrums, to regain our full economic independence at the earliest moment, and to do nothing that would put off that event either by hampering our output or wantonly dividing our people.

Along that same line is an editorial from the London Economist of November 20, 1948, and I read as follows:

Even those who have been most reluctant to believe that ministers of the Crown would so far forget their responsibility as to monkey with a major industry for reasons of mere internal party maneuverings are now compelled to agree with Mr. Churchill when he calls the bill "a feature in party tactics intended to keep the Socialist left wing as far as possible in order, and the Government as long as possible in office."

Again at Blenheim, in a speech on August 4, 1947, Mr. Churchill had this to say:

Therefore I supported the American loan and I will still support, and justify, further appeals to the United States provided that we are doing our best, that we are making the most of our resources, that we are determined to become a self-supporting nation and system at the earliest moment, and will put aside every impediment, and labor long and hard.

It is when we are not trying our best, not making the most of ourselves and our resources, not pursuing a wise or practical policy, not coming forward as a united nation, not trying to deal with the problems on their merits, that there is humiliation in asking and receiving aid from a mighty and friendly ally.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. Yes; I gladly yield.

Mr. LANGER. What puzzled me was that I understood from what the Senator from Missouri said that Mr. Churchill claimed this money was being used for the Labor Party of England, but yet he is in favor of the United States turning over this money. Is that correct?

Mr. KEM. I think Mr. Churchill is first and foremost an Englishman, and if I may interpret what he has said, I think he thought as many of us here did, at the outset that England needed

money, needed help from America. But he stands aghast when he sees that money being used to nationalize and socialize the industries of the British Isles.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Nevertheless the Senator from Missouri knows, does he not, that Mr. Churchill does want the Marshall plan continued, and wants England to get her share under the Marshall plan?

Mr. KEM. I was asked that question in the debate last week by the Senator from Oregon. I do not know that Mr. Churchill has said definitely or specifically that he opposes gifts or grants or so-called loans to Great Britain provided they are put to proper use. As I understand, what Mr. Churchill criticizes is the perversion of these grants and gifts, the misuses to which they are being put.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. From one of the quotations the Senator read I gained the impression that Mr. Churchill was in favor of ECA.

Mr. KEM. As I said, I think he believes that, in general, certain aid from America is justified. I may say in passing that many of us who oppose the amount provided in the pending bill have the same thought. I may say that the Senator from Missouri so believes. But what the Senator from Missouri does not believe, what he is opposing here and shall continue to oppose so long as he is a Member of this body is the use of the money of the American taxpayers to nationalize—to socialize—the basic industries of England or in any other European country.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator. Mr. McMAHON rose.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question or yield the floor, as the Senator desires.

Mr. McMAHON. I would prefer to address myself to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY] suggested to me a few moments ago that it might not be amiss to have something said on the amendment by a member of the committee. In accordance with that suggestion I shall very briefly address the Senate concerning the objectives sought in the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

I might begin by saying that I would not favor the nationalization of the steel industry of this country. If I were a citizen of Great Britain I doubt very much whether I would favor it there. However, that is not the question in issue.

When 2 years ago and more Gen. George Marshall delivered his speech at Harvard in which he outlined the conditions of western Europe and of the

world, and when he suggested that he believed this country would be willing to assist Europe if European countries would combine to assist themselves, the Foreign Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Ernest Bevin, lost no time in seizing on the suggestion, and an invitation went to every country in western Europe, including, although we tend to forget it, the Soviet Union, for a meeting to be held in Paris, as I remember, about 3 days later. In this country we waited with a good deal of interest to see whether the Soviet Union was willing at least to start in a cooperative effort to rebuild the war-torn economy of those countries, including her own. We did not approach the question, nor did the countries of Europe approach it from an ideological standpoint. Of course, Senators all remember that after the meeting had progressed for a couple of days, and after Mr. Molotov had showered insults and hurled his imprecations upon General Marshall and upon the United States of America for daring to suggest that we would be willing to try to rebuild western Europe, he, with his train of followers and assistants, departed behind the iron curtain.

It was that event more than any other, I think, which made us realize that there existed an irreconcilable difference of viewpoint, an irreconcilable intention as to the future of the world, and that there was definitely to be pitched a contest of freemen against slave states, a contest which all of us pray and hope shall never result in a conflict of arms.

Immediately the Soviet Union, with all the art of which it is capable—and it is extremely proficient along this line—began to propagandize everywhere to the effect that the United States of America had become a great imperialistic power; that it was bent upon controlling not only nations, but colonies and men everywhere, and was determined to be the master of the earth.

Of course, Mr. President, those of us who have had some part in forming our policy, those of us who know, or believe we know, what the American people are thinking realize that the last thing in the world this country wants or that its people want is to rule other countries of the earth. What we want is cooperation in building a free society of free states so that men and women can work out their destiny under God.

Mr. President, I can conceive of no action this Congress could take which would be more designed to prove the case sought to be made by Molotov and company than the adoption of this amendment. The purpose of the ECA has been to bind together free countries and free men. It has not been to dictate from Washington the nature of the economy under which the people in other countries should live. I think we would defeat the very objective which we are seeking to accomplish if we tried to do so. I hold no particular brief for the Socialist Government of Great Britain. Strangely enough, they seem to be making handsome progress, according to the figures which have been given to us by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Not at the moment. I shall be glad to yield in a few minutes.

As has been pointed out before, apparently the success which this plan has had has become one of the great arguments against its perpetuation. It seems to me that we have short memories indeed. A year ago many of us stayed up all night in order to get the results of the Italian election, because we knew, if we knew nothing else, that if Italy went Communist in that election, France was bound to follow, and that if France followed, the whole of western Europe would crumble into communism and decay.

The Italian election was won by the forces opposed to communism because, more than anything else, of the fact that this country had announced that we were willing and able to go to their assistance. It is easy to forget now that terrible winter of 1946, when it seemed that the hand of palsy was laid upon all Europe, and when Senators in this Chamber were debating very seriously what we would do when all Europe collapsed into communism. We seem to have been successful in pushing that day back. We have made great progress. We have done it, it seems to me, by realizing sensibly that we cannot dictate to the countries of Europe exactly what kind of governments they shall operate.

We can insist on one thing. We can insist—and I suspect will ever insist—that any government which receives aid from us shall maintain the basic civil liberties and rights which freemen get not from the state, but from God. They are natural rights—the right of freedom of religion, the right of freedom of speech, the right of freedom of press, the right in criminal cases to be charged openly, and then given a fair trial. Does anyone allege that those rights have been impaired or impinged upon in even the slightest degree by the present government of Great Britain?

Let us remember that we did not approach this venture in a spirit of pure idealism. It is not pure charity. We approached it on the basis of intelligent self-interest. We approached it on the basis that we have a great stake in the success of the economy of the countries which we are helping. I doubt if we would have any constitutional right to take money from the taxpayers of the United States and, purely as a matter of largesse, distribute it over the face of the earth. It is because it has the most direct relationship to the peace of the world, in which we have everything at stake, that we have decided to go forward under the present plan and the present policy of the Government.

Mr. President, we cannot amend the tariffs in Great Britain. We cannot suggest to the French that their budget shall be 1,000,000 francs more or 1,000,000 francs less, or that they shall discharge so many civil servants or hire so many others.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. In a moment. If we were to do so, we would prove the allegation which is made against us, and we would defeat the very objectives for which we are striving.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is the Senator familiar with the fact that Mr. Bruce—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator realize that that is exactly what we have done?

Mr. Bruce made a speech and served notice on the French Government that unless they balanced their budget we could not proceed with ECA. Does the Senator realize that that is exactly the course we have taken in France? We have told the French that if necessary they should discharge some of their 1,300,000 government employees.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

Mr. McMAHON. I do not yield at the moment.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that we have a right to advise; and I certainly would not be opposed to giving advice. We have that right; but to impose conditions is quite a different thing.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I will not yield at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I have advised the Presiding Officer two or three times that for the moment I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the advice from the Senator from Connecticut. The question is answered. The Senator from Connecticut declines to yield for the moment to the Senator from Missouri. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to quote from Mr. Harriman, our roving Ambassador, who said:

If you refer to conditions, I think you are treading in a very dangerous field. These are mature and sovereign nations with widely different types of organization, economic organizations, and systems, and I do not believe we could accomplish what ought to be accomplished if there are any conditions to our aid in this field. Suggestions, advice; yes. Discussions and arguments, yes; but not conditions. There must be a will on the part of the nations and the people of the nations, and progress must be based on conviction that each step that they take is wise and sound.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Connecticut comes from one of the greatest industrial States in the Union. The industries of Connecticut have long supplied many of the wants of the western area of the country, from which I come. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut if, as a representative of that State, he looks with satisfaction and equanimity upon a condition under which the manufacturers, producers, and working people of Connecticut will be in direct competition with foreign government-owned and government-operated industry financed with Marshall-plan money?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say in answer to the Senator from Missouri that he

rightfully terms the State from which I come one of the great industrial States of the country. Small in area, it has been known, particularly during the war years, as a great and efficient producer. It has been my observation that we in Connecticut can compete with the rest of the world because of the efficiency of our machinery and the intelligence and skill of our working men.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. Not at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield for the moment.

Mr. McMAHON. Our State has grown great meeting the competition of the world and overcoming it. I say to the Senator from Missouri that I have greater fears for the people of my State on grounds other than the one which he suggests. I saw what happened in 1930, when we enacted the highest tariffs the world has ever known. A thousand economists addressed a communication to the then President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover, and warned him that the imposition of such tariffs would plunge the economy not only of this country, but of the countries of the world, into despair. That is exactly what happened.

Mr. President, I am also aware—

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I refuse to yield for the moment. I shall tell the Senator from Missouri when I am ready to yield.

Let me say that I am also aware of the fact that a greater danger could come to my people and to all the other people of the United States, namely, the orientation of western Europe, with its 270,000,000 people and its machine-tool plants, into the orbit of the Soviet Union. It was because we knew that Hitler's Germany combined with Tojo's Japan would monopolize practically two-thirds of the skilled manpower and over 60 percent of the machinery of the earth, that the fight we have since finished was won, and it was essential that it be won if we were to continue to exist as a free people. But let such a condition come about again, this time under the domination of an even more ruthless tyranny, equip that tyranny with a stock pile of atomic weapons, equip it with jet airplanes, and equip it—nay, it is already so equipped—with its ruthless will, and then I say, Mr. President, I shall be concerned for the state of the people of Connecticut, yea, for the welfare of all the people of the United States and the people of all the world.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this time?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Connecticut spoke with feeling and assurance about the ability of the producers of Connecticut to compete with the world. I could not help but recall that a few days ago I read in the Washington Post that the New Haven Clock

Co., a long-established industry in the Senator's State, had shut down, putting 600 persons out of work; and that the reason assigned by the president of that industry was the difficulty or inability to meet foreign competition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that Senators can yield only for questions.

Mr. KEM. My question is this: Is the Senator from Connecticut familiar with that incident?

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator from Missouri that I am thoroughly familiar with the incident, and I have made a complete study of it. I do not intend to discuss that company's affairs, in relation to this amendment, on the floor of the Senate at this time. We are to have debate on the reciprocal trade agreements extension bill, and I shall reserve until that time my comment on the example the Senator from Missouri has given. Since I propose to speak when that issue comes to the floor of the Senate, I shall then welcome a further investigation of the attitude of the Senator from Connecticut on that question or on any other question pertaining to reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a further question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Connecticut spoke with feeling about the necessity of the United States preventing the overrunning of western Europe by the forces of communism. I should like to ask the Senator whether in his opinion there is any greater danger facing the people of the world today than the danger which would come from undermining the economy of the United States, the last and greatest and finest bulwark of democracy?

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, Mr. President, the answer to the Senator's question is perfectly apparent. The economy and the strength of the United States must be maintained as the keystone and cornerstone of the union of free peoples which we are trying to erect to combat the ideological tide, the ideological state, which is moving all over the world against freemen and free institutions.

I say to the Senator from Missouri that just as it is desperately necessary that we do what the Senator wants—and with which I agree—it is likewise essential that we maintain as our allies the countries of western Europe and its 270,000,000 people.

If the Senator from Missouri believes that Communist Russia is no threat to us; if he believes that if we had not undertaken to assist western Europe, Russia could have gone in there with impunity and it would have made no difference to us; if he is not at all concerned about her armament situation; if he is not concerned with the fact that Russia has enslaved 10 countries in the past 2 years—if he is not concerned about any of those things—then I say he has no right to vote for the authorization or expenditure of a single dollar under the Marshall plan or under any other plan which would take a dollar from the

United States for expenditure in England or France. Regardless of what I might think about the Senator's judgment in such case, nevertheless he has a right to his judgment; and if he believes that, it is his duty, I presume, to vote against such authorizations or expenditures.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I am sure the able and fair-minded Senator from Connecticut does not mean that those of us who favor the pending amendment are alined with the forces of communism.

I should like to ask the able Senator if he feels that it would be fair for me to make this argument against certain measures which the Senator from Connecticut is advocating with reference to the secrets of the atomic bomb: As I understand the situation, the Senator from Connecticut feels that those secrets should be made, in part at least, the property of the world. That idea certainly is in accord with the ideas held in the Kremlin. Because of that fact, does the Senator from Connecticut feel that it would be fair for me to indicate that the Senator from Connecticut is in any way sympathetic with the forces of communism, or that in taking the position which he does take he is alining himself with those forces?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's observation, let me say that I suppose it is somewhat difficult for any of us to have our position understood, no matter how plainly we may state it. Although I do not like to take a great deal of time now, yet this might be a good opportunity for me to restate my position as plainly as I can: No one has been more zealous or more insistent than I have been that the vital secrets of our atomic program not be disclosed to any nonauthorized person. About 3 months ago I made a speech, which, in part, I repeated on the floor of the Senate on one occasion when the matter was brought up here. The speech I mention was made at Detroit, and in it I pointed out that it was time for this Nation to consider seriously whether we could safely divulge the size of the stock pile of atomic bombs—not, mind you, how to make them; I wish the Senator to understand that point clearly—but the number that we had on hand. The Senator from Connecticut, realizing that that was a most important question, very carefully listed the arguments which could be made for that position, and also the arguments or reasons which could be urged against it. I suggested that it was high time we made a study, but I said that at that juncture I was unable to come to a conclusion. That was my position then, and it is my position now.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a further question: I ask him if he joins me in the thought that an argument *ad hominem* in either case would be wholly unfair and out of place.

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator from Missouri that I was entirely unaware of any attempt to make an *ad hominem* argument here. I was trying to point out to the Senator from

Missouri the main objective of the program in which we are engaged.

The main objective of this program is to maintain the freedom and security of the United States of America. The main objective of the program is to see to it that the tide of communism does not sweep over 270,000,000 people, with their resources to be drained off, and to be joined with a ruthless state for the purpose of conquest. I have pointed out to the Senator, not in any effort to make an ad hominem argument, that if we were in the bill to insist upon conditions with respect to the type of government the recipient countries should have, we would be at the same time entering a plea of guilty to the claim that has been made all over the earth by the Kremlin that we are seeking to imperialize the earth and to dominate the lives of men, women, and children everywhere. That is all I have been trying to point out to the Senator.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Was not the statement, in effect, that the ideas behind the amendment would be received with great satisfaction by Mr. Molotov and his associates?

Mr. McMAHON. I am afraid they would be. I know they would be. I can see Pravda, if the Senator will permit me, and I can hear the Red radio, saying, "See, we told you so. We told you in Paris that if you went into this thing you were going to lose your liberty. We told you that edicts would come forth from the United States which would dictate how you should conduct your Government. We told you so, and now it has been proved, because they have said to the British Government, 'the action which you propose to take with regard to your internal affairs, as to how you will operate your steel industry, shall not take place.'"

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether he does not believe that the release in whole or in part of information regarding the atomic bomb would be received with satisfaction by Mr. Molotov and his associates in the Kremlin?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Connecticut cannot quite see the pertinency of the question. I may say to the Senator from Missouri, I have tried to tell him what my position is in that regard. I doubt very much whether Mr. Molotov would receive information, as to the size of the stock pile, with any satisfaction whatever. The Senator from Connecticut is not aware that that would be good news for Mr. Molotov. I should certainly think it would not be good news. Some secrets as to how we do the thing and put it together, I presume would be received by them with satisfaction. So long as I have anything

to do with it, I am going to make it as difficult as possible for them to obtain that information.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether any news would not be good news to Mr. Molotov?

Mr. McMAHON. No. I may say to the Senator it would not be good news to him that the pending bill had been passed, or that the North Atlantic Pact had been ratified, or that we had provided for its implementation from a military standpoint, if that shall be necessary. That would not be good news to Russia and her satellites. The determination we have shown in our leadership of the nations to keep ourselves free and to maintain civil rights and civil liberties, to maintain the ordinary decencies among men, to recognize mankind as the creatures of God, not as creatures of the state, to recognize men as being endowed with certain natural rights and our willingness to act to defend those rights—that is the kind of news Russia does not like.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Did the Senator understand my question about news to relate to the passage of the pending bill, or to the divulging of information in regard to the atomic bomb?

Mr. McMAHON. I have stated to the Senator what my position is in that respect, and I am trying to point out that the Senator from Connecticut is not in favor of giving Molotov a scintilla of information that will enable him to make this fearsome weapon. I may say to the Senator I probably am in agreement with him on that; I take it I am, but I do not wish to become involved in a discussion of the atomic question, for it brings up many other things which, while they could be profitably discussed, and which should be discussed in the Senate in the near future, are not appropriate at this time.

Mr. KEM. I think perhaps the Senator is correct about that.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator and I do not agree—although I am not sure of it—but, in my opinion, the United States, when it made the offer to Russia and the world to furnish information on atomic energy in exchange for effective security from its misuse, wrote the most glorious page that has ever been written in the diplomatic record of any country at any time. I may say further to the Senator that, in my opinion, had that offer, magnanimous as it was, been accepted—and I have regarded it personally as the acid test of Russia's intentions—I dare say the Senator and I would not be here today debating an ECA authorization. Nor would we have to debate the North Atlantic Pact, because if that offer had been accepted, peace would have been well on its way to every corner of the earth.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to say by way of a preliminary that I agree with the Senator from Connecticut on many things, and I have not the slightest doubt either of his ability or of his patriotism.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. But I should like to ask the Senator, is it not generally understood that the approach of Mr. Molotov and the Kremlin is to wait until the American economy is weakened by unsound measures taken in this country, and then to move in for the kill?

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator that I am as much concerned as any sensible American must be, about \$50,000,000,000 budgets. I know the drain such expenditures impose upon any free-enterprise economy. I should be very happy indeed if we could now take about \$25,000,000,000 or \$30,000,000,000 and wipe it off the books. There is no one who would like to do it more than I. I share the fervor of the Senator from Missouri with respect to reduction of Government expenditures, but I have to make my estimate of the danger which faces this country, and of the wisdom of the methods and of the means we are taking to meet it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to inquire whether the Senator anticipates being able to activate his fervor at any time during the present session.

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator that I have some doubt. I must be entirely honest with the Senator. I look at the expenditures for the veterans, and I see no chance of cutting them. I see the expenditures for arms, and I see no chance of reducing them. I look at ECA, and I do not see much opportunity of reducing the expenditures for that undertaking. I look at the interest on the national debt, and I see no chance of reducing that by so much as a penny. Adding up all those expenditures, they amount to about two-thirds, I think, of the national budget, and there is left \$10,000,000,000 or \$11,000,000,000 with respect to which, in the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, economies may possibly be made. Of course, the Senator from Missouri may say there is an opportunity to make reductions by wiping out ECA; but I cannot go along with the Senator on that, because I am afraid, if we were to take that method of reducing expenditures, it would be the most costly economy ever known in the history of the world. If we were to reduce or wipe out this expenditure, it might well be that we would spend ten, twenty, or a hundredfold more in an effort to stave off the very thing which we would invite by producing a state of weakness, where there now exists a state of increasing strength and recovery.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator believe that the authorization of this money is sacrosanct, and would he, for the RECORD, give us his opinion as to whether it is the responsibility and the duty of the members of the Appropriations Committee—because I understood the Senator to say that he did not feel that the appropriation for ECA would be very much reduced—to go over the appropriation and recommend to the Senate a figure which is justified by the projects which are listed?

Mr. McMAHON. It is, as I see it, an obligation upon the part of the Appropriations Committee, another agency of the Senate, to scrutinize the program and the estimates with the greatest of care. It strikes me that if the estimates can be shown to have been made up on November 30 to one scale of prices, and there has since been a 5 or 6 percent decline in prices, certainly the Appropriations Committee has a right to take that fact into account.

Mr. President, while I am on that subject, I may say that, so far as the Senator from Connecticut is concerned, he does not view the assurances given by the committee as binding him to simply any kind of a reduction the committee shall choose to bring forward. I am not prejudging the committee in any way, manner, or form, but I say that if, in my judgment, the appropriation is cut to such a point that it might jeopardize the success of the program, I shall be found on my feet seeking to increase the appropriation and to upset the Appropriations Committee in that respect.

I shall do it from the deepest conviction, instinct, and impulse to which any man could be subject, because the world is marching to a climax which can be avoided, in the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, only by the marshaling of force, so that the desperate men who would hurl humanity into the abyss will retreat and give way. Let them get the idea that we are not serious in our efforts and that we are willing to permit Europe to retreat into confusion and chaos—once give them the idea that they are free to marshal the peoples of those countries into their camp, and the United States will be fighting the most desperate battle for its existence mankind has ever conceived, a battle which, if we win, I say once again, we shall lose. A third world war about which we have been talking—some of us too lightly—we had better talk about preventing, and we had better be thinking solely in those terms, because, in my opinion, we could not fight such a war and, at the same time, preserve the kind of government we have maintained in the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the Senator this question: If the receipts which are anticipated, from all sources, for the fiscal year do not exceed \$42,000,000,000 and the appropriations which we

are about to make for ECA, the implementation of the Atlantic Pact, for defense, for the integrated programs, and domestic appropriations for our own economy, exceed \$50,000,000,000, would the Senator feel we were justified in making a straight cut right through all appropriations in order to avoid increasing taxes or engaging in deficit spending?

Mr. McMAHON. Frankly, I do not want to answer that question at this time. I do not wish now to tie my hands for the rest of the session, because the question which the Senator asks implies a commitment over a period of time to which I do not think I want to bind myself. So, with all due deference to the Senator's question and its propriety, I still say that I refuse to be bound at this time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. The Senator has spoken very feelingly and forcefully regarding the use of ECA money for national defense. I should like to ask him if he believes the ECA is an adequate substitute, in whole or in part, for national defense?

Mr. McMAHON. Oh, no; certainly not. I regard it as being supplementary to our national defense budget. I agree with what Dr. Nourse said, as quoted in the newspapers today, that it is all one picture—ECA, defense, implementation. It is all for the defense and security of our own people.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Do I correctly understand the Senator's position when I understand it to be that ECA is supplementary to national defense, that national defense should be our first consideration, and then, after we have adequately armed ourselves, if we have funds for ECA, we should devote so much as we can to that purpose?

Mr. McMAHON. No; I do not think I would come to that conclusion, because I regard our policy as an integrated whole. I will say to the Senator that I am not so sure that perhaps some economies cannot be made in the national defense budget. The Senator from Connecticut has certain ideas about that which he will express when the appropriation bills reach the floor of the Senate. However, it seems to me we make a mistake in regarding the size of our national defense budget, the ECA, and the North Atlantic Pact as being anything except a part of the national defense of the United States. If it is not that, we have no right to undertake these things.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Connecticut to refer to ECA as being supplementary to the national defense?

Mr. McMAHON. Call it complementary, if the Senator will. It is all a part of the whole. That is what I am trying to tell the Senator.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator seems to have great faith in our financing the British Isles and the continent of Europe as being a part of our defense against communism. I will ask the Senator if he agrees with Mr. Winston Churchill when he says that the Socialist Parties of Europe are handmaidens and heralds of communism.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say that we have been through an election campaign recently, and I heard far worse things than that said about the party of which I have the honor to be a member. Such things are still being said. That does not prove that they are true. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Churchill. I think he is one of the great statesmen of our time or of any other time, but, at the same time, I know that Mr. Churchill is human and that he was confronting a constituency in an election.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator from Connecticut permit me to suggest to him that he has been led into error, that the statements made by Mr. Churchill were made by him in the House of Commons on the bill to nationalize the iron and steel industry of Great Britain, and were not in any sense a part of a campaign speech?

Mr. McMAHON. In one sense every speech members of the legislature make is a campaign speech in a democratic country, because it is upon the basis of what we say and do here that we must defend ourselves before the electorate. As the Senator from Connecticut understands, the iron and steel question in Great Britain is going to be determined in the 1950 election. The people of Great Britain will have the opportunity, in the same way we have the opportunity, to pass upon national policies, to go to the polls and cast secret ballots to determine what they as a people shall do. The right of a free ballot is one of the best evidences of the exercise and workings of democracy of which I know. That is the way the people of Great Britain are going to determine this question in the election of 1950.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator permit me the observation that the decision as to whether Great Britain shall nationalize the iron and steel industry of Great Britain should not be made by the British people at the election in 1950, but should be made by the Congress of the United States at the present session?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Connecticut has already expressed his ideas about that, and there is no use reiterating them.

Mr. President, I am anxious to take my seat, but I should like to say just one word before I conclude. When the Government of Great Britain nationalized its banks and nationalized its railways, it paid its own people with British notes and British pounds, not dollars. I can anticipate the Senator rising and saying, "Yes, but it is the Marshall-plan aid that sustains the whole economy, and gives their money some worth." That, I grant, is true, and no sensible man can deny it. At the same time, we must also admit that the pound notes which are

handed over to the owners of the securities of the British industries are not acceptable for dollars, but are really tradable only in the sterling area.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if the losses in the nationalized industries in Great Britain are not a part of the deficit in the British budget which we are called upon to make up under the Marshall plan?

Mr. McMAHON. No, I do not think so. I do not believe they are.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if he would be kind enough to elucidate that point a little further, and explain to the Senate, and for the RECORD, in what way the losses incurred by the nationalized industries of Great Britain are not a part of the deficit in the British budget which we are called upon to make up under the Marshall plan.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Connecticut is now at the end of his argument on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. I do not feel that I should prolong the discussion. I have given the Senator my opinion, and I shall now take my seat.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should prefer to make such suggestions as I shall present in a colloquy with the Senator from Missouri, but under the existing stringency of the rules under which the Senate is operating, I presume I should occupy the floor in my own right, and attempt to speak to the Senator from Missouri in that capacity. I shall invite his questions to me, and in advance, without going through too much detail, I assure the Senator from Missouri that I shall yield, while I have the floor, at any time he may wish to ask me a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will indulge the Chair a moment, the Chair observed the phrase in the Senator's remarks "the existing stringency of the rules." The present occupant of the Chair does not consider that there is a present stringency of the rules. The present occupant of the Chair regards the rules as stated, clear and definite, and so long as he remains the occupant of the Chair, the rules will be enforced without fear or favor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I find myself in some disagreement with the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. Without taking the time of the Senate to any great extent, I shall say that I am not satisfied to support the Senator's amendment as it now reads because of its reference to a specific industry, such as the iron and steel industry, and because of certain other verbiage which is used in the amendment. I have been giving it considerable thought, because I am definitely sympathetic with the point the Senator from Missouri is trying to make.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to certain basic assumptions I make. In the first place, we have heard of the "do not touch" philosophy so far as the operation of the internal affairs of other governments under ECA are concerned. I have supported the theory that we probably should not attempt to dictate the internal social and political operations of the governments we are trying

to aid, and the peoples we are trying to aid, but I submit that we are in every act of the ECA dictating the terms under which ECA will be used within those countries.

I submit that it has been made abundantly clear repeatedly by officials of the State Department, and on the floor of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, that if a country is a Communist-controlled country we will extend no ECA aid to it at all. That is a determination as to the use of ECA aid based upon a social and political philosophy entertained in the particular country.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question? The Chair is not attempting to be unduly stringent, but acting in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I stated, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri at any time for any question he may care to propound.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether at the outset of the Marshall plan program it was not indicated, at the OEEC meeting, that Spain did not have a government which met with the approval of the conferees there, and that as a result throughout the Marshall plan we have declined any aid to Spain.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am happy the Senator asked the question, because I was going over to the other side of the political and social fence to call attention to the fact that in Fascist Spain we have adopted the policy of not extending Marshall plan aid, because we do not like or approve, apparently, the type of government operating there. So in the Marshall plan we have undertaken to circumscribe the use of the funds, both for Communist countries on the one hand and for Fascist countries on the other, a direct program to determine the philosophy of government which we will elect to support with ECA money.

Mr. President, we hear much said repeatedly to the effect that we must not touch nationalism of industries or anything of the kind because we would be violating the freedom of self-determination in the participating countries. I think that argument falls when we consider the Communist philosophy on the one hand and the Fascist philosophy on the other, both of which we have said we would not aid with ECA money.

Mr. President, I may disagree, indeed I do disagree with the Socialist philosophy of nationalization, but, by the same token, I agree that the people of Great Britain have an inherent right of self-determination, and if they want socialism and nationalization, and if it is accomplished on a voluntary and free basis, that is their business. I shall not attempt to change or alter their form of government or their attitude toward their social or political forms so far as that is concerned; but I believe I have some right to say in advance how a portion of my tax dollar shall be spent in connection with the social and political activities of other countries. Without

attempting to change their forms I ought to have some right to place a limitation upon how the American taxpayer's dollar is to be spent abroad.

We are against communism, we are against fascism, and certainly I hope that the overwhelming majority of the people in the United States are against socialism and against nationalization. But eliminating the blood purge and a few things like that, I hope we see in it the same evils to a free and competitive society that we see in communism or in fascism.

If we go further into the operations of ECA, it becomes apparent that every dollar spent by ECA in countries abroad is a dollar spent with a limitation placed upon it by the Administrator. He even examines every private-business venture which ECA dollars are supposed to support, and he says "No, this is not good for your economy," or "This is good for your economy." "I will advance and authorize ECA dollars in this project," or "I will withhold them in that project." Those are private-enterprise projects. So in effect we control every dollar of money that is spent under the ECA program. If we did not so control our money, if we did not so use our money in the ECA countries, there would be no restrictions in the bill, and we might as well make a flat appropriation in dollars to each country, and say, "Use the money as you please."

While I do not like the Senator's amendment as such because I think there are certain restrictions in it which I feel I could not support, I should like to suggest to the Senator an amendment to or a substitute for his amendment to see what he thinks about it. In place of the language he has in his amendment I should like to suggest language something like this, to be inserted at the proper place:

The Administrator shall not authorize assistance under this act within any participating country when such assistance will provide dollars or dollar credits which may be used by such participating country directly or indirectly to acquire and operate, in whole or in part, any basic industry as a nationalized industry.

Mr. President, I call attention to the language of that proposal and its effect. My amendment does not attempt to dictate how countries shall conduct their internal affairs so far as nationalization is concerned. It does not say to any country, "You shall not nationalize your industry." But it does say that no American dollars or dollar credits shall be used to aid in the nationalization of their industries or to support such nationalization. They can proceed to nationalize if they want to. We place no prohibition on them. But if they do hereafter, they have to do it completely under their own power and without the aid of American dollars or dollar credits either in the acquisition of or the operation of such nationalized basic industries.

In my judgment, Mr. President, that preserves the principle of not dictating to a country whether it shall or shall not nationalize. It does not dictate what the people shall do under their own power within their country if they have the

means and will to do it. It only provides—and I will read it again:

The Administrator shall not authorize assistance under this act within any participating country when such assistance will provide dollars or dollar credits which may be used by such participating country directly or indirectly to acquire and operate, in whole or in part, any basic industry as a nationalized industry.

Mr. President, if we do not believe that nationalization of industries is good for a free economy and for the type of government and economy in the world in which we want to live; if we believe in leaving the other fellow still free, however, to do as he pleases within his own country with his own political and social forms, then I cannot see any objection to this prohibition. It only says that American dollars or dollar credits shall not be used hereafter by any country to nationalize or operate its nationalized basic industries.

I believe we have a perfect right to make reservations on the use of American dollars. I believe we not only have the right to do it, but we are doing it every day and in every transaction under the ECA. We evaluate projects. We say we will give money or withhold money based upon our judgment on the projects over there. We do not give money to Communist countries because we do not like the Communist philosophy. We do not give money to Fascist countries because we do not like the Fascist philosophy. If we do not believe in nationalization, I think we have a basic responsibility to put some kind of a string, not upon whether the British people or other people can nationalize their industries, not upon that, but we have a right to put some kind of a string on how American dollars and American credits shall be used in going forward with socialistic experiments of nationalization among peoples we are trying to help.

I am happy to help them even if they are Socialists. That makes not too much difference. I believe they have a peaceful method of attempting to accomplish their reforms. There is a difference between the National Socialists of Europe and the Communists. The objectives socially and economically are the same. The methods of attaining them and the methods of enforcing them are different, as the Senator from Missouri has pointed out. The National Socialists believe in an orderly procedure in attaining their nationalization and control. The Communists believe in the blood purge and revolution as the basic method of accomplishing their end. But respecting our American dollars, which have been obtained through the sacrifices of the American taxpayers, I believe we must think and act clearly and wisely in preventing their use and the use of credits for nationalization purposes, in which I believe the overwhelming number of Americans disbelieve.

I simply wish to say again to the Senator from Missouri that I have made my suggestion to him, I hope, in a spirit of cooperation and purpose which I believe we have in common. I do not mean to be offensive, and I hope he will forgive my criticism of his original amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, may I say very briefly—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized in his own right.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri addressed the Chair first.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I will yield the floor to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri cannot yield the floor to another Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan now addresses the Chair and asks for the floor in his own right. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Missouri is recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has resigned the floor, and the Senator from Michigan has been recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] will accept the substitute which has been suggested. I have not had much to say on the floor of the Senate in relation to the ECA, but I wish to say a few words on the pending amendment, and particularly on the substitute suggested by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

I was greatly impressed by the argument of the able Senator from Iowa when he stated that we have something to say as to the use to which our dollars shall be put. He indicated—and it is clear—that we said we would not extend aid to Spain because in the opinion of the American people Spain is a Fascist dictatorship. We had something to say when it came to giving ECA aid to Russia, which is a proletariat dictatorship. We have something to say, in the amendment which was offered by the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] in connection with aid to China. We have restricted the President. We have said that he shall not extend aid in areas in China which are dominated by the Communists. So we do have the right to say what American dollars shall be used for. Every dollar that is spent will be raised by taxation, and the sweat and tears of the American people will pay for these appropriations. Quite properly, America should say what the money shall be used for.

We talk about socialism and about communism; but I believe that anyone who understands the fundamentals of communism, of socialism, and of Marxism will say that they are so similar the difference is only a matter of degree. We think of Britain as being an outstanding nation in the preservation of freedom. We think of Britain in connection with our judicial system. We who are trained in the law go back to the days when we studied the judicial system of Britain. We know that in this country we have adopted many of the British legal principles. The great common law of America is the common law of the British Empire.

We cannot imagine that America could ever go socialistic or communistic. We cannot understand how the great British Empire, with its traditions, could ever go socialistic or communistic; but I say that it can happen there, and it can happen here. That is the question with which we are concerned today.

Anyone who read the article, Stalin on Revolution, published in the Foreign Affairs Quarterly for January of this year, has a better understanding of the subject. If one will read the Manifesto of 1848 by Marx and Engels he will understand how close socialism is to communism. Communism is able to move with the ebb and flow of the tide. It retreats here and advances there.

Let me bring to the attention of the Senate something which I received in the mail only yesterday. This pamphlet is being distributed at the University of Michigan. A few years ago the then Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Biddle, made a finding that the Communist Party in America stood for the overthrow of Government by force and violence. Does our present Government feel that is the principle of the Communist Party? It must, because it has indicted and is now trying in the District Court of the United States in New York City the heads of the American Communist Party for conspiring to overthrow the American Government by force and violence. Will the Communists retreat and try to advance upon some other front?

Mr. Foster, in his book published in 1931 or 1932, stated that the Red Army would help to establish communism in America.

Let us find out what is said in the pamphlet which is being distributed to students of the University of Michigan. I am sure that it is being distributed at other universities. At the end of the pamphlet we find the following:

Write to the National Youth Commission or Council of Student Clubs, Communist Party, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York City.

Then there is this line:

I would like more information on the Communist Party—

Name.....
Address.....
City.....
State.....

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair will enforce the rule requiring the Chair to be addressed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I entered the Chamber after the Senator had started his address. Who issued this pamphlet?

Mr. FERGUSON. The National Youth Commission or Council of Student Clubs, Communist Party, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York City.

Mr. President, I wish to read a portion of the pamphlet, and then I shall

place all of it in the RECORD. It is very cleverly written. On page 5 we find the following:

Now we will tell you what the Communist Party stands for.

On another page there is the following language:

The Communist Party does not now and never has advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. Its constitution specifically calls for the expulsion of any member who conspires to overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy.

That is the retreat, because they know that there is a law in the United States, the Smith Act, which makes it a criminal offense to conspire to overthrow the United States Government by force or violence.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if the Youth Commission or Council of Student Clubs of the Communist Party, the platform of which the Senator is reading, has not brought its platform exactly in line with the platform of the Socialist Parties of Great Britain, France, and other countries of western Europe.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am of the opinion that it is very similar.

On page 5 it is said:

Now we will tell you what the Communist Party stands for.

I now read what it is said the Communist Party in America stands for:

Peace, the Bill of Rights, full equality for the Negro people, the right to work, the right to strike, the right to social security, the right to advocate socialism to end the wars and depressions which capitalism breeds.

There is the secret of the whole thing; we find it in the last line of this publication, I say to the Senator from Missouri. All of us will agree to the first principles mentioned in the pamphlet, as I have just read them; they are humanitarian principles.

But then it is said in this pamphlet: the right to advocate socialism to end the wars and depressions which capitalism breeds.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I shall ask to have all of this pamphlet printed in the RECORD, but I wish to refer now to what it states. Mr. Foster says:

"In fighting against all these monstrous evils, in working for a Socialist America, I am performing the profoundest patriotic duty."

Then on page 6 they say to the students of the University of Michigan and, I am sure, to other university students—and now I read further from this pamphlet:

And . . . we'll tell you what the Communist Party demands for young people:

Mr. President, what do they demand for young people? I am reading from a statement made by the party which, so it says, has no tie to Russia. Oh, no; they

do not believe in revolution, they do not believe in what the Communist Party of Russia stands for, so they say; but here is what they say in this pamphlet; here is what the Communist Party demands for the young people:

First. Repeal the draft.

Mr. President, there are many persons who do not believe in the Communist Party, but who do believe in repealing the Draft Act, of course.

I read further from the pamphlet:

We stand for the defense of the United States against all its real enemies. But America is in no danger of attack from anyone. We are the most powerful Nation in the world today. The draft was engineered in order to create a war scare so that Wall Street could send American boys to China and Greece and the rest of Europe. Not to defend America . . . but to multiply Wall Street profits. To gobble the world.

Second. End Jim Crow in the armed forces. Discrimination, segregation, Jim Crow—these are the real subversives.

Third. Give 18-year-olds the right to vote. If they are old enough to be drafted they are certainly old enough to cast the ballot.

Fourth. Give youth a real job-training program; teach them skills; get them jobs.

Fifth. A public-housing program which will give young people homes—not promises.

Sixth. An end to quota system and all discrimination in education.

Seventh. Pass Federal aid to education bill.

Eighth. Full academic freedom for students and teachers. An end to thought control.

Senators will notice that the Communists apparently have retreated, and seem to be arguing now for humanitarian principles. Imagine, Mr. President. The Communist Party, which is part and parcel of the dictatorship of Russia, now wants an end put to thought control, so they say; and they expect the American people to believe that.

At Oregon State College, or at the University of Washington, not long ago, a professor was discharged, supposedly because of his Communistic tendencies or his beliefs in communism or his connection with it. Quite a case was made of it, but actually he was discharged on the ground that if a person is a Communist, he does not have the independence of thought necessary to a free academic mind. His thoughts are controlled—and that is exactly the truth. But in this pamphlet the Communists advocate to the youth of America, "An end to thought control."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire pamphlet printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Michigan to make reference to the recent Oregon State College and University of Washington cases?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I wish the Senator from Oregon would give us a little more light on that,

Mr. MORSE. I shall do so by way of asking a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Oregon, to permit him to ask a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Michigan know that the dismissals at the University of Washington were the result of hearings in which it was found, in the opinion of the persons who conducted the hearings, that the members of the faculty who were dismissed were or are avowed Communists?

Mr. FERGUSON. I was not certain that it was brought out at a hearing, but I had the other information.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Michigan was of the understanding that a finding was made that those persons were Communists?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Oregon propounding a question to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. And the Senator from Michigan understands the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. I say that I understand that a finding was made that they were Communists.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Michigan agree with the Senator from Oregon that no principle of academic freedom is violated whenever an institution of learning in this country takes the position that persons who are avowed Communists should not have the right to teach in American institutions of learning?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say that is absolutely true, because the moment a man adopts the Communistic philosophy, he closes his mind to everything except the things which are agreeable to the communistic line, and therefore he has no freedom of thought.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Michigan agree with the Senator from Oregon that there is a great deal of difference, and that the difference should be recognized, between academic freedom to search for the truth, no matter where the path of search may lead, and license to infiltrate into our educational system the indoctrination of the Russian ideology?

Mr. FERGUSON. I recognize that, and that is the real distinction. The people of America generally should understand that that is the real distinction between the two propositions, as the Senator has stated it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon, to permit him to ask a question.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Michigan permit me to call his attention—and I say this most humbly, for fear the majority leader may think I am again demonstrating that I think I know the answer to a great many questions, although I hope I know the answer to a few, but certainly not too many—will the Senator from Michigan permit me to ask him whether he is familiar with a piece of writing which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day in regard to the differences, as I see them, between academic freedom and the lack of right on the part of any teacher to hold his job when he is proved to be a Communist and uses his teaching position to infiltrate, by way of indoctrination, Russian propaganda into our schools?

Mr. FERGUSON. I must apologize to the Senator from Oregon when I say that I did not see that in the RECORD and I was not on the floor at the time when it was inserted. But I understand what the Senator from Oregon has in mind, and I recognize the difference.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to state one sentence at this point, I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that I desire to associate myself with his comments on the danger of permitting our school system to be used as a source for the indoctrination of communism.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, sometimes such matters make me feel that those who would have Communists, with their closed, arbitrary minds, teach our youth communism, should think about whether we would tolerate for a moment having a criminal teach criminal law, for instance, in our schools. The situation is quite similar, because it is a violation of our institutions and of our laws to permit crime to be taught in our schools; and, of course, after a declaration of war, some of the acts we have been referring to here would be treason.

Mr. President, returning now to the original subject. The Senator from Michigan believes that socialism of industries, if carried to a certain point, necessitates dictatorship for their operation, and the minute England or any other nation proceeds to socialize, to have the state become the owner of its institutions, of its industry, and, thereby, of labor, they must go then to dictatorship.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wanted to ask the Senator from Michigan whether the man to whom he was referring was a teacher in the State schools of Michigan or was employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the able Senator will bear with me, I was quoting from a folder which was mailed or delivered to a student at the University of Michigan. It was mailed to me yesterday, with a letter.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did the Federal Government, or any of the agencies of the Federal Government, have any part in it?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. It is a pamphlet. And, by the way, this is one of the few times a document of this kind has been labeled as being Communist literature. It is stated on the pamphlet: Write to National Youth Commission or Council of Student Clubs, Communist Party.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield further to the Senator from South Carolina for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Where was the pamphlet sent from?

Mr. FERGUSON. From New York City.

Mr. MAYBANK. What has that to do with the Federal Government? I am as much opposed to communism as is the distinguished Senator from Michigan. We have none of that in the schools of South Carolina, I may assure the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the able Senator will bear with me, I do not claim it has anything to do with the Federal Government. I am trying to develop the argument that in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan socialism and communism are so near together that the Communist Party in America has retreated from its open and avowed principles, although the Senator from Michigan believes that they still have in their hearts principles of force and violence so far as wishing to overthrow the Government is concerned. Those who are familiar with the doctrines of Marx know that communism and socialism are close together. Both of them, I may say advisedly, hate capitalism.

America is founded upon the idea of free institutions, of individual liberty—yes, on the Bill of Rights as we understand it, not as communism understands it. I say the American people have a right to say that their dollar shall not be used directly or indirectly to acquire and to operate in whole or in part any basic industry as a nationalized industry.

As I said before, Mr. President, when a government passes beyond a certain point in socializing its industry, it must ultimately resort to a dictatorship for the enforcement of rules and regulations. Therefore, if we are sure to have a free world, we have a right to say that our dollars shall not be used to do that which can ultimately result in a dictatorship, at which time the country would not be

entitled to any aid according to standards we have already prescribed. We say today that we will not give aid to Russia, we will not give it to Spain, we will not give it to China, except in areas which are not dominated by Communists.

If the conscience of any Senator tells him that through socialization a country can step over into totalitarianism, then he should not vote to give one dollar of the taxpayers' money to any nation which, in his opinion, by the use of it, could become a dictatorship, and therefore not a real ally with America in the cause of furthering world peace.

So I say that if the able Senator from Missouri will accept the substitute of the Senator from Iowa, I think we shall have squarely presented to us the question: Do we believe in the socialization of major basic industries? Do we believe that by socializing them, sooner or later it will be necessary to have a dictatorship to operate them? If a dictatorship is required to operate them, a nation in such circumstances cannot be an ally of the United States under the North Atlantic Pact or the ECA. I think the issue is presented to us fairly, and I hope Senators will see fit to vote for the substitute. Its adoption will tell the world where we stand on this great question involving the differences between ideologies—between America and her institutions, on the one hand, and the ideology of the other extreme, as exemplified by Russian institutions.

EXHIBIT A

SOMEbody's GOING TO INVESTIGATE YOU IF YOU DON'T WATCH OUT!

You don't believe it, eh?

Who's that guy working with you?

Who's that student you're rooming with this year?

Who's that new kid on your team?

Sure, we know his name is Joe. We know his father works in a hardware store and his brother is a mechanic at the plant downtown. But did you know his third cousin by marriage has an uncle who is known to have signed a petition to place a Communist candidate on the ballot in Pennsylvania in the year 1940? You didn't, eh? Well, how do you feel about it now—associating with an American whose third cousin's uncle believes everybody, including Communists, have constitutional rights?

Boy, wait till the un-American Committee gets you on the stand. Suppose they ask you what you were doing on December 26, 1947?

You don't remember that night; do you? But the committee does.

That was the night someone persuaded you to go to a peace rally. There were maybe 7,000 people there, but the boys were able to pick you out because you're a big guy and because you've got red hair. Red! Get it? And do you remember who spoke at that rally? VIRO MARCANTONIO—the United States Congressman from New York.

'Nuff said!

ONCE UPON A TIME

Once upon a time we had gremlins.

Now we have Communists instead.

If the people get mad about high prices, if you want more pay in your envelope, if you think every young person is entitled to a job regardless of the color of his skin, if students ask for education instead of UMT, if vets are getting worked up about no housing and exorbitant rents, if the voters get disgusted with the old parties, if Wallace's Progressive Party campaigns for peace, then this is what the big boys of Wall Street do:

They yell Communist loud and strong.

If they yell it loud enough and strong enough and long enough they hope you'll forget that Congress hasn't done anything to bring prices down or give the Nation housing or guarantee them peace. (Because the GOP and the Democrats are both in hock to big business.)

And the papers will be full of nice fat, scare headlines which are aimed to scare anybody who wants to vote for Wallace.

And to keep the fat headlines rolling, the un-American Committee cooks up a big fake spy scare.

And Harry says to Tom Clark: "Investigate the Reds! Call a grand jury! Make a big noise! Or they'll vote for Henry and we'll both be out of a job come November 4."

THEY DREAM UP FORCE AND VIOLENCE

So they call a grand jury. It's supposed to be a big hush-hush. But they let it leak out to the press that startling revelations are coming: big spy story—tie-up of Communist espionage in high places.

And when the grand jury finally emerges, does it say anything about Communist spies? It does not. Because there are no Communist spies. The jury admits it has absolutely no proof.

So lacking a bona fide spy scare they drag out an old lemon known as force and violence. On this charge they indict 12 leaders of the Communist Party. They plot to outlaw the Communist Party. This is the way the indictment goes: The Communists are "a society . . . of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow and destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence."

That charge is a lie.

This is the truth: The Communist Party does not now—and never has—advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. Its constitution specifically calls for the expulsion of any member who "conspires to overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy."

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the *Schneiderman* case, in 1943, stated that the Communist Party "desired to achieve its purpose by peaceful and democratic means."

Now, we'll tell you what the Communist Party really stands for:

Peace, the Bill of Rights, full equality for the Negro people, the right to work, and to strike, to social security, the right to advocate socialism to end the wars and depressions which capitalism breeds.

What we believe in was never said better than by William Z. Foster in answer to the *Herald Tribune*. He said:

"As an American I love our broad and beautiful land, its liberty-loving people, its wonderful industrial achievements, its glorious democratic traditions. But I do not love its capitalist system. All my adult life I have rebelled against an order of society which permits individuals to grab and hold as their private property the great natural resources and industries of our country, and which allows them to exploit for personal profit the masses of our people. I refuse to accept a social system under which a vast disproportion of the national wealth is owned by a few, and which forces one-third of our people to remain ill-clad, ill-fed and ill-housed, while armies of useless, parasitic capitalist idlers revel in luxury; a society which permits the barbaric lynching of Negroes to go unpunished; which inflicts our country periodically with devastating economic crisis and gigantic mass unemployment, and which is now deliberately organizing to plunge the world into another still more terrible war. In fighting against all these monstrous evils, in working for a Socialist America, I am performing the profoundest patriotic duty."

XCV—257

It is this kind of belief and the right to hold these beliefs that the Government is trying to stifle by indicting the 12 Communist leaders. The grand jury could charge no specific actions; it indicts the Communists for holding ideas. "Dangerous thoughts!" Of peace, security, democracy. If the Communist Party is outlawed—which is the purpose of the indictment—the gates are open to Fascism. Exactly as it started in Germany.

And we'll tell you what the Communist Party demands for young people:

First. Repeal the draft. We stand for the defense of the United States against all its real enemies. But America is in no danger of attack from anyone. We are the most powerful nation in the world today. The draft was engineered in order to create a war scare so that Wall Street could send American boys to China and Greece and the rest of Europe. Not to defend America . . . but to multiply Wall Street profits. To gobble the world.

Second. End Jim Crow in the armed forces. Discrimination, segregation, Jim Crow—these are the real subversives.

Third. Give 18-year-olds the right to vote. If they are old enough to be drafted they are certainly old enough to cast the ballot.

Fourth. Give youth a real job-training program; teach them skills; get them jobs.

Fifth. A public-housing program which will give young people homes—not promises.

Sixth. An end to quota systems and all discrimination in education.

Seventh. Pass Federal aid to education bill.

Eighth. Full academic freedom for students and teachers. An end to "thought control."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator be so kind as to send it to the desk? And does the Senator mean, by accepting it, that he is modifying his own amendment to read as it shall now be read by the clerk? Is that the meaning of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KEM. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri modifies his own amendment. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, between lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Section 111 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) The Administrator shall not authorize assistance, under this act, within any participating country when such assistance will provide dollars or dollar credits which may be used by such participating country directly or indirectly, to acquire and operate in whole or in part any basic industry as a nationalized industry."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri as modified.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, under all the circumstances, I think the Senate ought to recess now. I move the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow—

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas withhold his motion?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor. Does the Senator from Texas yield the floor?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Generally speaking, a Senator can yield only for a question, in line with the policy laid down by the Vice President, but since the Senator from Pennsylvania is the acting majority leader, he may make a statement.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it is our intention that when the Senate takes a recess, it recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. We hope that we may then be able to finish the consideration of the bill sometime tomorrow. I am sure that most of the Members of the Senate would like to avoid a Saturday session, and in order to accommodate the membership, it is our hope to remain in session tomorrow until we conclude consideration of the bill. But before we recess—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the acting majority leader if his statement means—and I agree that we should try to press for a conclusion of the bill—we will stay in session with the idea of finishing the bill tomorrow or tomorrow night?

Mr. MYERS. That is correct. We have fixed no definite time. It is our hope that we can finish tomorrow. I say that only because I think most of the Members of the Senate desire to avoid a Saturday session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from California is recognized for that purpose, as any other Senators will who wish to offer insertions for the RECORD.

ALLEGED DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter dated March 24, which I addressed to Honorable Dean Acheson, regarding quota restrictions which discriminate against American industry and agriculture, the reply of the Secretary of State, dated March 30, 1949, and a letter from Under Secretary Webb dated April 1, 1949.

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

MARCH 24, 1949.

HON. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We would be very much interested to know what steps have been taken by this Government to have the British Government materially reduce or

eliminate quota restrictions which discriminate against American industry and agriculture. At a time when the Congress is being urged to contribute to the opening up of the channels of trade it seems to us to be inconsistent for the British Government to establish economic iron curtains against American industrial and agricultural products, whether such restrictions be in the nature of quota arrangements, discriminatory taxation, or currency restrictions.

Any information you could furnish relative to this situation would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
California.

STYLES BRIDGES,
New Hampshire.

ROBERT A. TAFT,
Ohio.

EDWARD MARTIN,
Pennsylvania.

OWEN BREWSTER,
Maine.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 30, 1949.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have received the letter of March 24, 1949, signed by you and Senators BRIDGES, TAFT, MARTIN, and BREWSTER asking for information about the steps which this Government has taken to have the British Government eliminate quota restrictions.

I have asked officers in the Department to look into this matter carefully and will write to you again on the subject in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 1, 1949.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I refer to the letter of March 24, 1949, in which you and Senators BRIDGES, TAFT, MARTIN, and BREWSTER ask for information relative to certain discriminations by the British Government against American industry and agriculture and in which you state that the existence of such discrimination seems to be inconsistent with the objective of opening up the channels of trade.

Such discriminations against American industry and agriculture as are now in effect among European countries are part of a pattern whereby such countries are seeking to derive maximum benefit toward European recovery from their inadequate supply of dollars. In the main, these restrictions limit the import of products requiring dollar expenditure which the countries can do without or can obtain from their respective domestic economies or from soft currency sources. By conserving their dollars in this fashion, European countries are in a position to make the most of the assistance which they receive under the European Recovery Program and thereby to insure that European recovery will progress at the speediest practicable rate and at a minimum cost to the American taxpayer.

Current policies, which have been developed jointly with the Economic Cooperation Administration and with other interested agencies, have been framed with a full recognition of the desirability of returning at the earliest possible date to a pattern of nondiscriminatory multilateral trade. In order for such a pattern to be established on a sound and lasting basis, European recovery must have progressed to a point where not only the over-all balance of payments of the European countries can practicably be brought into balance, but also their balance of payments with the dollar area.

It is the aim of the ERP to achieve such a situation as rapidly as practicable. Progress toward this objective during the last year has been real, but a point has not yet been reached where it would be possible for European countries to achieve a balance in their dollar payments without careful conservation of their dollar earnings supplemented by assistance from the United States.

As you no doubt know, the relaxation of existing restrictions upon trade and currency convertibility involve questions of timing which are of the utmost complexity. You will recall the unfortunate experience which the British suffered when, in the summer of 1947, under the terms of the loan agreement, they reestablished limited sterling convertibility. You will recall that the British Government was compelled to abandon such convertibility within a few weeks, but only after serious inroads had been made upon her dollar reserves. In its participation in the development of policies in this field, the Department is earnestly endeavoring to avoid such premature measures in the future, which would only result in an increased burden on United States taxpayers, while at the same time moving toward the earliest attainment of multilateral, non-discriminatory world trading. The Department shares with you the conviction that such a pattern of world trading is the only lasting basis upon which economic relationships with Europe can be built.

I am enclosing extra copies of this letter and I should appreciate your giving one to each of the Senators who joined you in signing the letter.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted immediately following that correspondence a copy of an article which appeared in the London Times under date of March 31, 1949, relating to film quota.

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

REDUCTION IN FILM QUOTA—OPPOSITION URGES UNDERSTANDING WITH AMERICA

WESTMINSTER.—In the House of Commons this evening Mr. H. Wilson, President of the Board of Trade, moved the approval of an order to reduce the film quota for first feature films from 45 percent to 40 percent.

He explained that the order did not represent an uncontroversial proposal. No quota in this unhappy and divided industry could be uncontroversial. He had received no representations, official or unofficial, from Hollywood or any other part of America. The quota was fixed by the Board of Trade, conscientiously and fearlessly, in relation to the available facts.

He had departed from the figure recommended by one-half of the film council. Producers and renters were in favor of accepting the 45 percent, and were supported by one-half the trade-union representation. The exhibitors and the other half of the trade-union representation supported a proposal to reduce the quota to 33 1/3 percent. Apart from the chairman the voting was exactly equal, and the chairman cast his vote in favor of a reduction, but said he did not favor a reduction as low as 33 1/3 percent. In those circumstances he did not think it could be represented that he had flouted the advice of the film council since that advice was divided.

INCENTIVE TO INDUSTRY

There were two main considerations to be borne in mind in fixing a quota. One was the paramount necessity of building up a sound and healthy production industry in this country. Last year's quota was meant

to be an encouragement and incentive to the industry. During the passage of the recent act he undertook to fix the quota at such a level as would provide a distribution outlet for all British films of a reasonable quality. They had to have in mind supplying to exhibitors a reasonable choice of films for their patrons. It would therefore be wrong to fix a quota merely in the interests of encouraging British production.

From the discussions in the film council it seemed reasonable to assume that new British first-feature films this year would number between 70 and 80. The 40-percent quota would mean that a town with three cinemas having a change of program no more than once a week would satisfy its obligation with 63 British films. The quota of 45 percent would require a total of 72 British films, and thus the new order gave a slightly larger margin between the number of films available and those required.

It was a great disappointment to him to have to reduce the quota. He did not want to sound too discouraging about it. The industry was going through difficult times, and if he thought that the reduction was more than temporary he would feel a good deal more concerned about the position than he did. He approached the reduction with the idea of reculer pour mieux sauter.

THE BIG COMPANIES

It was a fact that the big companies in the industry had been drawing in their horns for financial reasons. The films required to honor the reduced quota would have to come to a greater extent than hitherto from independent producers, who would require to be financed from sources other than the traditional ones in the industry, particularly from the new Film Finance Corp. Recent Hollywood film awards had shown that the quality of the best British films was still the best in the world.

Apprehension had been expressed that the quota was too high for the non-circuit exhibitor. The board of trade was empowered to award reduced quota percentages or in some cases total exemption from quotas to exhibitors who applied for relief and fulfilled certain prescribed conditions. It was too early to say to what extent relief would be given in the coming period but, in relation to the current year, they had granted relief of varying amounts to 1,471 cinemas, besides awarding total exemption to a further 307. In most cases it would be possible to award relief to those exhibitors who required them.

He was certain it was right to reduce the quota. It would have been an unfair burden on exhibitors in the light of the number of films expected to come forward to have required them to show 45 percent of their screen time through British films. That might have led to a break-down of the act if a large number of cinemas could not fulfill the quota set; nor would it have been in the best interests of British film production. On the other hand, to have reduced the quota further to 33 1/3 or 25 percent would have dealt a grievous blow to British film production in this country.

He could understand why exhibitors in general were pressing for a lower quota, but they must realize that the short-term direct financial interest of the cinema exhibitor did not coincide with either the short-term or the long-term economic interest of the country as a whole. However true it might be that exhibitors' profits would have increased if they had been allowed to show a higher proportion of imported films, it was true that the economic condition of the country would have been gravely prejudiced by such a course, and, indeed, it would have dealt such a serious blow at the film production industry that it might have endangered the supply of films to the exhibitors.

UNEXPECTED RESULTS FROM QUOTA—MORE FINANCE NEEDED

Mr. E. Fletcher (Islington, E., Labor) said that if the object of the quota was to give the maximum assistance to British film production, it followed that no unnecessary or unjustified relief from the quota should be given. Those cinemas which had had quota relief were able to show more American films and draw off revenue from the cinemas showing a higher quota, and he estimated that as a result there was a net loss of film to British film production.

In the current year the quota of 45 percent, while it had been fulfilled by and large, had had the unexpected result that instead of being a stimulus to British production the reverse had happened. Studios were empty, there had been redundancy and loss of employment. The reason for this was the difficulty in getting finance from private sources, and sooner or later it would be necessary for the Government to give increased financial assistance to British producers, just as it would also be necessary to work out a concordat with the Americans for quality films to be made in both countries on a basis of reciprocal showing.

Sir I. Fraser said that in a laudable attempt to encourage the making of British films and the saving of dollars the president of the board of trade had fixed the quota too high for all practical purposes.

Mr. N. Maclean (Glasgow, Govan, Labor) said that in suggesting a quota of 40 percent the president of the board of trade was acting in defiance of the Cinematograph Films Council, set up by himself, which recommended a quota of 33½ percent.

Mr. Granville (Eye, Labor) said we were losing the celluloid cold war with the United States. The cut of 5 percent in the quota and the fact that there was a great deal of redundancy in British studios proved that either the advisers to the president of the board of trade were wrong or there was something fundamentally wrong in the industry itself. The industry could not be safeguarded by quota qualifications. It needed an international agreement which would give the production side of the industry in this country the first real opportunity it had had for years.

ARTIFICIAL PROPS

Mr. T. O'Brien (Nottingham, W., Labor) said that the film industry, buttressed as it had been with a quota for the past 20 years, had now failed to stand up to the Americans. It was a source of considerable disquiet. He was not convinced that the finance was or would be available to meet the 40-percent quota. The quota would not put into employment one man who was now unemployed but would lead to further unemployment. The problem could only be solved by taking away the artificial props which this government and previous governments had put up to bolster the industry. The more props there were the more disagreement there would be among the interests in the industry. The time had come to tell the industry that it could no longer expect any government permanently to assist it.

Mr. McCallum (Argyll, Conservative) asked what consideration had been given to the position of independent Scottish exhibitors.

Mr. Levy (Eton and Slough, Labor) said that no amount of money tendered as gift or loan to the production side of the industry would be of any use in alleviating existing difficulties unless there was fairer distribution of box-office earnings.

Mr. W. G. Shepherd (Bucklow, Conservative) said that the basic difficulty was the lack of necessary cooperation by the American industrialists whose backs had been put up unnecessarily by Mr. Dalton. It was also essential that there should be some sort of unity in the British industry.

AMERICAN PRODUCTIONS

Mr. Wilson said he had warned the American negotiators last year that he would fix the highest possible quota figure. He could not have discussed with them, or even indicated to them, the figure he had in mind at that time, because he had no specific figure in mind, and by statute he was required to consult the new films council which could not be set up until the act was passed.

With regard to the present quota, no representations had been received from American interests. He would welcome much greater American film production in this country. The American industry was facing possible changes as a result of a legal decision which made it difficult for them to negotiate either with the British Government, or the British film industry.

It was completely wrong to suggest that the present situation was due to the 45-percent quota. If it was the opposition's argument that the falling off in the box-office receipts was due to the low quality of the films produced under the quota, they must realize that this quota was only announced in the middle of June and did not come into effect until October. It would have been almost impossible to get the films produced to have an effect on attendance and the finances of the industry.

BANK ADVANCES—MR. LYTTELTON'S CRITICISM

Mr. Lyttelton (Aldershot, Conservative) said the effect of fixing a 45-percent quota had undoubtedly been to give some substance to the fears about the quality of British production, which he thought had been falling. Producers admittedly were finding finance difficult. The advances which one joint-stock bank had made to one large film concern were greatly in excess of £10,000,000 and the security which the bank had against the advances largely consisted of canned films. It was not the type of banker's advance which was particularly popular either in Lombard Street or Threadneedle Street.

He could not congratulate the government on the history of the negotiations with the American film industry. We could not afford the unrestricted importation of American films, but the opposition had said that every effort should be made to gain not only an agreement with the Americans but also their cooperation. A great mistake was made at that time because immediately after the agreement with Mr. Eric Johnston had been concluded the quota was fixed at 45 percent without any previous consultation with the Americans. That was an immature piece of negotiation. It had led to a number of unpleasant consequences for us.

He noted from reports which he had received from America that the reduction of the quota to 40 percent had done nothing whatever to relieve the bitterness of the American film industry at the size of the quota generally. The Americans were extremely obstructive to British films being shown in the United States. Rightly or wrongly, they felt they had been treated in rather a smart way by the British Government.

WORST OF ALL WORLDS

Another consequence was that there was something like a sit-down strike by American producers in this country concerning the use of the blocked sterling they had accumulated here. They were sullen and uncooperative and were not using that blocked sterling to produce films here. Exhibitors were short of third-feature films and the public were definitely put off attendance at cinemas by the quality of the films. The consequence was that unemployment was beginning to be rife.

Taking it all together, the rather maladroit way in which the Government conducted their negotiations had resulted in the industry as a whole getting the worst of all worlds.

The Government's action, so far as the Government had interfered, was done in a way which would lead one to suppose that the industry was already nationalized. [Laughter.] It gave one very little confidence about the future.

He hoped that the lessons of this mess would be borne in on the Government. A certain amount of face-losing on their part had to be recognized and we should try to gain the cooperation of the Americans. It was clear that the industry was in great jeopardy. The necessary first steps were to reopen the subject with the American producers, to release some of the British film earnings abroad, and to consider at an early date some remission of the purchase tax.

This order represented a set-back to all who were hoping for a continually expanding production, but provided that the industry could settle its other problems, financial, distribution, and all the rest, he would hope not only that this quota could be realized without hardship to anyone, but, further, that they could look forward to a reversion to a higher quota in the reasonably near future and see a firmly established film industry in this country.

Mr. Blackburn (Birmingham, King's Norton, Labor) said that on the last occasion when he addressed the House, he repeated information he had incorrectly received as a member of the committee of inspection in the liquidation of the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company that Lord Baldwin had intervened in relation to the prosecution of Lord Kylsant. He wished to withdraw that statement. He now knew that it was incorrect.

We had in this country, he continued, the resources and the men to fulfill the 45-percent film quota and no valid reason had been given why it should not be fulfilled. The government should requisition the studio space and see that we produced the films for the quota. We did not want the American film industry being built up in this country. We should be fighting to have our own industry. The whole of the producers and renters were unanimous that they wanted to retain the 45-percent quota.

Mr. Gallacher (Fife, W., Communist) said that Mr. Rank and company laid the foundations of the ruin of the industry and the mass unemployment through the enormous expenditure on films in the attempt to get the American market. The 45-percent quota could easily be fulfilled. Mr. Wilson should take over control of the studios and set the people to work.

The order was approved.

EXTENSION OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to inquire if there will be an executive session this evening.

Mr. MYERS. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that there will be an executive session.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas, in view of the fact that the debate has been continuing for approximately 3 weeks and that all phases of the subject have been covered, if it would not be possible to get a unanimous-consent agreement that at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon the Senate

begin voting on the bill and all amendments thereto. It seems to me that 3 weeks is a pretty long time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it is feasible and sensible; but I do not know whether it is practicable.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas whether he will put that proposition to the test. I do not mean to be captious in asking this, but I myself think that after 3 weeks of debate we ought to dispose of the matter and proceed with something else.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will yield to the Senator from Maryland so that he may propound the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot yield for that purpose. What is the pleasure of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning tomorrow at 2 o'clock, the Senate proceed to vote upon all pending amendments, to be followed by a vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I do not share the view that the debate on this important issue before the Senate has been too prolonged. I am perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself. As a proponent of the pending legislation, I take the position that it is of the utmost importance that the point of view of Senators who are in disagreement with the legislation be made a matter of record, so that the people of the Nation—and there are hundreds of them writing to their representatives, raising objections to the pending bill—can know as a fact that we have considered all possible objections and criticisms to the proposed legislation.

Further, I want to say, Mr. President, that in view of the parliamentary situation which has developed in the Senate, in view of the course of action which has been followed by the majority leader in the handling of the business of the Senate, it will be a long time indeed before the Democratic side of the aisle will be able to transact business by way of unanimous consent. It will transact business by motion only.

The Junior Senator from Oregon objects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate—

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MYERS. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania why not proceed with the session. Why should the Senate recess at this time?

Mr. MYERS. There was a general understanding or agreement that a recess would be taken at approximately 6 or 6:30 o'clock unless there seemed to be an opportunity to complete debate on the bill by 8 or 9 o'clock. There are a number of pending amendments, and it seems

to me there is no possibility of finishing before 12 o'clock tonight. Therefore we thought it would be better to go over until tomorrow, in the hope that we might remain in session tomorrow until a reasonable hour and get a vote on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the acting majority leader says he hopes we can get through tomorrow?

Mr. MYERS. The best I can say is hope.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for a question?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Is the Senator familiar with the biblical statement that hope deferred maketh the heart sick?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Long deferred, is it not?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire would question the authenticity of the quotation as given by the occupant of the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Presiding Officer has no right to engage in conversation with Senators on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is quite correct, and if it is the desire of the Senator from Maryland, the remark will be expunged.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania have valid reasons for his hope that the Senate can finish tomorrow?

Mr. MYERS. I do. The Senate now seems to be in good humor, and I am hopeful we can finish tomorrow. I think it is probably advisable to take a recess this afternoon, because every Member seems to be in good humor at this time.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for a question?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I suppose the Senator thinks that sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair makes no observations in connection with that statement.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MYERS. I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sam D. W. Low, of Houston, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 22, with headquarters at Galveston, Tex., to fill an existing vacancy; and

Victor Russell, of Port Arthur, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex. (reappointment).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska (reappointment).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on Executive Calendar.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hawthorne Arey to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I respectfully ask that the nomination go over at this time. I want the RECORD to show that I am making the suggestion in behalf of a Senator who is not on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will go over, in accordance with the request.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hugh W. Cross to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oswald Ryan to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, without taking the time of the Senate to make a few remarks I had intended to make on this nomination, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I have

prepared be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator understands that under the rule the statement will be printed in small type, not in the regular type, does he?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON

Oswald Ryan is an original member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, appointed by President Roosevelt in 1938. He had previously served 6½ years as general counsel of the Federal Power Commission under the Hoover and the Roosevelt administrations, during which time he had argued important public-utility cases to the Supreme Court and other Federal courts.

Mr. Ryan was the only lawyer on the Board during its early years and the only member that had had previous experience in public regulation. Accordingly he took leadership in developing the technique of the new regulation. Thus, he urged, and the Board adopted years ago, an administrative procedure which separated the judicial from the prosecuting functions and provided for a fair hearing for all interested parties in both judicial and legislative cases. In this connection, it is a significant fact that when the Administrative Procedure Act was adopted by the Congress a few years ago, the Civil Aeronautics Board was the only quasi-judicial commission of the Government which found it unnecessary to make basic changes in its procedure to conform to the new law. That was because the basic reforms provided by the new act had been adopted years before by the Board on its own motion.

Another contribution which is credited to Mr. Ryan was the establishment of prudent investment as the basis of rate making. Mr. Ryan, before coming to the Civil Aeronautics Board, had appeared before the Supreme Court and argued as a "friend of the Court" in favor of the prudent-investment method of public-utility rate making as against the old reproduction-cost method. He successfully urged this rate-making reform upon the Board.

Mr. Ryan has also led in the past 10 years in bringing about a cooperative relation between the Civil Aeronautics Board and the various State aviation agencies which have frequently been in conflict. In 1945 he offered to the representatives of the States assembled at St. Louis a solution to the problem which contemplated congressional action which would give to State aviation agencies and courts concurrent jurisdiction to enforce Federal aviation laws and regulations. Within the past few days the State aviation commissions, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the Civil Aeronautics Board have reached common agreement upon this plan which the Congress will be asked to incorporate in legislation.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, December 16, 1942]

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday the President sent to the Senate two nominations to the Civil Aeronautics Board, one being that of Oswald Ryan, of Indiana, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the term expiring December 31, 1948, which is a reappointment, and the other the nomination of our colleague the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It was not intended

that the nomination of the Senator from Oklahoma should come up for consideration at this session. By some mistake of the clerical force at the White House his nomination was included. The Senator from Oklahoma is not eligible to appointment to that Board until after his term as Senator expires, because the Board was created during the term of the Senator from Oklahoma which is now expiring. Therefore, I do not expect any action to be taken upon that nomination, now. The other nomination, however, of Mr. Ryan is a reappointment, and I ask unanimous consent that that nomination be confirmed without reference to committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this matter was called to my attention yesterday. I am acquainted with Mr. Ryan and familiar with his work on the Board, and so far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Ryan at this time. It is a reappointment, and, of course, otherwise would have to go over until the next session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the request, Mr. President, with the approval of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to make one or two remarks as to Mr. Oswald Ryan, in furtherance of the request made by the majority leader. As the author of the act under which Mr. Oswald Ryan is serving, I wish to pay the very highest possible compliment to him for his very able, efficient, and progressive administration while he has been in his present position. I think there is no man in the United States who could better fill the position than Mr. Oswald Ryan, and I am glad to join in the request that his nomination be immediately confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oswald Ryan, of Indiana, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the term expiring December 31, 1948 (reappointment).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of Oswald Ryan is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order be withdrawn, because I understand the Senator from South Carolina desires to direct some remarks to the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order made by the Chair a moment ago will be set aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is set aside.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say that Mr. Oswald Ryan, a distinguished member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, who has been nominated for a 6-year term, served ably and long on the Federal Power Commission, and in the dark days in South Carolina we were fortunate in having Mr. Ryan serve in that position. He rendered great service to the State of South Carolina in connection with the development of the Santee River. He defended us in the circuit courts and in the local courts. The State went on record, by the adoption in the legislature of a long resolution, in appreciation of his great service as a member of the Federal Power Commission, originally appointed, I believe,

by President Hoover. He served ably and long, and I am happy to be in the Senate to cast my vote for the confirmation of his nomination. He is an outstanding American, and has been of great assistance to South Carolina and to the United States in general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Oswald Ryan, of Indiana, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board? Objection was made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] for the purpose of allowing the Senator from South Carolina to speak on the nomination.

Mr. MYERS. I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is withdrawn.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that my only purpose in objecting—and perhaps I should have reserved the right to object—was to give the Senator from South Carolina an opportunity to speak in reference to this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the nomination.

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 8, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of March 18), 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Stephen T. Early, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

John Carson, of Michigan, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1945.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John J. Wein, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires April 7, 1949.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

Lyman A. Thackrey	Herbert S. Duckworth
Carl F. Espe	Frank Akers

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Samuel E. McCarty
George W. Bauernschmidt

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grade of captain subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the line of the Navy:

Carlton R. Adams	Burrell C. Allen, Jr.
Scarritt Adams	Robert A. Allen
James A. Adkins	William Y. Allen, Jr.
John W. Alies III	Charles H. Andrews

John B. Azer
 Harry P. Badger
 James O. Banks, Jr.
 Rudolph C. Bauer
 Paul P. Blackburn, Jr.
 Everett M. Block
 John B. Bowen, Jr.
 Alston M. Boyd, Jr.
 Parke H. Brady
 John M. Bristol
 Douglas B. Broken-
 shire
 Thomas M. Brown
 Edward Brumby
 Harvey P. Burden
 Norwood A. Campbell
 Joseph P. Canty
 Edward S. Carmick
 Albert S. Carter
 Francis M. Carter
 George M. Chambers
 Wreford G. Chapple
 Robert N. S. Clark
 Joseph C. Clifton
 Doyle M. Coffee
 Victor B. Cole
 Edward E. Colestock
 John B. Colwell
 Richard J. H. Conn
 Ray R. Conner
 John Corbus
 Howard G. Corey
 Robert R. Craighill
 Dana B. Cushing
 James W. Davis
 Edward M. Day
 Harry E. Day
 Walter S. Denham
 Jefferson R. Dennis
 Paul L. DeVos
 John B. Dimmick
 Joseph E. Dodson
 Jack S. Dorsey
 William T. Doyle, Jr.
 William M. Drane
 Charles G. Duffy
 Elmer J. Dunn
 Harold E. Duryea
 Otis J. Earle
 Walter G. Ebert
 Ian C. Eddy
 Hal K. Edwards
 John E. Edwards
 William E. Ellis
 Christian L. Engleman
 Lot Ensey
 Robert J. Esslinger
 William S. Estabrook,
 Jr.
 Charles T. Fitzgerald
 Andrew M. R. Fitzsim-
 mons
 John F. Flynn
 Robert S. Ford
 Dennis L. Francis
 Bernhart A. Fuetsch
 Robert E. Gadrow
 Edmund E. Garcia
 Kenneth M. Gentry
 Frank D. Giambat-
 tista
 George O. Gjoerloff
 Charles R. Gilliam
 Marvin H. Gluntz
 John B. Gragg
 James D. L. Grant
 Eltonzo B. Grantham,
 Jr.
 George M. Greene
 William M. Gullett
 Elvin Hahn
 Thomas B. Haley
 Mervin Halstead
 Henry O. Hansen
 Burton S. Hanson, Jr.
 Chesley M. Hardison
 William L. Harmon
 David A. Harris
 James W. Haviland III

David D. Hawkins
 George L. Heap
 Harold M. Heming
 Charles R. Herms
 Alexander S. Heyward,
 Jr.
 George M. Holley
 Herschel A. House
 John G. Howell
 Charles C. Howerton
 John Hulme
 Hayes E. Irons
 Alexander Jackson, Jr.
 Andrew McB. Jackson,
 Jr.
 Walter T. Jenkins
 Lafayette J. Jones
 John H. Keatley
 Harold W. Keopka
 John O. Kinert
 William H. Kirvan
 Denys W. Knoll
 Lyle L. Koepke
 George F. Kosco
 Donald F. Krick
 Keith M. Krieger
 Thomas R. Kurtz, Jr.
 Frederick W. Laing
 James G. Lang
 Rowland C. Lawver
 James T. Lay
 John E. Lee
 Nicholas A. Lidstone
 Horatio A. Lincoln
 Charles W. Lord
 Vernon L. Lowrance
 Frederic C. Lucas, Jr.
 Frank P. Luongo, Jr.
 Oliver D. T. Lynch
 Edgar J. MacGregor III
 Hugh T. MacKay
 Elwood C. Madsen
 Joseph B. Maher
 Ray E. Malpass
 Herbert H. Marable
 Edmund S. L. Marshall
 Henry M. Marshall
 Kleber S. Masterson
 Laurance O. Mathews,
 Jr.
 Leo G. May
 Charles T. Mauro, Jr.
 Albert S. Miller
 Frank B. Miller
 Theodore T. Miller
 Ray A. Mitchell
 William A. Moffett, Jr.
 Robert R. Moore
 John A. Moreno
 Elias B. More II
 Warren H. McClain
 Charles E. McCombs
 George T. McCready,
 Jr.
 Montgomery L. McCul-
 lough, Jr.
 Francis C. B. McCune
 Robert D. McGinnis
 Louis D. McGregor, Jr.
 John R. McKnight, Jr.
 Bowen F. McLeod
 Ira E. McMillan
 Roscoe L. Newman
 James H. Newsome
 Roy A. Newton
 Kelvin L. Nutting
 Emmet O. Beirne
 Davis W. Olney
 Arthur E. Owen
 George G. Palmer
 Alex M. Patterson
 Harold Payson, Jr.
 Herman A. Pieczent-
 kowski
 William S. Post, Jr.
 Lynne C. Quiggle
 Samuel M. Randall
 Allen L. Reed
 Edward C. Renfro

Everet O. Rigsbee, Jr.
 Horacio Rilvero, Jr.
 Josephus A. Robbins
 Norman K. Roberts
 Allan B. Roby
 Bernard F. Roeder
 Joseph A. Ruddy, Jr.
 Lawrence E. Ruff
 Royal L. Rutter
 Henry G. Sanchez
 Eddie R. Sanders
 William H. Sanders,
 Jr.
 Eugene T. Sands
 Gifford Scull
 George C. Sea
 Raymond N. Sharp
 Frank T. Sleat
 Harry Smith
 William O. Snead, Jr.
 Arthur F. Spring
 Clyde B. Stevens, Jr.
 James E. Stevens
 Francis S. Stich
 Robert J. Stroh
 Walter W. Strohbehn
 Ray F. Yager
 Robert T. Sutherland,
 Joseph B. H. Young
 Jr.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Lawrence L. Bean
 Sam C. Bostic
 Byron F. Brown
 George G. Burkley
 Herman F. Burkwall
 Charles L. Denton
 Archibald M. Ecklund
 Richard H. Fletcher
 Roland H. Fogel
 James E. Fulghum
 Percy B. Gallegos
 Charles Gartenlaub
 John A. C. Gray
 John K. Hawes
 Harold Hirshland
 Peter E. Huth
 Spencer Johnson
 Louis P. Kirkpatrick
 Ernest S. V. Laub
 Jerome P. Long, Jr.
 John A. Lund
 Leslie L. MacClatchie
 Ralph R. Myers
 Ira C. Nichols
 Paul G. Richards
 Nathan L. Robbin
 Thomas P. Rogers
 William M. Russell
 Shelton P. Sanford
 Robert V. Schultz
 David W. Sherwood
 Walter J. Shudde
 Leonard E. Skilling
 Fred B. Smith
 Charles C. Terry, Jr.
 Leslie L. Veseen
 Ross W. Weisiger
 James N. Williams
 Michael Wishengrad

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Clark T. Abbott
 Thomas L. Becknell,
 Jr.
 James W. Boundy
 Aubrey J. Bourgeois
 Carlos M. Charneco
 George W. Foott
 Hugh C. Haynsworth,
 Jr.
 Willard C. Johnson
 Albert P. Kohlhas, Jr.
 William M. Landau
 Onnie P. Lattu
 Lionel C. Peppell
 Walter F. Prien

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Henry G. Clark
 Arthur I. Flaherty
 Pinckney M. Jeffords
 James C. Tily
 Alexander S. C. Wadsworth
 William F. Wesanen

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Robert E. Blair
 Jesse B. Bancroft
 Donald M. Coughlin
 Thaddeus V. Joseph
 George H. Mills
 Max A. Moon
 Edwin A. Thomas
 Lauro J. Turbini

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Naval Reserve subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lenus F. Adams
 Benjamin B. Dowell
 Arthur F. Morash
 Charles E. Smith
 Wilson Starbuck
 Frederick R. L. Tuthill

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of March 18), 1949:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Hawthorne Arey to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1950.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Hugh W. Cross to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1950.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Oswald Ryan to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1954.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of Earl R. Adams et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), effective June 15, 1949, subject to physical qualification, and with the dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, and the nominations of John R. Cross et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant in the Medical Service Corps, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), effective June 15, 1949, subject to physical qualification, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 31, 1949, and appear in full in the Senate Proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Earl R. Adams, which name is shown on page 3597, and ending with the name of Dale E. Wykoff, which is shown on page 3598.

IN THE NAVY APPOINTMENTS

Rear Adm. John W. Reeves, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Vice Adm. Arthur W. Radford, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving under a Presidential designation as Commander in Chief, Pacific, Commander in Chief, United States Pacific Fleet, and High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Orlie G. Baird
 Leo P. Bauerlein
 Robert "C" Brown, Jr.
 Edward R. Day, Jr.
 Dean C. DuBois, Jr.
 Jimmie "C" Hendricks
 Charles B. House, Jr.
 Alvin Rush
 Ralph G. Spencer
 Louis R. Tevell
 Jeremy F. Worden

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Robert C. Austin
 Lee R. Balderston
 John F. Rawls, Jr.

Robert L. Herman (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy:

George E. Allison	Robert P. McArdle
William F. Beatty	Carey P. McMurray
Harry L. Benson	James G. Measel
Victor D. Brockmann	Albert J. Monger
Alva D. Burkett	Richard D. Murray
James E. Cahill	William G. Nealon
Charles E. Cantrell, Jr.	Norman J. Neiss
Warren E. Carman	William E. Nowers
Richard E. Case	Phil G. Olsen
William A. Cody	Delbert A. Olson
Jack C. Coggins	Joseph E. Puccini, Jr.
Robert T. Darcy	Howard M. Puckett
Howard M. Davenport, Jr.	Robert N. Radtke
George D. Edwards, Jr.	David R. Reilly
Lester H. Finger	Wallace Rich
Frederick L. Foxton	Daniel P. Riley
Jack D. Fuller	Paul E. Russell
Robert W. Hargarten	Wallace L. Russell
Harry J. Hinden	William McC. Shaver
David B. Holcombe	James R. Stohl
Jack I. Holmes, Jr.	Glenn E. Trewet, Jr.
Robert T. Holmes	Bruce W. VanAtta
William C. Hoyman	Joseph M. Verlander
Glenn D. Jordan	Robert S. Vermilya
Herbert L. Jos	Cecil R. Vollmer
Frank C. Kolda	Gerald A. Warnke
Andrew F. Kruzich	Douglas A. Washburn
Joseph R. Laubach, Jr.	Eugene F. Witkowski
Edward F. Lebledz	Robert H. Witten
Walter R. Lewison	John L. Zent

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Edward Auerswald	William T. Morgan
William E. Biro	Wehrle D. Richmond
Albert T. Buckmaster	James H. Rogers
William H. Diana, Jr.	Francis M. Simmons
Charles F. Jesson	Wayne F. Smith
Wade C. Kemmerer	John H. Thayer
Alfred G. Kreinberg	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949.

Andrew M. Durham	Robert L. McClintock
Joseph L. Forehand	William F. Reiser

William T. H. Barton (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Mary A. Ayars	Elizabeth L. Kotch
Jennie Binkiewicz	Bertha A. Krumming
Irene L. Bryant	Margaret H. Lester
Elizabeth M. Dobos	Elizabeth F. Metcalf
Jessie R. Franklin	Janet R. Mullen
Edna P. Gordon	May L. Reid
Bobbie L. Henley	Jean A. Replogle
Annette A. Kalista	Mary Stefanick
Margaret A. Kane	Dannelle Westbrook

John M. Whalen to be a commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Lloyd A. Bohaker	Howard H. Fischer
Arthur D. Eastman	James C. Reader
Harold W. Feder	

LIEUTENANTS

William E. Hutson
Charles E. Rudolph, Jr.
John H. Smith

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Wayne A. Nelson

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Emile W. Achee	Edward C. Adkins
Francis McK. Adams	Richard S. Agnew
Jr.	Hugh W. Albers
Richard D. Adams	Edward L. Alderman

Robert B. Aljoe	Kenneth M. Carr
David S. Allen	Robert H. Cartmill
Milton N. Allen	John P. Cartwright
John H. Alvis	Edward S. Carver
Ted M. Annenberg	Albert L. Cecchini
Robert H. Ardinger	James H. L. Chambers, Jr.
"A" "J" M. Atkins	Samuel R. Chessman
Wilfred A. Bacchus	Edmond A. Chevalier
Allan F. Bacon	Raymond G. Chote
John A. Bacon, Jr.	Louis G. Churchill, Jr.
Herman M. Bading	Glenwood Clark, Jr.
Gilliam M. Bailey	Robert S. Clark
Richard T. Bailey	Willard H. Clark, Jr.
John C. Bajus	Horace D. Clarke, Jr.
Robert F. Baker	Wade E. Clarke
Allen H. Balch	Richard A. Claytor
William J. Balco	Richard C. Clinite
Jack E. Baltar	David G. Cluett
Robert Barden	Warrington C. Cobb
Henry B. Barkley, Jr.	Albert G. Cohen
John C. Barrow	William M. Coldwell
John F. Barrow	Leonor L. Collins
Joseph J. Barrow	William D. Collins, Jr.
Byron S. Bartholomew, Jr.	Oliver D. Colvin, Jr.
Bernard E. Bassing	Richard R. Colvin
Charles J. Baumann, Jr.	Robert N. Congdon
Fred G. Baur	Robert W. Conklin
Reaves H. Baysinger, Jr.	Harvey Conover, Jr.
Raymond W. Bean	Karl F. Cook
Reynolds Beckwith	Robert J. Coontz
James W. Beeler	Alan B. Cooper
George M. Benas, Jr.	Stanley G. Cooper
Cedric E. Bennett	Francis E. Cornett
John E. Benoit	Stanley T. Counts
Francis W. Benson, Jr.	Sidney S. Cox
John S. McK. Benson	Billy H. Craig
Richard H. Benson	Donald E. Craig
Manuel S. Bentin	Edgar A. Cruise, Jr.
Richard H. Berby	John B. Culp, Jr.
Melvin Berngard	George W. Cummings
Karl J. Bernstein	Theodore A. Curtin
Frederick J. Blodgett	Stanley W. Curtis, Jr.
Thomas E. Bloom	Donald A. Dahlman
Paul R. Boggs, Jr.	John M. Dalrymple
Roger M. Boh, Jr.	John F. Danis
Donald B. Bosley	Chester G. Davis
Alfred C. Boughton	Whittier G. Davis
William DeW. Bourne	Julius H. Demyttenaere
Rhodes Boykin, Jr.	Edwin L. Dennis, Jr.
Robert E. Brady	Lawrence H. Derby, Jr.
Walter J. Brajdich	James D. Dickson
William W. Brandfon	Joe A. Dickson
Carl R. Brandt	Edward O. Dietrich
Charles B. Breaux, Jr.	Louis W. Dillman
Edward S. Briggs	Horace E. Dismukes
William R. Boughton, Jr.	John C. Dixon, Jr.
Coleman "T" Brown, Jr.	Stephen A. Dobbins
Ernest B. Brown	John F. Dobson
Frank P. Brown, Jr.	William C. Doby
James B. Brown	John F. Docherty, Jr.
Robert A. Brown	Harry J. Donahue
Gerald F. Brummitt	John M. Donlon
William L. Bryan	James A. Donovan
Harry F. Bryant, Jr.	Kurt F. Dorenkamp
Winfred L. Buckingham	William C. Dotson
Robert W. Bulmer	Robert McI. Douglass
Gerald L. Burk	Barton M. Downes
John F. Burke	John E. Dralm
Barksdale A. Bush, Jr.	Royce C. Dreyer
Herman J. Bushman	James R. Dugli
Jr.	William E. Duke, Jr.
Dempsey Butler, Jr.	Valerio "M" Duronio
James D. Butler	Gordon G. Duvall
Kenneth LeR. Butler	Behrend J. DuWaldt
Thomas O. Butler, Jr.	Gerald W. Dyer
William McC. Callaghan, Jr.	William T. Eaton
John J. Campanile	James E. Edmundson
David O. Campbell	John R. Edson
Donald H. Campbell	Howard R. Edwards, Jr.
Lucien Capone, Jr.	Henry W. Egan
James A. Carmack, Jr.	Montraville W. Egerton, Jr.
Bruce A. Carpenter	John J. Ekelsund
James W. Carpenter	Richard M. Ellis
Andrew R. Carr	Presley E. Ellsworth

Merton R. Fallon	Charles A. Hotchkiss II
Robert L. Farley	Charles M. Howe
Robert E. Fellowes	James C. Hughes, Jr.
Leslie K. Fenlon, Jr.	Eugene St. C. Ince, Jr.
Eric N. Fenno	James E. Inskeep, Jr.
James V. Ferrero, Jr.	Robert C. James
Stanley S. Fine	Rodney R. James
William A. Finlay, Jr.	Albert L. Jenks, Jr.
John E. Fishburn III	Shepherd M. Jenks
George D. Florence	Whitney Jennison
Philip F. Florence	John E. Jensen
Henry P. Forbes	John A. Jepson
Sydney E. Foscatto, Jr.	Theodore N. Johnsen, Jr.
James R. Foster	Dallas DeS. Johnson
John B. Foster	Gerald R. Jones
Joyce M. Frazee	Herman W. Jones
Warren J. Fredericks	John V. Josephson
Richard A. Frost	Daniel H. Kahn
Peter L. Fullinwider	Joseph N. Kanevsky
James L. Furrh, Jr.	Thomas M. Kastner
Donald A. Gairing	Keatinge Keays
Channing Gardner	James K. Keihner
Paul A. Garrison	Richard W. Kelly
John P. Gartland	David S. Kendrick
David E. Gates	Richard A. Kennedy, Jr.
Matthew J. Gauss, Jr.	Robert W. Kennedy
Bernard S. Gewirz	William R. Kent III
Ralph McD. Ghormley	Thomas J. Kilcline
Beaumont Glass, Jr.	Herbert J. Kindl
Stephen S. Glass	Archer E. King III
Frank S. Glendinning	William C. King
William I. Goewey	Clark M. Kinney, Jr.
Milton D. Goldberg	John R. Kint
Roy E. Goldman	Gilbert J. Kirk, Jr.
Joseph H. Gollner	Joseph O. Kirkbride, Jr.
Russell F. Goodacre, Jr.	Peter F. Klein
Robert W. Goodman	Vernon P. Klemm
Franklin P. Goulburn, Jr.	George M. Kling
William C. Grant, Jr.	James E. Kneale
Roy R. Grayson	Wallace J. Knetz, Jr.
James H. Green	Arthur K. Knolzen
John W. Green	John H. Koach
John L. Greene	Richard G. Greenwood
Richard G. Greenwood	Philip J. Koehler
Stanley "J" Greif	Walter J. Kraus
Michael B. Guild	Stephen R. Krause
Davis L. Gunkel	William S. Kremidas
Milton Gussow	Otto E. Krueger
Douglas B. Guthe	Robert G. Kuhne
William S. Guthrie	Michael K. Lake
James V. Haley	William G. Lalor, Jr.
William H. Hamilton, Jr.	Chris W. Lamb
Theodore J. Hammer, Jr.	John G. Landers
James W. Hanson	John S. Lansill, Jr.
Norton D. Harding, Jr.	Paul H. Laric
William N. Harkness	David C. Larish
Donald M. Harlan	Norman O. Larson
John F. Harper, Jr.	Theodore J. Larson
William L. Harris, Jr.	Lloyd K. Lauderdale
Charles P. Hary, Jr.	Robert L. Lawler, Jr.
William C. Haskell	William G. Lawler, Jr.
Dale A. Hawley	Mark B. Lechleiter, Jr.
George A. P. Haynes	Thomas F. Lechner
Walter L. Helbig, Jr.	Jack R. Leisure
Dale P. Helmer	John F. Leyerle
John W. Hemann	Theodore E. Lide, Jr.
Donald Henderson	James B. Linder
Robert C. Hendrickson, Jr.	Wesley E. Lindsey, Jr.
Robert C. Hennekens	Thomas D. Linton, Jr.
Hugh E. Longino, Jr.	Donald Lister
Harvey S. Henning, Jr.	Hiram P. F. Llewellyn
Frederick W. Herbine	Joseph H. Logomasini
John D. Lund	Robert C. McCoy
William H. Lynch	Major I. McCreight
Robert M. McNulty, Jr.	Carlos d'A. McCulloch
Kenneth V. McArthur	Ewing R. McDonald, Jr.
Ralph W. McArthur	
Jeremiah R. McBride	
Gerry M. McCabe	
Elbert J. McCoy	
John C. McCoy	
Major I. McCreight	
Carlos d'A. McCulloch	
Ewing R. McDonald, Jr.	

Thomas E. McDonald
 William D. McFarlane, Jr.
 John S. McFeaters, Jr.
 Thomas P. McGinnis
 William C. McMurray
 James A. McQuilling
 Edward I. McQuiston, Jr.
 John A. McTammany
 James L. McVoy
 Clinton D. MacDonald
 Reginald M. Machell
 Jack E. Magee
 Edward J. Maguire, Jr.
 Timothy R. Mahoney
 Charles W. Maier, Jr.
 John E. Majesky
 John B. Mallard, Jr.
 Halford E. Maninger
 Robert G. Manseau
 William F. Marr
 Charles E. Martin
 William L. Martin III
 James W. Matheney
 Stanwix G. Mayfield III
 William H. Meanix, Jr.
 Gilbert D. Mello
 Charles F. Meloy
 Richard Mergl
 Warren H. Merrill
 Frank Messenger III
 Edward J. Messere
 John T. Metcalf, Jr.
 Harry B. Meyer
 Charles W. Meyrick
 John D. Middleton
 Arthur H. Mikosovsky
 Conrad C. Miller, Jr.
 Edmund A. Miller
 Gerlous G. Miller, Jr.
 John R. Miller
 Raymond L. Miller
 Robert O. Minter, Jr.
 George L. Moffett, Jr.
 Robair F. Mohrhardt
 Oliver S. Mollison
 Ludi A. Moore
 Robert S. Moore
 Alfred J. Morency
 George E. Morgan, Jr.
 Hal McN. Morgan
 Harry W. Morgan, Jr.
 James F. Murphy
 James D. Murray, Jr.
 William A. Myers III
 Donald A. Nadig
 Guy M. Neely, Jr.
 Andrew G. Nelson
 Philip S. Nelson
 Robert H. Nelson
 Meredith W. Nicholson
 Lionel MacL. Noel
 Calvin C. Norman
 George L. Norman, Jr.
 William J. Norris
 Curtis R. Norton, Jr.
 John A. Oesterreicher
 William A. O'Flaherty
 Patrick G. O'Keefe
 Oscar E. Olsen
 Robert B. Ooghe
 John C. Ostlund
 Edward J. Otth, Jr.
 Dean T. Ousterhout
 Andrew J. Owens
 Edward W. Page
 James R. Page
 Anthony L. Palazzolo
 Courtland A. Palmer, Jr.
 Howard B. Parker, Jr.
 Warren S. Parr, Jr.
 James E. Patton
 Milton O. Paul
 John H. Perkins, Jr.

Richard J. Peterson
 Willard S. Peterson
 Malcolm E. Phares
 Thomas J. Piazza
 Richard B. Plank
 Kenneth A. Porter
 Robert S. Pottelger
 William W. Potter
 Bobby L. Potts
 Edwin S. Pratt
 Lee S. Pyles
 Calvin E. Rakes
 Shirley McC. Ramsey
 William M. Ratliff
 Edgar A. Rawsthorne
 William G. Read, Jr.
 William L. Read
 James P. Reddick, Jr.
 Charles E. Reid, Jr.
 Eugene J. Reiher
 David R. Rice
 John T. Rigsbee
 Robert K. Ripley
 James B. Risser
 Gerald G. Roberts
 Thomas M. Rogers
 Paul D. Roman
 Richard M. Romley
 Robert E. Rowe
 Jack W. Rupe
 William H. Russ III
 William N. Rutledge
 Merwin Sacarob
 Frithlof N. Sagerholm, Jr.
 Frank C. Sain
 Robert J. Salomon
 Wilbur H. Sample
 Ernest D. Sanders
 William C. Sandlin, Jr.
 Peter J. Saraceni
 Peter J. Sarris
 William J. Sawtelle
 Valentine H. Schaeffer, Jr.
 Albert A. Schaufelberger, Jr.
 Frank P. Schlosser
 Donald R. Schmidt
 Bernard Schniebolk
 Paul L. Schoos
 Walter A. Schriefer
 George S. Schuchart
 Elliott P. Schuman
 James H. Scott
 Jack Scoville
 Carl H. Sebenius, Jr.
 Thomas T. Seelye, Jr.
 Angelo P. Semeraro
 Louis M. Serrille
 Richard H. Seth
 Harry E. Shacklett
 William M. Shanhouse
 Sumner Shapiro
 Lewis A. Shea, Jr.
 Oscar C. Shealy, Jr.
 Byron M. Shepard
 Frank E. Sherman
 Eugene F. Shine, Jr.
 Earl R. Short
 Rodric M. Singleton, Jr.
 George L. Siri, Jr.
 Robert E. Sivinski
 Stephen A. Skomsky
 Carl R. Smith, Jr.
 Charles R. Smith, Jr.
 Donald A. Smith
 Earl W. Smith, Jr.
 Frederic W. Smith
 Gerald F. Smith
 Homer L. Smith
 James H. B. Smith
 Paul E. Smith
 Robert F. Smith, Jr.
 Robert L. Smith
 Robert McK. Smith
 Wayne D. Smith

Cornelius S. Snodgrass, Jr.
 William H. Somerville
 Felix S. Spielmann
 David H. Sprague
 Edgerton T. E. Sprague
 Dennis C. Stanfill
 Walter D. Stapleton
 Leland R. Stegemerten
 Robert E. Stewart
 Charles L. Stiles
 Donnell M. Still
 Clarence W. Stoddard, Jr.
 George B. Stone
 Reid Stringfellow
 Herman A. Stromberg, Jr.
 James A. Stubstad
 William C. Stutt
 Phillip B. Suhr
 John H. Sullivan
 George W. Sumner, Jr.
 Charles O. Swanson
 Peter S. Swanson
 Claude E. Swecker, Jr.
 Harry F. Sweitzer, Jr.
 Gerald E. Synhorst
 Richard W. Taylor
 Malcolm H. Thiele
 Philip H. Thom, Jr.
 Wallace J. Thomas
 Alexander D. Thomson
 Harry R. Thurber, Jr.
 John A. Tinkham
 Harold F. Tipton, Jr.
 Robert W. Titus
 Robert R. Tolbert
 Harry DeP. Train II
 Fred Troeschler, Jr.
 John K. Twilla
 Clinton R. Vall
 Wallace Valencia

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Norman Altman
 William "B" Anderson, Jr.
 William A. Armstrong
 Erling O. Barsness
 William W. Bennett
 Richard B. Blackwell
 Glenn S. Brooks
 Robert M. Brown
 Herbert F. Butler, Jr.
 Danforth Clement
 Anthony B. Coburn
 Rex S. Coryell
 Charles L. Culwell
 Dorsey W. Daniel
 Jimmy P. Dearing
 Charles DiBenedetto
 Holton C. Dickson, Jr.
 Chester L. Ditto
 Thomas J. Donohoe
 James E. Durham, Jr.
 Henry D. Elchalt
 William T. Emery
 George D. Fisher, Jr.
 Horace P. Fishman
 James J. Garibaldi
 William L. Gary
 Thomas M. Gill
 Ephraim P. Glassman
 Richard Glickman
 Jack H. Haberthier
 Don C. Haeske
 Richard W. Haley
 William G. Hall
 Robert P. Hausold
 Everett C. Higgins
 Bernard C. Hogan

Jack D. Venable
 Elias Venning, Jr.
 Phillip Vladessa
 William A. Voegel
 Leonard F. Vogt, Jr.
 Robert L. Volz
 Warren P. Vosseler
 John R. Walker
 Joseph K. Walker
 Edward C. Waller III
 Robert L. Walters
 Thomas J. Walters
 John A. Wamsley
 Frank W. Ward III
 Frank T. Watkins, Jr.
 James D. Watkins
 James H. Webber
 William D. Weir
 Henry C. White
 Richard E. Whiteside
 Barry D. Whittlesey
 Eugene J. Wielki
 Fred J. Wilder
 Edwin E. Williams
 Ralph P. Williams
 Carl B. Wilson
 James C. Wilson
 Ralph E. Wilson, Jr.
 Russell F. Wilson
 Richard S. Wolford
 Barkley T. Wood, Jr.
 George P. Wood, Jr.
 David J. Woodard
 Edwin E. Woods, Jr.
 William W. Wright
 James H. Wynn III
 Abdiel R. Yingling, Jr.
 Duane C. Young, Jr.
 Randall W. Young
 Charles J. Youngblade
 Charles J. Zekan
 Marcus A. Zettel
 Edward F. Zimmerman, Jr.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Irving Bobrick
 Warren F. Brown
 Wesley A. Brown
 Neal W. Clements
 William L. Collins
 Rudolph F. D'Ambra
 Stephen A. Giles
 William C. Hall
 Gordon W. Hamilton
 Louis E. V. Jackson

Lemon DeK. Lang
 Paul G. LeGros
 Walter E. Marquardt, Jr.
 Claude J. Quillen, Jr.
 Donald R. Trueblood
 Roger G. Tweel
 Donald W. Wittschiede
 William E. Wynne

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 3d day of June 1949:

William D. Bassett, Jr.
 James D. Beeler
 William A. Black
 Kenneth A. Bott
 Philip C. Brannon
 Ralph H. Brown
 William J. Budge
 James J. Connors, Jr.
 Kelly J. Davis, Jr.
 Lewis H. Devine
 Richard C. Ebel
 Richard H. Francis
 James R. Gober
 Fred Grabowsky
 Thomas I. Gunning
 Wayne L. Hall
 Robert T. Hardeman
 Thomas P. Hensler, Jr.
 Carlton H. Hershner
 Irven A. Hissom
 Henry Hoppe III
 Robert G. Hunt, Jr.
 John M. Johnson, Jr.
 Charles M. C. Jones
 MacLean Kelley
 Calhoun J. Killeen
 Robert H. Krider
 Randlett T. Lawrence
 Charles P. McCallum, Jr.
 Robert L. McElroy

Charles H. Mays
 Robert C. Needham
 Edward J. O'Connell, Jr.
 Lawrence G. O'Connell, Jr.
 William C. Peterson
 Tom D. Parsons
 Roger W. Peard, Jr.
 Theophil P. Riegert
 Thomas E. Ringwood, Jr.
 Archie R. Ruggieri, Jr.
 Kenneth W. Schiweck
 Merlin F. Schneider, Jr.
 Richard W. Sheppe
 Eugene O. Speckart
 Carl M. Stalneck
 Paul F. Stephenson
 Allan MacL. Stewart
 Joseph Z. Taylor
 Jack E. Townsend
 Kenneth E. Turner
 Littleton W. T. Waller II
 William Wentworth
 Richard H. West
 Charles S. Whiting
 Harry D. Woods

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Robert E. Allard
 Ralph G. Dalton
 Albert S. Douglass
 Henry E. Hohn
 Bertie G. Homan
 LeRoy Klein

Donald O. Modeen
 James S. Orloff
 Glenn E. Skinner, Jr.
 Chandler G. Smith
 Charles M. Walker

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Lucille R. Kroupa
 Lolita D. Surprenant

Frances M. Tibbetts
 Barbara J. Vines

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

"J" V. Hart

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Ralph H. S. Scott

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS

Appointment to the temporary grade of major general in the Marine Corps

Merwin H. Silverthorn

Appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps

Hubert G. Bozarth

Appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps

Merle C. Davis

Appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps

Robert F. Malden Henry M. Whitesides
James E. Shugart Charles D. Fay
Dan C. Walker John R. Linnenkamp

Appointment to the permanent grade of commissioned warrant officer in the Marine Corps

William R. Yingling, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
Msg. Martin Higgins, of Catholic University, offered the following prayer:

Let us lift up our hearts to God.

We thank Thee, O God, our Father, who by making all and redeeming all hast shown us that all in Thine eyes are equal, and who from among the nations hast singled out us to be the heralds of that truth and its champions. Thou didst state the dignity of the individual in the Great Book spread wide by the nailed hands on Calvary. In Thy timeless patience Thou didst abide while man haltingly read and the law of slavery gave place to the law of serfdom and the law of serfdom to the law of privilege. But the law of equality—that Thou didst keep by Thee for a people predestined. Thou didst inspire our forefathers to dare a glorious and new thing, to write the dignity and worth of the individual into the Constitution, and upon that sacred truth to found a Nation. Through the intervening years Thou hast vouchsafed us an ever deepening insight into the meaning of that principle, through blood to know that slavery cannot be, through want to realize that economic serfdom must not be. Thou hast now exalted us, and in this hour we stand the world's hope and faith.

Therefore, O mighty Father, we, Thy lowly suppliants yet Thy children, humbly beg and beseech Thee to keep us true to the high responsibility and trust that Thy providence hath reposed in us. Send forth Thy light upon our lawmakers that they may guide us with unfaltering front in the way that Thou hast marked out for us.

In Thy power strengthen and nerve them courageously to assert the dignity, the rights, of man at home and abroad against every foe. Help them and us to the end that the glory fade not from the upturned faces of humanity and that in our land and in all lands freedom prevail ever. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 103):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ANDREW L. SOMERS, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part

of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Vice President had appointed Mr. WAGNER and Mr. IVES members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Bristol Press March 2, 1949.

Mr. IRVING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to a statement that was made by the President of the United States in regard to rent control.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a resolution by the Common Council of the City of Cudahy, Wis., relative to the observance of General Pulaski's Memorial Day and in the other a resolution commemorating the thirty-first anniversary of the Lithuanian nation, adopted by a group of Americans of Lithuanian descent in Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article from the Springfield Sun, relative to the establish-

ment in 1902 of the first club which later became the 4-H Club movement in the United States.

Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made by Hon. Clare Boothe Luce at the Philadelphia Forum, despite the fact the Public Printer estimates it will cost \$175.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

DEMOCRATIC TREND IN WISCONSIN

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to report to the Congress that the people of Wisconsin have again risen to the support of the President and the Democratic Party. In a special election to fill vacancies in three State senatorial districts three Democrats were elected.

This victory was particularly significant in the Twenty-ninth District, which is a northern rural area never before represented by a Democrat. The successful Democratic candidate is John Olson, a well-known farm co-op leader in that area.

It has become quite clear to Wisconsin farmers that the fine progressive spirit which has long been their outstanding characteristic must find political expression through the Democratic Party. All over the State they are breaking with the Republican stalwarts, who have absolutely nothing to offer the farmer, the city worker, or the small-business man, and are turning to the party of real progress under President Truman's leadership.

The action of the farmers and small-business people in Wisconsin's twenty-ninth senatorial district, and of the city workers and businessmen in the third and seventh districts, is of political significance all over the country. The Republican Party stands repudiated on its record of obstruction and futility. The program and leadership of the Democratic Party is endorsed, even in areas where it has never had strength before. Those who think they can win votes away from the Democrats by a record of black, blind reaction are due for a big awakening next election.

REPUBLICAN TREND IN MICHIGAN

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.