

following the recess of the Senate from tonight until Monday, the Senate proceeded to vote on the pending joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) and all amendments thereto, at 4 o'clock p. m.; provided, that no amendment which is not germane shall be considered; and provided further, that the time between 12 o'clock noon and 4 p. m. on said day shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection. The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in that connection, I ask unanimous consent that we waive the requirement for having a quorum call.

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

The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

Without objection, the agreement is entered into.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 27, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 24 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George A. Garrett, of the District of Columbia, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Ireland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Leon L. Cowles, of Utah.
Robert F. Hale, of Oregon.

John F. Fitzgerald, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Harold M. Granata, of New York.
Edward S. Parker, of South Carolina.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James E. Bowers, of North Carolina.
Thaddeus C. Martin, of Arkansas.
Harold M. Midkiff, of Virginia.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Osborne A. Pearson, of California, to be Assistant Postmaster General. (To fill vacancy created by appointment of Vincent C. Burke to the position of Deputy Postmaster General under authority of sec. 2 of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949.)

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Robert A. Riddell, of Los Angeles, Calif., to be collector of internal revenue for the

sixth district of California, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

EUGENE WORLEY, of Texas, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Hon. Charles S. Hatfield, deceased.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Richard T. Ackley	John L. Appel, Jr.
William Acosta	Robert J. Armstrong
Robert D. Albright	Henry J. Arnold
John R. Allen	Richard W. Arnold, Jr.
Roger D. Ailling	Paul W. Arthur
Allen E. Alman	Anthony A. Attardi
Daniel G. Anderson, Jr.	Robert I. Backstrom
Lyle C. Anderson	Donald C. Buseck
Ralph E. Anfang	James E. Johnson
William M. Apgar	Jack C. Scarborough, Jr.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Francis B. Quinlan	John B. Sherman
Alois E. Schmitt, Jr.	Max L. Washington

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Renato D. Stefano, Jr.	Harvey M. Soldan
Byron A. Nilsson	Gene F. Straube

James H. Longworth (Naval Reserve aviator) to be an ensign in the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

William N. Grammer
Ray B. Mueller

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Lawrence B. Frey, Jr.	Donald C. Olson
Thomas R. Haufe	Burton D. Ostergren

Goldie D. Greer to be an ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercies, in a world swept by violent forces with which unaided we cannot cope, Thou only art our help and our hope. Through all the mystery of life Thy strong arm alone can lead us to its mastery. Thou hast made of our very restlessness a sign that without Thee we cannot be satisfied.

Fronting the claimant duties of this new week, steady our spirits with the realization of untapped power available to servants of Thy will if only they go quietly and confidently about their appointed tasks. Forgive us the distrust of ourselves, of life, and of Thee, and for the cowardly doubts which blind us to the heights which are full of the char-

lots of God. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 24, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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 February 25, 1950, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1990) to amend section 429, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the act of August 5, 1882, as amended, so as to substitute for the requirement that detailed annual reports to be made to the Congress concerning the proceeds of all sales of condemned naval material a requirement that information as to such proceeds be filed with the Committees on Armed Services in the Congress.

The message also announced that the act (S. 2681) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at a celebration commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, to be held at Lexington and Concord, Mass., April 16 through 19, inclusive, 1950, having been presented to the President on February 14, 1950, and not having been signed by him within the 10-day period prescribed by the Constitution, had become a law without approval.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 2328. An act to amend section 482 of the Revised Statutes relating to the Board of Appeals in the United States Patent Office; and

H. R. 7220. An act to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases.

ABDUCTION OF GREEK CHILDREN

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the problem of the displaced Greek children ever since it was brought to the attention of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans in 1948 by the Greek Government, which charged that thousands of Greek children were being forcibly abducted by the guerrillas for Communist indoctrination in the eastern European countries and as a means of further terrorizing the Greek countryside. The findings of that special committee revealed that approximately 25,000 children had been removed to Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and other countries in eastern Europe. We all know that the efforts of the United Nations and of the International Committee of the Red Cross have so far failed to succeed in remedying this truly tragic and unjustifiable condition. I have asked the

Secretary of State on several different occasions to use every means at his disposal to underscore the position of the United States with respect to the resolutions adopted by the United Nations. If we Americans can take the leadership in inspiring world opinion against what is one of the blackest marks on the Soviet record, we will have done a humane and a manly thing. I will continue to do whatever I can as an individual Senator to achieve this result.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. LODGE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SALTONSTALL was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. AIKEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the week beginning today.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHOEPPPEL was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DARBY, because of official business, was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that the Senate is proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement, under which the time between now and 4 o'clock is divided between the proponents and opponents of the pending joint resolution, and controlled respectively by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may proceed with what might be termed the morning hour until the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] shall reach the Senate, because he is in control of one-half of the time, unless some other Senator has been designated to control the time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent. I ask unanimous consent now, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont, that he may have leave of the Senate to be absent today and tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont has asked that in his absence I take charge of the time which was given into his control when the unanimous-consent agreement was made.

I would say, for the information of the majority leader, that it is perfectly agreeable to me that a quorum be called,

and that routine business be transacted, provided the time is taken out of the time allotted to both sides.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement be modified so as to substitute the Senator from Nebraska for the Senator from Vermont to control the time on behalf of the opponents of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield for that purpose.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Brewster	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Myers
Cain	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Jenner	O'Connor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Darby	Kerr	Schoeppel
Donnell	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Downey	Langer	Sparkman
Dworschak	Leahy	Stennis
Eastland	Lehman	Taylor
Ecton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Long	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lucas	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Withers
Hayden	Malone	
Hendrickson	Maybank	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and by unanimous consent, the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate this afternoon and the Committee was authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the time consumed in the transaction of routine business will be charged equally against both sides.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Resolution 42

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, a bill H. R. 4453, known as the Fair Employment Practice Act, the purpose of which is to establish a permanent agency of the Government to eliminate discrimination in employment; and

"Whereas the State of New York has been among the pioneers of the States of the Union to enact such legislation which has been successful in reducing or eradicating such discrimination in the industries of this State; and

"Whereas all citizens without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin are entitled to equal opportunity to be gainfully employed and it is in the public interest that such unfair practices, which tend to engender bitterness and unrest among large segments of our population be eradicated as opposed to the principles of our form of government; and

"Whereas during the last war when it was essential for our war industries to keep production at their highest level, the Fair Employment Practice Committee was highly successful in reducing or eliminating such discrimination in such industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That it is the sense of the people of the State of New York, expressed through the considered judgment of their representatives in the legislature, that the enactment of such legislation is of the greatest importance to the people and will tend to unite the country and create greater respect for our institutions among the other peoples of the world; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed H. R. 4453 or such other, similar, appropriate legislation as will accomplish the purposes of this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to

the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to do all within their power to bring about the enactment of such legislation.

"By order of the senate:

"WILLIAM S. KING,
"Secretary."

"In assembly, February 21, 1950. Concurred in without amendment.

"By order of assembly:

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
"Clerk."

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to lower the high cost of food

"Whereas the laws which guarantee farmers high prices for their commodities were enacted to relieve an acute national economic emergency affecting the farm industry which no longer exists; and

"Whereas the new law is plainly designed to keep basic foods as high in price as they have been; and

"Whereas this is plainly inflation of a most painful nature; and

"Whereas it overlooks the fact that most of the income of the American family pays for food; and

"Whereas according to laws of supply and demand in a free market food becomes cheaper the more it is produced, while under the law in question the taxpayers' money is used in ever greater amounts as food becomes more plentiful to prevent the consumer from the taking advantage of the natural action of economic law which has made America the greatest nation in history; and

"Whereas the Government has under loan or has taken title to four-fifths of all the flaxseed produced last year, third of all the cotton, nearly a third of all the wheat, more than half of all the peanuts, two-fifths of all the potatoes and dried edible beans, nearly half of the stored butter; and

"Whereas the present new farm price-support program will cost billions which will come from the same people who will pay the resulting high prices; and

"Whereas the farmers are becoming more and more dependent upon the Government: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact laws that will be in keeping with a peace time economy; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, February 13, 1950.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk."

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 16, 1950.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to pass anti-poll-tax legislation

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges and petitions the

Congress of the United States to pass legislation which would remove payment of poll tax as a prerequisite of the right to vote in elections; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, February 13, 1950.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk."

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 16, 1950.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to pass antilynching legislation

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to pass legislation seeking to make it a Federal offense for any person to engage in the crime of lynching; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In the house of representatives, adopted, February 13, 1950.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk."

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 16, 1950.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

INDEPENDENCE FOR LITHUANIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanian-Americans in my State of Wisconsin in commemoration of the thirty-second anniversary of the declaration of independence in Lithuania. The resolution pertains to the unspeakable crimes which have been committed against the heroic freedom-loving Lithuanian people.

Mr. President, each of us I am sure, in the Senate recognizes that in spite of the Soviet occupation of the Baltic areas, the people of those three countries are as deserving of freedom and are as unalterably opposed to Soviet oppression as are any other peoples trapped behind the iron curtain. I believe that the United States Government should resolutely oppose any action which would indicate that we agree to the occupation of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; on the contrary, we must make unmistakably clear that we will never agree to such violation of the rights of free peoples.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the text of this resolution adopted by the Lithuanian-American Council Branch of Racine, Wis., and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT A MASS MEETING OF THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS, HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LOCAL BRANCH OF THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC., IN COMMEMORATION OF THE THIRTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE IN LITHUANIA, AT SOKOL HALL ON THE 12TH OF FEBRUARY 1950

Whereas Lithuania, the country of our fathers, has been, and still is, unlawfully occupied by the Soviet military and police forces; and

Whereas the Government of the United States, though recognizing the independence of Lithuania, has failed to condemn the unlawful acts of the Soviets in the occupied country, and to extend any help to their victims; and

Whereas the Soviet rulers apply ever harsher methods of opposition and outright annihilation of the indigenous population of that country: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian descent and ancestry, shall continue to support the efforts of Lithuanian people to regain freedom and reestablish an independent Lithuanian Republic; be it further

Resolved, That we appeal to the Government of the United States to denounce openly the Soviet policy of destruction of native population, the crime of genocide, and take effective steps to make Russia respect the principles of the declaration of human rights; be it further

Resolved, That we go on the record as favoring the immediate ratification of the convention outlawing genocide by the United States of America Senate; be it also

Resolved, That we urge the Government to use its power and influence to help Lithuania and other Baltic States regain their freedom and sovereign rights in accordance with the principles of Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations, and not to make any peace settlement with the Soviet Russia until this has been achieved; and be it finally

Resolved, That the Resolution forwarded to the President of the United States, and copies thereof sent to the Secretary of State, the Senators and Representatives of the State of Wisconsin, and to the press.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY
COMMITTEE,

GEORGE KAPOCIN, Chairman.
MARTIN KASPARAITIS, Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 7207. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1287).

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

S. 298. A bill for the relief of John Rowland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288);

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Dagnall; without amendment (Rept. No. 1289);

S. 1169. A bill for the relief of Christina Shalfeiff; without amendment (Rept. No. 1290);

S. 1261. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1291);

S. 1262. A bill for the relief of Juliana Mendiola Alastra; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292);

S. 1484. A bill for the relief of Augustino Marila; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293);

S. 1524. A bill for the relief of Edith Scheiber; without amendment (Rept. No. 1294);

S. 1798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Minda Moore; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1295);

S. 1929. A bill for the relief of Anna Samudovsky; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1296);

S. 2156. A bill for the relief of Sister Edelrudis Clara Weskamp; without amendment (Rept. No. 1297);

S. 2308. A bill for the relief of William Alfred Bevan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1298);

S. 2393. A bill for the relief of Martin Albrecht; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1299);

S. 2431. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Kato; without amendment (Rept. No. 1300);

S. 2479. A bill for the relief of A. D. Strenger and his wife Claire Strenger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1301);

S. 2568. A bill for the relief of Carmen E. Lyon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1302);

S. 2611. A bill for the relief of Roland Roger Alfred Boccia, also known as Roland Barbera; without amendment (Rept. No. 1303);

S. 2655. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hrynjak; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1304);

S. 2811. A bill to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code, with respect to the importation or transportation of obscene matters; without amendment (Rept. No. 1305);

S. 2812. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 1306);

S. 2934. A bill for the relief of Julius Elzas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307);

H. R. 1025. A bill for the relief of Waymon H. Massey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1308);

H. R. 3138. A bill for the relief of Arthur Holbert; the estate of Ernest L. Gass, deceased; and the estate of James L. Thomas, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1309); and

H. R. 6694. A bill for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1310);

S. Res. 202. Resolution to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering activities; with amendments (Rept. No. 1317); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

S. 274. A bill for the relief of Constantin E. Aramescu; without amendment (Rept. No. 1312);

S. 2277. A bill for the relief of George A. Voregarethsos (George Spiro Chatmos); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1313); and

S. 2427. A bill for the relief of Masae Marumoto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1314).

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

S. 2071. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Willmarth; without amendment (Rept. No. 1311).

By Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1024. A bill for the relief of Jacob Brown; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1318).

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

H. R. 3482. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Canadian River by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1319).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1315) 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. 75) was ordered to be 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:

Alvarez, Jose Gonzalez.

Arrighi, Arrigo.

Augustine, Albert Gustave.

Ballingall, William.

Barriero, Modesto, or Modesto

Barriero Pereiras.

Baxter, Mary (nee Mary Ramsay or Mary Robertson).

Beaumont, Richard Louis.

Berndt, Karl Johan, or Carl Johan Berndt.

Bokwa, Josef.

Bouma, Anna (Anna Novak) (nee Anna Vojtova).

Bronk, Margaret Elizabeth (nee Blackwell).

Brown, David Emanuel.

Calengas, Leonardos Petros, or Leonardos Kalengas.

Chang, Shou-Lien, or Sheldon Shou-Lien Chang.

Chiotellis, Anna, or Anna Hiotellis (nee Anna Hadjinicolaou).

Chow, David Ta Wei, or Chow Ta Wei or David T. W. Chow.

De Gonzalez, Carmen Pardo, or Carmen Pardo Vda De Vega.

De Putter, Theodule Joseph or George De Putter.

De Regt, Leendert, or Leo De Regt or Leo De Regt.

Divitcoff, Petre George, or Petros Georgios Divitcoff.

Drechsler, Karl.

Espenada, Nellie (nee Scholes aka Nellie Peterson or Nellie Perry or Nellie Churchill).

Fieber, George John.

Fong, Wone, or Fong Wone or Harry Wone or Rev. Harry Wone.

Gomez-Diaz, Parfirio, or Porfirio Gomez-Madina.

Grenoski, Joseph Frank, or Frank Stroda or Franzisek Grenowski or Frank Grenowski.

Herman, Josephine Moreno.

Jasnoch, Felix Bruno or Jassnoch.

Johansson, Nils Sigvard, or Nils Hohansson or "Nick" Johansson.

Johnson, John Moore.

Knutsen, Bernt Mathias.

Koufoudakis, Aristides Dimitrios.

Koufoudakis, Eftihia Aristides.

Larsen, Sigurd.

Lee, Anna Dorothy.

Lefert, Joseph Emil.

Lettsome, Ellen Rebecca, or Ellen Rebecca Jennings.

Lettsome, Hueroy Alpheous, or Hugh Roy Lettsome "Angel."

Lolax, Einar William, or Einar Lolax.

Lucas, Vaia Stamati (nee Asime).

Luzzi, Domenico.

Makritzky, Alexander Edward or Makritzky or Makrickits or Makricki or Makricki or Makrickys.

Makritzky, Michalina Maria.

Mallis, Antonios Apostolis.

Marshall, George Falkner.

Migliore, Caterina (nee Dionigi or Catherine Migliore or Leonarda Savoiardo or Saviardo or Guiseppe Bagarella).

Migliore, Anthony, or Antonino or Antonino Migliore or Salvatore Migliore or Antonino Joseph Migliore.

Migliore, Rose, or Rosa Migliore or Guiseppe Migliore or Rose Mary Migliore.

Min, Ng Yick, or Ng Yik Nin or Eng Yick Min.

Morfessis, Telemachos (alias, Telemachos Morfessis).

Muller, Carl Christian Frederick Vilhelm, or Carl Fred Lem or Carl Fred Muller Lem.

Nevarez-Alarcon, Ninfa.

Nigo-Gonzalez, Leonardo, or Leon Nigo.

Noakes, Romkje Anna.

Ojeda, Domingo.

Ojeda, Manuel.

Paraskevopoulos, Peter Kostas (alias Peter Kostas Parras).

Patronas, Minas.

Peavey, Fred Washington, or Fred W. Peavey.

Perry, Amy Jane (nee Donaldson).

Petersen, Alice Marie.

Peterson, Dorothy (nee Arron or Dorothy Lewis).

Petrone, Domenico, or Dominick, alias Leonardo Ricciardi.

Piovesan, Vittorio Giovanni.

Propst, Anna (nee Perrault or Ethel Georgeanna Perrault Propst).

Pukansky, Joseph.

Pustelnik, Stefan Pawel.

Rausch, Eva (nee Bieler or Evette Rausch or Chawa or Ewa Bieler).

Reyes, Jose Billegas.

Roland, Elizabeth Allen (nee Allen).

Rosario, Maximo.

Rose, Maria Alexandra.

Salgado, Jorge, or Jorge Salgado-Rodriguez.

Sandoval-Silva, Epitasio.

Schachter, Herman Max.

Schulhof, Bernard or Bernat.

Seeber, Eugene John.

Sikaras, Helen (nee Martoulas or Helen Stellos Martoulas).

Silver, Isidore aka Icko Iola, or Izzo or Izzl or Icek or Icko Iglia.

Simmonds, Della Hortencia.

Simone, Tommaso (also Thomas Simone).

Skordas, Lambros.

Smith, Emma Maria Valdes (nee Valdes).

Stathapoulos, Stephanos, or Steve Stathes.

Stettler, Emma (nee Emma Sbaschnig).

Stevens, Peggy Joan (nee McCartney).

Taberlet, Fred Romolo, or Romolo Taberlet.

Toullatos, John.

Tronrud, John, or John Wilhelm Tronrud.

Tschinkowitz, Valentin, or Walter Bayer.

Vaz, Manuel Viegas.

Warwick, William.

Wiessgarber, Barbara (nee Spanler).

Wiessgarber, Nikolaus.

Wolff, Hedwig Sadie (nee Schauer).

XXXXXXXX Zakos, Sophie Kretokos, or Sophie Kretokos (nee Perides).

XXXXXXXX Zachou, Theodota (nee Theodota Goussi).

XXXXXXXX Zarensky, Isaac, or Zarebski or Zaremsky.

XXXX Just, Reinhard.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1316) 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. 76) was ordered to be 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.

XXXX Becerra, Jose Guadalupe.

XXXXXXXX Bianco, Anthony Lo.

XXXXXXXX Cochran, Graham, Rayman, or Graham Reginald Boske.

XXXXXXXX Colantonio, Michele.

XXXXXXXX Conran, Judy Lynne.

XXXXXXXX Cumella, Raymond, or Raimondo Cumella.

XXXXXXXX Giatrakos, Elefterios.

XXXXXXXX Ginararis, Avgerinos George.

XXXXXXXX Klimenko-Gurewska, Helene (now Helen Kuntz).

XXXXXXXX Koesling, Grete Hedwig.

XXXXXXXX Lam, Caroline Han Fang Wang (alias Caroline Han Fang Wang Lim).

XXXXXXXX Liu, Len Hee (alias Len Hee Lee or Liu Hen Hee).

XXXXXXXX Loolam, August Reginald.

XXXXXXXX Mavarakis, Stratos Antoniou.

XXXXXXXX Merani, Giobatta Alessandro, or Emilio Giobatta Merani, or Emilio G. Merani.

XXXXXXXX Mitchell, Aurelia.

XXXXXXXX Oh, Sydney Bah, or Sydney Scott Bahoh.

XXXXXXXX Rodrigues, Jose.

XXXXXXXX Rupa, Amir Bin.

XXXXXXXX Schneider, Victor.

XXXXXXXX Squazza, Assunta, or Assunta Giungi.

XXXXXXXX Squazza, Fernanda, or Fernanda Giungi.

XXXXXXXX Teijeiro, Olegario, or Olegario Teijeiro Garcia.

XXXXXXXX Young, Virginia Josephine.

XXXXXXXX Cividanes, Jesus Vieiro.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 27, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2328) to amend section 482 of the Revised Statutes relating to the Board of Appeals in the United States Patent Office.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 3125. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lutfu Lahut Uzman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3126. A bill to revise the basis for award of disability pension; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3127. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Eva Peneaux White Thunder;

S. 3128. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John D. Decora;

S. 3129. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mr. and Mrs. Charles Whitford, heirs of Anna Louise Whitford, deceased; and

S. 3130. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lot Smith and Helen Seymour Smith, heirs of Charles Smith, deceased; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 3131. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William I. Spaulding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 3132. A bill to incorporate the American Society of International Law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3133. A bill for the relief of Anthony B. Estella, his wife and two children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3134. A bill to provide for a 25-percent increase in the annuities and pensions payable to railroad employees and to their survivors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. HOEY):

S. 3135. A bill to amend the peanut-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 3136. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the town of Mills, Wyo., a sewage system located in such town; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3137. A bill for the relief of Carmine Amedeo;

S. 3138. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Bulbool;

S. 3139. A bill for the relief of Asmoth Ali, Angob Ali, Esrail Ullah, Mufassar Ullah, Moraham Ali, Miftahuj Jaman, Moskod Ullah, and Mascador Ali;

S. 3140. A bill for the relief of Azman Ali;

S. 3141. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Katal Miah (or Kutai Miah); and

S. 3142. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Hanif; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 3143. A bill to provide for the conduct of a periodic census of governments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to permit certain war-service indefinite employees to acquire competitive civil-service status and permanent tenure by qualifying in noncompetitive examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE REPORT ENTITLED "LOW-INCOME FAMILIES AND ECONOMIC STABILITY"

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 233), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Low-Income Families and Economic Stability," printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, be printed as a Senate document.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr.

HENDRICKSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. IVES, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. THYE) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAYBANK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5472, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7207) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 6, line 17, strike the period after the word "law", insert a colon and add: "Provided further, That hereafter, the amount of annual leave for Government employees, including the employees of the Postal Service, shall be at the rate of 20 days per year, and the amount of sick leave shall be at the rate of 12 days per year for classified and wage board employees."

Mr. DOUGLAS also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7207, making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

[Mr. HICKENLOOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator KNOWLAND at a Lincoln Day dinner at Des Moines, Iowa, on February 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISTREATMENT OF GREEK CHILDREN—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD various statements regarding the mistreatment of Greek children, which appear in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ABOLISHING ELECTORAL COLLEGE

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Constitutional Amendment on

Elections," published in the Chicago (Ill.) Daily Calumet of February 4, 1950, and the other entitled "Lodge's Amendment," published in the Rockford, Ill., Star, February 5, 1950, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED AIRPLANE TRIP TO THE NORTH POLE—ARTICLE FROM THE DAILY ALASKA EMPIRE

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Airplane Scheduled To Make Landing at North Pole Next Summer; Hubbard on Flight," published in the Daily Alaska Empire of Juneau, Alaska, February 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE WATER-SHED TREATMENT PROGRAM

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the supplemental statement to the 1950 report of the Soil Conservation Service to the Subcommittee on Wildlife Conservation of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE H-BOMB: HUMANITY'S NEW PERIL—ARTICLE BY CLARENCE POE

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The H-Bomb: Humanity's New Peril," written by Clarence Poe, and published in the March 1950 issue of the Progressive Farmer, which appears in the Appendix.]

LET'S EXPLORE YOUR MIND—ARTICLE BY ALBERT EDWARD WIGGAM

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column entitled "Let's Explore Your Mind," by Albert Edward Wiggam, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTES OFF THE RECORD, BY GERTRUDE PIERSON

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the column entitled "Notes Off the Record," by Gertrude Pierson, published in the Cashmere (Wash.) Record, which appears in the Appendix.]

RENT CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "End of Rent Control," published in the Washington Post of this date, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPEAL TELEPHONE EXCISE TAXES—STATEMENT BY T. H. SANDERSON

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement under the heading "Repeal telephone excise taxes," prepared by T. H. Sanderson, director of the Wisconsin State Telephone Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

MCCARTHY'S CREAKING LIMB—ARTICLE BY PETER EDSON

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "McCarthy's Creaking Limb," written by Peter Edson, and published in the Washington Daily News of this date, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL SECURITY AGAINST RAILROAD RETIREMENT MONTHLY SURVIVOR BENEFITS—A COMPARISON

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to use 2 minutes to make a statement and an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not object. The junior Senator from Nebraska has asked unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak for 2 minutes. The senior Senator from Nebraska, however, controls but half of the time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] controls half the time for debate on the pending measure.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I shall ask that I be granted only 1 minute of time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall yield that much time, 1 minute, to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on several previous occasions I have introduced into the RECORD facts and figures relating to tax payments and the benefits of those covered by our two great Federal retirement systems—the Social Security System and the Railroad Retirement System. From the tabulations I have prepared to date, it appears that the terms offered to those covered by social security under the legislation now being considered by the Senate Finance Committee are more favorable than the terms offered to railroad employees under the Railroad Retirement Act.

I now have a tabulation comparing benefits payable out of the two funds to the dependents of insured employees. Dependents' benefits are perhaps even more important than retirement benefits. So long as a man is still alive, he may be able to continue working and support his family, or if he has been successful he may have been able to accumulate something to help him out when he retires. Dependents' benefits are primarily intended to take care of cases where the breadwinner dies relatively young and there must be some provision to take care of his wife and children.

The tabulation I have, which I now want to insert in the RECORD, is labeled exhibit D and compares benefits for widows and children under the Railroad Retirement Act, under the present Social Security Act, and under the provisions of H. R. 6000, as passed by the House of Representatives. It will be noted that in every case the benefits provided for dependents under H. R. 6000 are higher than those provided for men covered by the Railroad Retirement Act. This is true despite the fact the pay-roll tax on railroad men is four times as great as that on employees under the social-security system. Even under the rising scale of tax payments provided in H. R. 6000, the pay-roll deduction from the wages of railroad men will always be about twice as great as that from employees under the social-security system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have referred may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXHIBIT D.—Social-security versus railroad-retirement monthly survivor benefits—a comparison

	Social security, 1950	H. R. 6000, social security proposed	Railroad retirement, 1950
Maximum survivor benefits possible:			
Aged widows.....	\$34.20	\$48.30	\$40.61
Widows with children....	34.20	48.30	40.61
Children.....	22.80	48.30	27.08
Widow and 1 child.....	57.00	96.60	67.69
Widow.....	34.20	48.30	40.61
And 2 children.....	22.80	48.30	27.08
Total.....	79.80	128.80	94.77
Widow and 3 or more children or 4 or more children.....	21.25	37.50	27.08
	21.25	37.50	27.08
	21.25	37.50	27.08
Total (prorated equally).....	85.00	150.00	108.32
Maximum.....	85.00	150.00	108.32
Parents.....	22.80	48.30	27.08

¹ 75 percent of the primary insurance amount for first child, and parents.

Source: Rail Pension News, published by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Pl., Chicago 43, Ill.

The above exhibit D has been submitted to the Senate Finance Committee now holding hearings on H. R. 6000 for their study and consideration that rail workers should receive the same ratio of increases in benefits now proposed for those covered by social security and has been submitted by Mr. Thomas G. Stack, president of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc. (a voluntary organization of union and nonunion rail workers), February 1950.

COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton- and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, it is now 12:30. That leaves 3 hours and 30 minutes for the discussion of amendments to the bill, which are now pending, and such amendments as hereafter may be offered. Am I correct in assuming that each side will have one-half of the time, or 1 hour and 45 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the understanding of the Chair; and the Senator from Oklahoma controls half of the time and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] the other half. The time is to be divided equally, allowing for the time required for the roll call and for the transaction of routine business. The Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Nebraska will each have control of 105 minutes, assuming there is no further interruption.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending joint resolution and ask that the amendment be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. An amendment is pending. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma can only be read for the information of the Senate at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I submit my amendment and ask that it be read

at the desk for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and lie on the table, and will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, at the end of section 2, it is proposed to add the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to offer for sale at the point of storage any potatoes produced in surplus areas and now in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation to wholesalers, jobbers, retailers or consumers, for distribution and consumption in deficit areas, at prices per bushel which will return to the said Commodity Credit Corporation its total investment in such potatoes, including handling and carrying costs: And provided further, That the Secretary is authorized to define surplus areas with respect to the production of potatoes and also deficit areas where such potatoes may be distributed: And provided further, That this proviso shall be complied with prior to either giving away or the destruction of any potatoes now in the possession of the said Commodity Credit Corporation."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield to myself 15 minutes. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The amendment which has just been read for the information of the Senate provides that before the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be permitted to give away any of the potatoes which it now possesses, it shall offer them for sale. The potatoes involved will be the potatoes produced in areas, such as Maine, where there are surplus potatoes. The Commodity Credit Corporation will be authorized by the amendment to sell such surplus potatoes in deficit potato areas, or areas where there are not sufficient potatoes raised to supply the demand. The amendment provides that the surplus potatoes shall be sold in the deficit areas at a price which will return to the Commodity Credit Corporation its cost, considering its purchase price, or take-over price, and its handling and carrying charges. I will ask later that the amendment be called up for consideration by the Senate and for a vote. I hope we may take the amendment to conference and see what we can do to work out a plan for the disposition of our Government-owned potatoes so as to save as much money as possible and at the same time make such potatoes available to consumers in areas where not enough potatoes were produced to serve the demand for such commodity.

Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Senate an amendment which is now printed, and which will be offered later. The amendment is known as the Williams-Ives-Saltonstall-Hendrickson amendment. I ask that the amendment be read for the information of Senators, and then I shall state my reasons for opposing the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

That paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (Public Law No. 439, 81st Cong.) and section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as added by subsection (c) of section 409 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, are hereby repealed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this amendment, if it should become the law, would repeal portions of the act which was passed and signed last October. If the amendment should prevail, then the 90-percent support price which the law now provides with respect to certain crops in 1950, would be repealed. It provides that the full flexible support price scheduled for all basic commodities, save tobacco, shall go into effect immediately. That means that the provisions for 90-percent support price for the basic products, save tobacco, for 1950, and the minimum of 80 percent of parity for 1951, shall be repealed.

In fact the amendment, if enacted, will repeal and destroy the present farm-price-support law and program.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield. Mr. ROBERTSON. Is that substantially the bill on this subject the Senate passed early last fall?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is somewhat along that line. It is not the same, but it is substantially the same.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Oklahoma will recall that the Senator from Virginia voted for the Senate bill; he was opposed to the House bill which continued provision for a mandatory 90 percent of parity for the basic crops for this year.

The Senator from Virginia would like to vote again as he voted before, if he can get a clear understanding as to how close this amendment is to what he has previously supported.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The amendment, if agreed to, will repeal the provision of existing law authorizing the use of the highest of either the parity price for the basic commodities, as computed under the old formula, or the price as computed by the modernized formula for a 4-year period.

Mr. President, this amendment brings up the old fight between high prices and low prices for farm products. It seems that the representatives of the industrial East are demanding that those who live in their area receive high prices for the things they produce and at the same time, they are demanding low prices for the things that they consume—products such as food, and cotton and wool for clothing.

Mr. President, I remind those who reside in the industrial East that if the prices of farm products go down, then wages will go down, production will drop, the prices of the things the East produces will go down, and a depression will come again to our country.

We cannot have a prosperous economy with one-fifth of our population—

which is what the farmers constitute—receiving for the things they produce prices so low that they are unable to buy the goods produced by industry.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will agree with me, I am sure, that even though the amendment I have proposed is adopted, it still will leave the support prices of cotton, wheat, tobacco, and corn higher than the prices the farmers have received for those commodities during the past 10 years. So we shall not be repealing the support prices, for the farmers still are receiving for those commodities more money on the average than they have received for them in the past 10 years.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate rejected a proposed amendment on the theory that we should not change the program after certain crops have been planted. But now it is proposed in connection with the consideration of this amendment, that we make such a change.

Mr. President, I have only a limited amount of time. Although I shall be glad to yield for questions and suggestions, I must yield a part of my time to other Senators. For that reason, I wish to make this issue plain.

Mr. President, in order that this country may survive, in order that the States, the cities, and the counties may survive, all being a part of our Nation, we must have high prices. We must have high prices for farm products; we must have high wages; we must have high salaries; and we must have high prices for the articles produced by industry generally. In no way can we have a high national income, except through high prices. At the present time the goal for farm products is full parity prices. The present law provides a 90 percent of parity as support prices for basic commodities—such as wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. The amendment, if approved will repeal and destroy even the 90 percent of parity support price for the basic farm products.

Mr. President, the record shows that the farmer receives only a relatively small part of the consumer's dollar. When a consumer goes to the store and buys a dollar's worth of bread or a dollar's worth of meat or a dollar's worth of potatoes or any other commodity produced by farmers, the farmer does not receive all of such dollar. The record shows that the farmer gets less than 50 cents of the consumer's dollar. Only in times of unusually high prices do farmers receive as much as 50 percent, or 50 cents, of the consumer's dollar.

Who gets the remainder of the money the consumers pay for food and clothing? The railways receive their full share for transporting the commodity from the place of production to the mill or factory. The railroads have fixed tariff rates so they receive their full share or 100 percent of their rates.

After the commodity reaches the mill where it is processed, the mill receives its full share—not 60 or 80 or 90 per-

cent, but 100 percent of its cost, plus its profits, in connection with the work of processing the commodity.

When the product is processed, it goes to the wholesaler or the jobber, as the case may be, and the wholesaler or the jobber gets his full profit. After the wholesaler or jobber receives his profit, the product goes to the retailer for distribution; and the retailer receives his share in profits for handling the processed commodity.

So when the consumer buys the finished product, he pays for the transportation of the commodity back and forth; for processing, for jobbing or wholesaling, and for the retailer's profit. Then what is left, if anything, the farmer receives. At the present time the farmer receives some 37.8 percent or less than 38 cents out of each dollar consumers pay for their food and clothing. The result is that in times of low prices for farm products, when others who handle such products are receiving 100 percent of their profits, the farmer receives what is left—if anything is left.

So, Mr. President, I am for high prices in order to assure the farmer a fair share of the consumer's dollar. He can get his fair share only when we have relatively high prices for the commodities which he produces.

Mr. President, there is another reason for my opposition to the amendment. At the present time we have a national debt of some \$257,000,000,000. We have a national budget of some \$42,500,000,000, which must be paid in the form of taxes, if the budget is to be kept in balance. In addition to the Federal budget, we have State, county, city and district budgets totaling some \$17,000,000,000, which, added to the \$42,500,000,000 Federal budget make a grand total of some \$60,000,000,000, which the taxpayers must pay in order to keep the various units of our Government going concerns.

Mr. President, how are we to get \$60,000,000,000, in taxes from low price schedules? It has not been done in the past. It is not now being done, and it cannot be done in the future. Only a few years ago, at a time within the memory of every Senator, we had low prices. For example, during 1930, 1931, and 1932, the total income of all the people would not have been sufficient to pay the Federal tax bill for the current year. The only way by which high national income can be developed and maintained is through high prices—high prices for farm commodities, high wages, high salaries, and high prices for the products of industry. Then, of course, in order to be just and fair, all prices must be equalized, so that no group will have an advantage over any other group.

Mr. President, we see today economic conditions wherein industrial prices are rising, wherein wages are increasing, and at the same time we see prices of farm products falling day by day. Mr. President, such conditions cannot be permitted to continue in the United States and I oppose the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, late last Friday afternoon, I undertook to participate in the debate on the pending Wherry amendment, which I interpreted as placing certainly for the time being an embargo on potatoes from Canada. Frankly, I had had no opportunity whatever to study the problem or to prepare anything on the subject, so I requested the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma to give me 10 minutes this morning in which I might attempt to clarify one or two things I had said Friday, and to enable me to give the Senate the benefit of certain information I secured this morning from the State Department.

I recall that I said Friday, Canada was our best friend and our best customer. I repeat the statement. I said Canada took \$500,000,000 worth of goods from us. What I intended to say was that Canada took \$500,000,000 more goods from us than we took from Canada. Canada last year bought from us approximately \$2,000,000,000 worth of goods, and we took from Canada approximately \$1,500,000,000 worth of goods. I said Canada took from us between three and four times the amount of fresh fruits and vegetables—which, of course, includes potatoes—than we took from Canada. I was unable to answer Friday the charge that the President of the United States and the State Department were negligent in their duty in not restricting imports of potatoes from the 1949 crop, as they had done with respect to the 1948 crop.

This morning I got from the State Department an answer to the question, which is this: Last week the Department of Agriculture approached the State Department with respect to the importation of Canadian potatoes, and the State Department in turn approached the appropriate representatives of Canada, to discuss the matter. In the discussion, the facts were developed that up to last week 6,000,000,000 bushels of Canadian potatoes had been imported by us, and that according to their very best estimates, not more than 3,000,000 additional bushels of potatoes would come into this country, to be divided along established lines between seed and table potatoes. That would be the total of our importation of Canadian potatoes this year out of the crop harvested last fall, and it would be 200,000 to 300,000 bushels less than we took from the 1948 crop under the agreement to curtail importations because of our support price.

So, Mr. President, I think we are now facing a situation in which we are going to get fewer potatoes from Canada than we did last year. Only 3,000,000 more bushels of potatoes, if nothing is done, will be imported, and yet we are asked to enact into law a mandatory embargo upon Canadian potatoes to become effective immediately, because the President would have to take immediate action because of our surplus production;

but the law would also stand on our statute books for an indefinite period in the future.

So I wish to invite the attention of my distinguished colleagues to two pertinent facts. One is that we are proposing to do something which will have no practical effect upon the economy of our Nation at this time. Second, the action would be construed as a highly unfavorable action by the Canadian officials, and I fear would have more serious repercussions than that. Why? Because we all know that ECA Administrator Hoffman has been pleading, urging, and almost demanding that the nations of western Europe integrate their economy, break down their tariff barriers, and engage in freer trade among themselves, and in connection with the time when her dollar aid will end he has held out to them the hope that one billion of American dollars they will need can be secured by our accepting an equivalent amount of European goods in our domestic market, which, Mr. Hoffman said, would amount to approximately 1 percent of our total production, and therefore could not possibly hurt this Nation. But if, because of about 3,000,000 bushels of potatoes we put an embargo against a nation which is buying from us \$500,000,000 worth of goods more than we buy from it and which spends every dollar it receives for potatoes for our citrus fruits, machinery, or whatever we are selling, why will not European nations believe that when a competitive situation arises we will not treat them with the same kind of selfishness which this amendment proposes that we extend to our neighbor, our best friend, and our best customer?

So I say, with those broad implications, the Senate should not go on record in favor of an amendment of this kind.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia demonstrates how dangerous it is for Members of the Senate to consider an amendment such as that offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] without complete and exhaustive hearings before an appropriate committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. We are living in a dangerous world which is now engaged in a cold war which could some day eventuate into a shooting war. We are living in a world in which we need friends. We still have considerable weight in international affairs, but the situation which now confronts us indicates that we cannot afford to throw it around. I think we should not do something which could easily be construed not only in Canada, where we have good friends, but in other parts of the world where we are trying to get good friends as meaning that we are not dedicated to the fundamental principle of live and let live, and that as soon as we feel that the danger of atomic bombs and other types of bombs dropping on our heads is eliminated, we are going to return to a program of every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield myself one additional minute. A moment ago I had read from the desk an amendment which I shall call up after 4 o'clock today. In order that I shall not then take unnecessary time, I wish to submit a copy of a letter which I sent to Secretary Brannan on February 24, 1950, and I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed immediately after the reading of the amendment, which will come after 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have had made an analysis of House Joint Resolution 398 and Senate bill 2919, which will be in conference. This analysis comes from a man who is competent to make such an analysis. His name is Horace Hayden. I ask unanimous consent that the analysis be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

OKLAHOMA COTTON GINNERS'

ASSOCIATION, INC.,

Oklahoma City, Okla., February 24, 1950.

Subject: Analysis of House Joint Resolution 398 and S. 2919, correction of 1949 cotton acreage allotment law.

Senator ELMER THOMAS,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: The cotton acreage allotments laws have become so terribly involved and complicated and there are so many unknown factors that it is difficult to make an analysis with assurance that conclusions will be entirely correct.

In the 1938 law there was provision by which the total tilled acres of every cotton farm was taken into consideration. From the total tilled acres was deducted the acreage devoted to other basic crops, the remainder left the total acreage available for cotton. This total acreage was divided into the county allotment which gave a percentage factor to be used by the county committee in allotting acreage. The law provided that all farms should be given the same percentage of its available cotton acreage. The effect of this provision was to cut down the man specializing on cotton and increasing the acreage of the farmer who only planted a small amount of cotton.

In preparing the 1949 cotton acreage law, we from Oklahoma and several other States objected to that method of arriving at cotton allotments. We requested that the law provide that after the cotton history had been established for all farms in the county, that the cotton history be adjusted percentage-wise to the county's allotment. It is a simple way of handling the matter and to our way of thinking it is the only fair way to handle this allotment. We were told that the Department insisted on the tillable acres formula rather than the cotton history formula. It looked so involved to a number of us and we felt it would create many inequities and hardships. During hearings the Department apparently made no objections to the tillable acres formula and left us with the impression that they would insist on that method in arriving at farm allotments. We now understand that the Department claims that this formula is too complicated and creates many inequities and that they would much prefer to have the cotton history formula used. It is too late to make that change for 1950.

The tillable-acres formula was further complicated by reason of war crops as pro-

vided in Public Law 12. That created cotton farms that have long since changed their cropping system and are not in position to plant cotton. They still have allotments granted them, even though a great many are surprised in receiving a cotton allotment and would be more than willing to surrender their allotment for use by other farmers in that county.

You will recall that in the Senate bill 1962, provision was made by which any unplanted acreage could be either surrendered permanently or for 1 year, in order to correct the inequities of the tillable acreage formula. That provision was eliminated in the House, and it is our opinion that this particular point is causing most of the difficulties throughout the cotton South. Oklahoma experienced this difficulty under the 1938 law, and we were quite anxious that we not experience it again. Texas had a similar experience, but not quite as severe as in Oklahoma. We felt at the time that many other States would experience similar difficulties, principally by reason of changes in cropping systems and by reason of cotton credits created under Public Law 12.

It is our understanding that some of the States which objected and helped eliminate the reallocation provision of S. 1962, have now admitted that this was an error.

So far as I can learn, all States are fairly well satisfied with the total cotton allotment for the State as provided in Public Law 272, but the method of making allotments to farms is causing general dissatisfaction over the entire belt. In Oklahoma we feel that Public Law 272, if unchanged, will cause 30 percent of our allotment to be unplanted. We had hoped that could be corrected to a larger extent by the surrender and reallocation of unused acreage and were prepared to get most of the unplanted acreage released for reallocation.

House Joint Resolution 398, together with a flood of other bills in both Houses, was introduced in an effort to correct the mistake made in eliminating the reallocation provision of S. 1962.

We believe the meat of the whole situation is some method of getting the States' allotment planted and not increasing the allotment for any State above the amount provided in the 21,000,000-acre national allotment. We believe that can only be accomplished by leaving to the discretion of county committees and not by application of a fixed rule laid down by the Secretary.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 398

Section I of that bill provided that every farm shall have a minimum of—

(a) 70 percent of the average of the 1946-47-48 cotton acreage; or

(b) 50 percent of the highest acreage of any one of those years. (Both of the above provisions include acreage in War Corp Credits); but

(c) No farm shall be allotted more than 40 percent of his total tilled acreage.

Section II of that bill provides that acreage which will not be planted to cotton may be released by holder of allotment and deducted from his allotment, to be used to supply the minimum acreage as provided in section I.

Any surrendered acreage remaining after providing the minimum acreage described above may be reapportioned in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable to other farms in same county receiving allotments, which the Secretary determines are inadequate.

The legislative report on that bill reads, "In the absence of some very exceptional circumstances, however, no farm having a cotton history could be said to have an inadequate allotment if its allotment was equal to the larger of 70 percent of the amount planted or regarded as planted during the years, 1946-47-48; or 50 percent of the highest acreage planted or regarded as planted in

any one of such years, and not in excess of 40 percent of the acreage tilled annually or in regular rotation."

You can see from the above that any acreage surrendered over and above the amount necessary to provide minimums set out above, must be used on small farms or new farms. In fact will not be used at all.

If unplanted acreage is surrendered in sufficient volume to provide the minimums set out above, the County and State will not suffer in future years. If the unplanted acreage is not surrendered in sufficient volume then the acres necessary to provide the minimums as set out above are only temporary and will be eliminated in considering the actual planted acreage for future years. Under this provision there is no incentive for the farmer to release his acreage because it is released almost permanently. We believe that provision will mean the reduction in Oklahoma's cotton history of at least 200,000 acres for 1951 and future years. This is indicative of what will happen to many other States.

It is only a stopgap for 1950 and will cause terrific repercussions and distortion of all State allotments after 1950.

S. 2919

The Senate has deleted the entire House bill and substituted the principal provisions of S. 2919, changed slightly in view of later thinking.

The Senate version provides in the first section that any unplanted acreage may be surrendered without reservation by the farmer who has changed his cropping system and does not intend to plant cotton in the future. Illustration: (Turned to grass, legumes or other crops that cannot be easily changed from year to year) or if the farmer is planting cotton in a rotation with other crops he may surrender his cotton allotment for 1 year without reducing his allotment in future years by such surrender.

The Senate bill reads that acreage so surrendered may (should read shall) be reapportioned to other farms in the State, preference being given to other farms in the same county as original allotment. Reapportionment to be made to farms with inadequate allotments in view of past production records.

Up to this point the Senate bill does the thing that we believe should be done. It eliminates the mathematical formula which has been written into previous laws or bills.

We do not believe that any mathematical formula can be used without creating serious handicaps and hardships in many areas, if not all of them. We believe that if the bill should stop at that point, it would probably serve the purpose of correcting many of the inequities caused by Public Law 272.

The next section of the Senate bill provides that no farm shall have less than 60 percent of the average of the 1946-47-48 planted acreage or acreage regarded as having been planted, but contains a limitation that not more than 40 percent of the tilled land after deducting from farms the acreage devoted to other basic crops.

In Oklahoma this means that the wheat and peanut acreage shall be deducted before arriving at the acreage to be devoted to cotton. On most farms deduction of acreage in other basic crops will have no effect because the majority of the farmers are specialists just like manufacturers and they are either specializing in cotton or some other crop. However, on an estimated one-sixth of the farms in this State this limitation will work a serious hardship.

The 60 percent of the average or 40-percent limitation of S. 2919, is an effort to force diversification or rotation of crops. We believe that the 70-percent provision with a 40 percent of total tilled acres as provided in the House bill, will accomplish that result with much less hardship than the provision of the Senate bill. This rigid limitation with low average of cotton history will force a

great deal of land to be left entirely out of cultivation for the reason that those farmers do not have the equipment, training or the type of land to be devoted to other crops. We really believe that provision in the House bill is almost too rigid in itself to be imposed on farmers without notice. Certainly the provisions of the Senate bill are entirely too stringent.

It is our conclusion after intensive study with all agencies concerned that if the first section of the Senate bill could be used alone without the provisions of the average planted acreage or the limitation of crop-land to be devoted to cotton, the county committee could work out most of the hardship cases, but we do believe that the reapportionment of surrendered acreage should be left to the county committee and not under arbitrary rules that may be set up by the Secretary for use in every county of the belt. It is impossible for one rule to work equally in all counties.

If it is necessary to have a limitation on the average planted acreage and a limitation on the crop land to be devoted to cotton, then we believe the minimums as provided in the House bill would cause less hardship, not only in Oklahoma but every other State, than the limitation as provided in the Senate bill.

Both bills provide that the farmer may have a reasonable length of time in which to make application for adjustment under the revised law. We believe that should be retained. The House bill provides for 15 days period and we presume that this means 15 days after the passage by both Houses of the bill. The Senate bill does not set a time limit. We feel that 15 days is too short a time for the committee to acquaint all cotton farmers of their privileges. Even though planting time is near, we believe that time should be increased to 20 days.

We also believe that the Senate bill can be handled as a permanent revision which is not in the House bill.

Without question, if the House version is adopted in the present form, it will call for another bill to correct the 1951 and future acreages. Otherwise the allotments in 1951 will be in a much worse shape than they are now.

Very truly yours,

HORACE HAYDEN,
Secretary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield myself 25 minutes. I have no exception to take with reference to the amount of business done between Canada and the United States, but I state that a close analysis of the subject, if the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the majority leader had made such an analysis, would disclose that the difference in the balance of trade is not based wholly on exports from the United States to Canada or imports from Canada to the United States. I want to stress that my amendment, which would stop imports of potatoes only when we had more than we knew what to do with, is being objected to on the ground that some foreign countries might resent it. It simply will not work out that way.

The purposes and principles of the amendment were not objected to. The distinguished Senator from Virginia said that he agreed with the objectives of the junior Senator from Nebraska, but that he disagreed with the methods by which the result was to be accomplished. That is the interpretation I placed on what the Senator said.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Nebraska has made a correct interpretation of my statement.

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Nebraska wants, therefore, to explain his amendment in terms of foreign relations, to demonstrate that it is logical and sound from every angle, and that the method of procedure is entirely correct.

It involves no ill will and will cause none.

The nations which signed the multilateral agreement at Geneva in 1947 and 1948, foresaw the possibility of surpluses. They foresaw that it would be manifestly unfair to force one nation to add to its own surpluses by absorbing those of other nations, and they specifically provided for just such a contingency.

Under this agreement, any nation with a surplus might, with complete peace of mind, and without in any way antagonizing another nation, prevent that surplus from being swelled by additional imports.

Our neighbor on the north, shut off shipments of table potatoes to the United States by agreement made pursuant to the terms of the earlier trade agreement the United States had with that country.

It will be seen that Canada did so, because the Geneva trade agreement provided for just exactly that means of protecting America's agricultural price-support programs.

The principal supplier of potatoes imported into the United States, has rigidly restricted imports of agricultural and other products from the United States and has completely shut off many American products. No element of retaliation on the part of either nation was involved. The diplomats of our State Department realized that Canada's embargoes, quotas, import licenses, and other restrictions on imports of goods from the United States, were born of necessity, exactly as is the amendment which is before the Senate.

The countries which signed the Geneva trade agreement have already consented to this amendment.

Article 11 of that agreement, to which most of the countries which export potatoes to the United States adhere, is headed "General elimination of quantitative restrictions." I read paragraph 1. This is the over-all statement:

No prohibitions or restrictions other than duties, taxes or other charges, whether made effective through quotas, import or export licenses or other measures, shall be instituted or maintained by any contracting party on the importation of any product of the territory of any other contracting party or on the exportation or sale for export of any product destined for the territory of any other contracting party.

Paragraph 2 reads:

The provisions of paragraph 1 of this article—

Which I just read—

shall not extend to the following—

This is the first exception—

Import restrictions on any agricultural or fisheries product, imported in any form, nec-

essary to the enforcement of governmental measures which operate—

Now I read indentation 2, under subparagraph (C)—

to remove a temporary surplus of the like domestic product.

That is as plain as the English language can be, and it takes care of the very situation we have at hand.

How could we do other than admit that the signers of this document intended to, and did, provide for limiting imports of a product that was in surplus in the importing country?

There was a complete meeting of the minds on this point that it would be applied, and it has been applied, on a number of occasions by other countries for reasons of State, such as exchange difficulties. We realized that and we continued to operate under that provision of the exception to the general provision.

Indentation 1 of subparagraph (C) discusses marketing and production limitation. That was brought out by the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who asked why we should permit surpluses as long as we have marketing limitations and quotas in this country and provide price supports for all the surpluses from other countries. This provision states that the general elimination of quantitative restrictions made effective by article 11 shall not apply to agricultural products which are domestically controlled by marketing or production programs.

In this instance, however, unlike the paragraph in which surpluses are mentioned, that is, subparagraph 2, a provision at the end of the article states that import restrictions because of marketing or production programs "shall not be such as will reduce the total of imports relative to the total of domestic production as compared with the proportion which might reasonably be expected to rule between the two in the absence of restrictions."

Therefore the exception to the exception barred the amendment which I originally offered, because we have marketing quotas and restrictions imposed in the United States. That is the whole thing in a nutshell.

It then goes on to say that in determining this proposition due regard shall be paid to a previous representative period.

It seems clear that we should only limit imports to the normal proportion when we have a domestic marketing or production program. If we restrict domestic output or sales, then we can restrict imports in the same proportion.

Surpluses were specifically and intentionally considered different problems, requiring more drastic measures. That is why this surplus clause was placed in the agreement, and we should take advantage of it just as Canada has.

The agreement does not in any sense infer nor state that they should not be eased by shutting off imports. If there had been any intention, even the slightest intention, to prevent this amendment or similar amendments from being adopted, then surely the agreement would have so stated. It did

so state in the case of marketing programs, as I just mentioned, and by the very omission of such a statement with regard to surpluses it provided for just exactly what is proposed here.

My desire to maintain rigidly the foreign commitments made by our State Department, much as I disagree with some of them, led me to revise my first proposed amendment so that it would conform to the spirit as well as the letter of the Geneva agreement. That is exactly why I did it, because the exception to the exception eliminated the amendment so far as the letter or the spirit of the law was concerned, even though marketing quotas were imposed. Here is a provision by which the surplus is taken care of. There is no exception to it. We are supposed to rely on it, as are Canada and the other 23 countries.

It should be clear that we are following exactly the course that was provided for in that agreement. It is the course other countries would follow in similar circumstances.

It is the logical, sensible course, as was foreseen by those who drafted and signed the controlling trade agreement. There is no room for the slightest feeling of retaliation. There could not possibly be any inference that we, by the adoption of this amendment, would be "taking a crack" at any nation or group of nations. It is a business proposition operated in the friendliest of terms and one forced upon us by the circumstances that created a surplus in this country and in other countries as well.

When the 1948 crop turned out to be larger than our requirements, Canada, with no ill feelings on the subject, responded to an appeal by this country to limit exports of potatoes. A willingness to compromise indicated a knowledge on the part of both countries that drastic action was necessary. It was recognized that the United States could have completely eliminated all imports under the terms of all our domestic laws and foreign agreements concerning potatoes.

It was also recognized, as it should be now, that the net result would be the same no matter how the agreement was negotiated, namely, that of preventing imports from swelling the large surplus in the United States.

Mr. President, I desire now to read from the actual text of the official letter, which is a part of the agreement which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] mentioned when we were debating this matter in the Senate. This was sent to the Canadian representative and signed by Robert A. Lovett, Acting Secretary of State of the United States. This quotation states our quid pro quo or share in the agreement:

In view of the adverse effect which unrestricted imports of Canadian potatoes would have on the potato programs of the United States and the fact that it is anticipated that the Canadian proposal will substantially reduce the quantity of potatoes which would otherwise be imported into the United States, and in the interest of international trade between the United States and Canada and other considerations, the United States Government assures the Canadian Government

that it will not hereafter impose any quantitative limitations or fees on Canadian potatoes of the 1948 crop imported into the United States under the system of regulating the movement of potatoes to the United States outlined in the Canadian proposal.

Mr. President, those are the very words which were used. That was the proposition made a year ago. It is the same we are asking for now. It was not retaliation then, and it is not retaliation now.

The United States was wielding a big stick in that agreement.

The Canadian Government knew, and we knew, that we could shut off imports of those potatoes, and that public opinion would probably force that action. So there was an agreement.

There was no thought of retaliation. There was no intention on the part of Mr. Lovett or anyone else to create any ill will between countries. There was no antagonism between the negotiators, and there certainly is none now.

The result of all this was just exactly the same as we have in mind now, except that the former agreement did allow the shipment of potatoes marked for seed. The situation then was not nearly as bad as it is now, and we are going a little further than did the former agreement.

The present situation calls for quick, decisive action. It comes several months later in the year than did the November 1948 agreement. Imports are much larger, and we are already destroying millions of pounds of our own 1949 crop. None of this congressional action would be necessary otherwise.

I cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, believe that Canada will take it unkindly, or even think of retaliation. Their business sense will certainly point out to them the fairness of a proposition which would designate to each respective nation the job of taking care of its own surpluses. If they have a surplus of potatoes, then they have our deepest sympathy, because we are afflicted with the same malady, only to a much greater extent.

Let there be no equivocation or misunderstanding. The amendment would require us to cease importing potatoes only when and if we had more than we could find use for, as is provided in the amendment.

What could be more fair or businesslike? What infinitesimal ground for retaliation is there? With respect to that angle, I may state some very interesting facts which bring out this friendly attitude between our countries.

Canada issued an order on November 18, 1947, prohibiting—not just limiting, but prohibiting—the importation from the United States and other countries of a wide variety of agricultural and other commodities.

This embargo had a serious effect on a great many farmers, fruit growers, and manufacturers in the United States. These men and these companies, for many years, had marketed a part of their output in Canada. Suddenly, without prior warning, shipments were shut off.

Among the items affected were fresh fruits; all fresh vegetables, except potatoes and onions; most dried fruits; most

canned and packaged goods; beans, peas, rice, peanut butter, honey, molasses, cigars and cigarettes, poultry, eggs, and meat. In addition, typewriters, radios, automobile tires, furniture, pianos, fur coats, and many, many other articles were affected. Apples, onions, and citrus fruits were permitted to enter, but only up to 50 percent of the 1946 level.

A month or so later the embargo list was considerably enlarged to include paper sacks, facial tissues, wax-coated paper, plywood, and a number of other articles.

Was there retaliation on the part of the United States? Certainly not. Did we take action to nullify, insofar as possible, any of these restrictions? Certainly not. Our farmers and manufacturers objected, for their loss of markets was quite serious to them.

This country, however, realized that these actions by our northern neighbors seemed to those promulgating the laws advisable and necessary and we did not take it as any slap at the United States.

Here is an interesting feature of these strict embargoes and quotas adopted by Canada. The announcement was officially made just 4 hours after the publication of the signing and effective date of the comprehensive tariff reductions made under the Geneva trade agreement. In other words, our agreement for the mutual reduction of tariff barriers to which Canada was a party was announced just 4 hours before that country rendered almost all her concessions ineffective.

The United States did not retaliate. Of course not. The friendly, though businesslike, relations between the two countries were not affected.

It is only fair to say that many of the severe restrictions placed upon shipments of goods from the United States to Canada have been modified. Quotas have been enlarged and import licenses are granted more freely than before.

Canada, however, has little ground on which to object to this one single restriction on potatoes, when we have too many of our own.

Speaking of potatoes, Canada issued an order on April 21, 1948, prohibiting the importation of potatoes, including sweet potatoes, from scheduled countries, including the United States. This prohibition was for the period April to June to shut out the early potatoes from the Carolinas, Virginia, and other southern areas. No one retaliated.

In May of 1948 Canada prohibited the importation of a number of new items, including parts for repairing radios and many kinds of machinery.

In June of 1948 another list of new items under prohibition was issued.

On November 1, 1948, the severe restrictions on imports into Canada of lettuce and tomatoes were eased somewhat.

It was then announced that restrictions would later be eased on imports of cabbage, celery, spinach, and carrots.

The official proclamation specifically stated that the relaxations would occur later as they were to be timed so as not to prejudice the normal marketing of Canadian produce.

I quote the Foreign Commerce Weekly of November 15, 1948:

Imports (into Canada) of each of the commodities will be authorized only when advancing prices or short supplies indicate depleted domestic stocks.

I submit, Mr. President, that is all the pending amendment seeks to do. In fact, we do not intend to go nearly that far. We would limit imports only when we have an undisposable surplus.

The amendment conforms with the trade agreements. It comes within the letter of the law and it comes within the spirit of the law. A year ago we took similar action. Action along the same lines can now be taken, and it should be taken, because the potato surplus is greater than it was a year ago.

On that particular subject I wish to say for the record that up to date the importation of potatoes from Canada has been 6,000,000 bushels. The figures given to me by the experts of the Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with those of other agencies, show that the estimate of imports for this crop year is about 15,000,000 bushels, not 6,000,000 bushels or 9,000,000 bushels. Translated into dollars and cents it means upward of \$20,000. If the majority leader is desirous of economizing, here is the best place I know to begin economizing, for a saving of \$20,000,000 can here be made. It can be made by an action which is within the law. We insist that surpluses in this country not be supported in the case of farmers who have no acreage or marketing quotas. Why should Canadian farmers who have no acreage or marketing quotas be protected by us, when we do not protect our own farmers who have acreage or marketing quotas?

So, in summary, the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska conforms to existing law. It complies with international trade agreements. Action similar to that I propose was taken by the Administration a year ago, and it can be taken again if Congress desires to do so.

Everyone can see there is a tremendous surplus of potatoes, and everyone knows that Congress is obligated to act.

Adoption of my amendment is necessary as a temporary expedient for the protection of the American economy.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. President, how much more time has the junior Senator from Nebraska?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4½ minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply regret that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is not now on the floor. I want the Senate to know that the facts I have given relative to surplus potatoes were authenticated and given to me by officials of the Department of Agriculture. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is on the floor. He is deeply interested in this particular legislation. I appeal to those who are acquainted with the subject and with the present emergency. The estimate of surplus potatoes is in the neighborhood of from sixty to seventy million

bushels. If 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes are shipped into the United States from a country whose farmers are not affected by United States quotas or United States restrictions with respect to planting, and that country receives the benefit of our price support for their surplus potatoes, what does that mean? What are we doing with our own surplus of potatoes? We are selling them for 1 cent a hundred pounds. Mr. President, I say it is the duty of every Senator to save the taxpayer every dime that can be saved to him, and a considerable sum of money can be saved by the adoption of my amendment, which comes within the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act. It is our duty to take advantage of such an opportunity. We should do so this year in face of a surplus which, it seems, will be nearly twice as large as that of last year. If potatoes are imported into the United States at the same rate as importations during the first part of the crop year—and the importations during the first part of the year were 6,000,000 bushels—there will be upward of 15,000,000 bushels imported. I base that statement on the estimate made by the Department of Agriculture experts. In view of that fact, I say the amendment should be adopted. The amendment would do this year exactly what the administration did last year.

Mr. President, there will be no retaliation as a result of the adoption of my amendment. No one has more sympathy with nor greater good will toward Canada than has the junior Senator from Nebraska. I appreciate every dollar's worth of business we receive from Canada. But why should we guarantee to the growers of potatoes in a foreign country a price support for their potatoes on a vague theory that it is good business for us to do so. I say it is not good business for us to do so. I repeat, there will be no retaliation for the action proposed by my amendment. Such action should be taken now. I hope the Senate will adopt my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma if he cares to use any of his time now.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have agreed to give those who sponsor the wheat amendment 30 minutes of the time controlled by me. I prefer that the time be taken on the question now before us, before I yield 30 minutes on the wheat amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] desires to speak, but he wishes to speak after the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has presented his amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. Ives. Mr. President, it occurs to the Senator from New York that it might be well to proceed with the other amendment prior to the one to be offered by the Senator from Delaware, because the amendment of the Senator from Delaware is a complete substitute.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at the present time the proponents of the so-called wheat amendment are not on the floor. In order that we may not lose time I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to present arguments in favor of an amendment to be later offered for himself and in behalf of Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and Senator HOLLAND, of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, each amendment will be argued separately and voted upon at 4 o'clock. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Voting will begin at 4 o'clock.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment, which I submitted last Friday, be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. . For the crop year of 1951 and thereafter no price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose here to discuss again in detail the potato amendments. It will be recalled that last Friday the Senate adopted the so-called Aiken substitute amendment to the Lucas amendment. One of the main reasons advanced for the adoption of that substitute amendment was that it permitted the Government to carry out its moral obligation to the growers of potatoes throughout the Nation, in contrast to the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. It will also be recalled that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois provided that no price support would be made available to any Irish potato grower for his 1950 crop after the enactment of the joint resolution, which meant that Congress would have to take affirmative action almost immediately in order that the potato growers of the Nation might be in a position to receive 1950 support prices.

The Aiken amendment, on the contrary, provided that until the Congress acted, the farmers growing potatoes would be entitled to price support.

My amendment simply provides that Congress must act by 1951 in order that potato farmers may be in a position to receive price support for the 1951 crop. My amendment does not in any manner affect the potato growers insofar as price supports are concerned for the 1950 crop. It affects growers only for the 1951 crop and thereafter.

Mr. President, as I pointed out some time ago, I know that the Agricultural Committee of the House as well as the Agricultural Committee of the Senate have tried on many occasions to provide an effective law dealing with potato surpluses, that is to say, a law which would sufficiently encourage the farmers who produce potatoes to agree to curtailment of their acreage in production. That is the only way we can prevent these huge surpluses. I can see no reason why a potato grower should be in a different position from that of a cotton farmer, a wheat farmer, or a producer of any of the other basic crops. In order that a wheat farmer or a cotton farmer may obtain support for the price of his commodity, it is necessary that the farmers producing that commodity vote among themselves to impose a quota restriction—a curtailment of their acreage. I contend that the same method should be imposed on the growers of potatoes. There is no reason why it should not be done.

As I pointed out last Friday, the marketing agreements have been ineffective, insofar as they have been used in an effort to curtail a surplus of potatoes. As late as September of last year, only 55 percent of the potato growers of the Nation had agreed to marketing agreements; the others did not enter into any agreements at all. We should note that last year the Department of Agriculture made an effort to support not only potatoes produced under marketing agreements which amounted to 55 percent of the 1949 crop, but also potatoes produced not subject to any sort of marketing agreements—45 percent of the last season's yield. As a consequence of price support of this type an enormous surplus of potatoes has been produced each year. We cannot curb the surplus production unless and until Congress passes a law permitting the potato growers to impose upon themselves the same kind of quota adopted by the wheat growers or the cotton growers.

I repeat, Mr. President, as I said on Friday, any farmer who expects his Government to support the price of his commodity should be willing to impose quota restrictions upon himself. A number of persons have said that means regimentation. That may be; but I say this is done by the farmer in a democratic way, after an affirmative vote by two-thirds of the growers. Only if the cotton farmers or the wheat farmers or the corn farmers agree to vote curtailment of their acreage, will there be a curtailment and I believe that the same, identical method should apply to the producers of potatoes.

The amendment I propose simply gives notice to the potato growers of the Nation that if they expect price supports from their Government during the year 1951 and thereafter they must lend their support to the enactment of a law which will permit the Department of Agriculture to say to the potato growers, "You may plant only so many acres of potatoes each year." If the potato growers give their unqualified support, I am satisfied that Congress will enact such a law. They are entitled to a price-support pro-

gram if they are willing to accept marketing quotas.

As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] stated last Friday, his committee now stands ready to begin hearings on legislation to carry out that proposal. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Mr. President, I wish to say that I shall cheerfully and gladly assist, to the extent of my ability, in the enactment of a law which will permit the potato farmers of the United States to impose upon themselves a quota system similar to that which now applies to the producers of all of our basic crops. At the proper time, I should like to submit my amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have proposed an amendment, and I shall offer it at the proper time.

However, I think perhaps the distinguished chairman of the committee and other members of the committee with whom I have conferred will accept the amendment for the purpose of taking it to conference and there considering it.

I should like to put into the RECORD at this point section 359 (b) of the law as it pertained to the use of excess peanuts for oil purposes, prior to its repeal. I also offer for the RECORD, in that connection, a statement explanatory of that portion of the law and how it was administered under the law as it has heretofore existed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, section 359 (b) and the explanatory statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 359 (b) was as follows:

"Beginning with the 1941 crop of peanuts, payment of the penalty of 3 cents per pound upon the marketing of peanuts as provided in subsection (a) above will not be required if such excess peanuts are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated each year by the Secretary or if the producer pays to the United States, with respect to excess peanuts which, when marketed, were identified in the manner prescribed in the regulations of the Secretary as quota peanuts, an amount determined under regulations of the Secretary to represent the amount received for the peanuts in excess of the amount which would have been received had such peanuts been delivered to a designated agency as excess peanuts. Any peanuts received under this subsection by such agency shall be sold by such agency (i) for crushing for oil under a sales agreement approved by the Secretary; (ii) for cleaning and shelling at prices not less than those established for quota peanuts under any peanut diversion, peanut loan, or peanut purchase program; or (iii) for seed at prices established by the Secretary. For all peanuts so delivered to a designated agency under this subsection, producers shall be paid for the portion of the lot constituting excess peanuts, the market value thereof for crushing for oil as of the date of such delivery less the estimated cost of storing, handling, and selling such peanuts but not less than prices established by the Secretary pursuant to authority contained in existing law.

Any person who, pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, acquires peanuts for crushing for oil and who uses or disposes of such peanuts for any purpose other than that for which acquired shall pay a penalty of 3 cents per pound upon the peanuts so used or disposed of and shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both, for each and every offense. Operations under this subsection shall be carried on under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, and the operations of any agency designated to receive and market peanuts may be separate from or combined with operations of other agencies."

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The peanut program operated under this provision. The Secretary of Agriculture designated the peanut co-ops as his agencies to receive and market the excess peanuts which were grown.

Those co-ops were the VA-NC Peanut Co-Op, for Virginia, North Carolina, and a part of South Carolina, the GFA for Georgia, Florida, and Alabama and possibly some border States which produced limited quantities of peanuts, and the Southwest Peanut Association for Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, etc.

These co-ops, as buyers or agents for the Secretary, maintain buyers at the principal peanut markets and they received and stored the excess peanuts. Then in turn the co-ops sold the excess peanuts to the mills to be crushed into oil.

One year at least, there developed a shortage in quota peanuts for edible purposes, and it was fortunate that these excess peanuts were available and a good quantity of them were sold to the edible trade at the full support price. Later, the profit made on these excess peanuts was distributed among peanut growers.

There were, of course, some cases where the peanut producer undertook to market some of his excess peanuts as quota peanuts. But no excessive number of violations were ever reported to me and in addition there have since been some changes in the law which tends to make such violations less likely. These changes are contained in Public Law 323 of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I also offer for the RECORD, and ask to have printed at this point, a copy of the act to amend the peanut-marketing provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, approved August 1, 1947, together with an explanatory statement.

There being no objection, the act and explanatory statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Public Law 323—80th Cong.]

[Ch. 445—1st sess.]

[H. R. 4124]

An act to amend the peanut-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That section 358 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 1358), is amended by striking the last sentence of subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The amount of the marketing quota for each farm shall be the actual production of the farm acreage allotment, and no peanuts shall be marketed under the quota for any farm other than peanuts actually produced on the farm."

Sec. 2. Section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (U. S. C., title 7, sec. 1359), is amended as follows:

(1) By changing the first sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows: "The marketing of any peanuts in excess of the marketing quota for the farm on which such peanuts are produced, or the marketing of peanuts from any farm for which no acreage allotment was determined, shall be subject to a penalty at a rate equal to 50 percent of the basic rate of the loan (calculated to the nearest tenth of a cent) for farm marketing quota peanuts for the marketing year August 1-July 31."

(2) By striking out the last sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Peanuts produced in a calendar year in which marketing quotas are in effect for the marketing year beginning therein shall be subject to such quotas even though the peanuts are marketed prior to the date on which such marketing year begins. If any producer falsely identifies or fails to account for the disposition of any peanuts, an amount of peanuts equal to the normal yield of the number of acres harvested in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall be deemed to have been marketed in excess of the marketing quota for the farm, and the penalty in respect thereof shall be paid and remitted by the producer. If any amount of peanuts produced on one farm is falsely identified by a representation that such peanuts were produced on another farm, the acreage allotments next established for both such farms shall be reduced by that percentage which such amount was of the respective farm marketing quotas, except that such reduction for any such farm shall not be made if the Secretary through the local committees finds that no person connected with such farm caused, aided, or acquiesced in such marketing; and if proof of the disposition of any amount of peanuts is not furnished as required by the Secretary, the acreage allotment next established for the farm on which such peanuts are produced shall be reduced by a percentage similarly computed."

(3) By striking subsection (b) and redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g), as subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

Approved August 1, 1947.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

From this act you will observe:

1. That the marketing quota for each farm is confined to the actual production of the allotted acreage, while previously the marketing quota was either the actual production or the normal production, whichever was greater;

2. That the penalty on the marketing of excess peanuts was increased from 3 cents per pound to 50 percent of the support price;

3. That if any producer falsely certifies or fails to account for the disposition of any peanuts, he will be deemed to have marketed excess peanuts to the extent of the normal yield of the total excess acreage;

4. If a producer misrepresents peanuts produced on one farm as having been produced on another farm, then the acreage allotments in the future for both of such farms shall be reduced by the same percentage that the falsely certified peanuts bears to the marketing quotas for each such farm.

It must be admitted that these changes and additional penalties will make violations far less tempting and far less likely than they were under the program previous to the passage of this act.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about this amendment. It has been in the law; it is not new. It only permits the crushing of excess peanuts—that is to say, peanuts grown over and above the quota—for oil purposes at the market price. There is

no subsidy, no support price, in that regard.

Question has arisen that perhaps in complete fairness to the producers of soybeans, I should modify or amend my amendment. At the proper time I shall offer to it an amendment or modification simply providing that if the Secretary imposes acreage controls and marketing controls on soybeans, then, notwithstanding the provisions of this act, he shall have full power to impose restrictions upon the marketing of oil produced from peanuts grown on excess acreage.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The price paid for peanuts which are to be crushed for oil is lower, is it not, than the 40 percent of parity paid for other peanuts?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; very much lower.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator give us some idea of what that price is?

Mr. GEORGE. Peanut oil is now selling for about 14 cents a pound. At present market prices, it is not feasible to plant peanuts to be used for the production of peanut oil. The peanut oil is produced only from the extra peanuts. Under the Marketing Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to reduce the peanut acreage to the point which will meet only the trade requirements for edible peanuts. Therefore, such a provision would eventually eliminate the production of peanut oil, unless oil from peanuts produced on excess acreage could be sold at the prevailing market price.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask another question, to bring out what I have in mind. Let us say that a farmer produced peanuts which would not be acceptable at price support, under the parity formula. Could such a producer of peanuts go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and, even though the peanuts would be used to produce peanut oil, be able in any way to receive the support price under the 90 percent guaranty provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act?

Mr. GEORGE. Not at all. Any excess peanuts must be used only for oil purposes by agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture himself.

Mr. President, as I have said, I wish to add to my amendment, by way of amendment or modification of it, a further provision reading in substance, that in the event the Secretary imposes acreage restrictions or marketing restrictions on soybeans, notwithstanding the provisions of this act, he shall have the same power and authority to control the planting of excess peanuts, even for oil purposes.

Mr. President, peanuts already are under strict quotas. The one real difficulty in that connection arises from the fact that the penalty for any excess planting is very high. The penalty now is 50 percent of the support price, if the farmer overplants his acreage and undertakes to sell in any way at all the peanuts produced on the excess acreage.

So, Mr. President, I amend or modify my amendment before I offer it. After modifying it in the way I have just indicated, I now offer the amendment.

In this connection, I ask that a brief statement in connection with the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The proposed amendment to again authorize the planting of excess acreage of peanuts is very necessary for the following reasons:

1. Peanut acreage has already been reduced approximately 40 percent, that is, 20 percent in 1949 and another 20 percent in 1950. Such reductions have already substantially reduced the economic welfare of peanut growers.

2. Another reduction in peanut acreage, of between 10 and 20 percent, is quite likely in 1951 as it is anticipated that a normal crop on the 2,100,000 acres allotted for 1950 will produce a surplus of peanuts for edible purposes. Such further reductions next year will mean that the acreage of the peanut producer will be reduced at least in half, if not more.

3. For the most part, peanuts and cotton are produced in the same areas. Marketing quotas are now also in effect for cotton and this year the cotton growers will suffer a substantial reduction in cotton acreage, some more than 50 percent if the pending resolution is not enacted, and many as much as 40 percent if the pending resolution is enacted. While the national cotton acreage for this year is 21,000,000 acres, resulting in these reductions, the Secretary will be required under the Cotton Quota Act to further reduce cotton acreage in 1951 to about 17,500,000 acres. Reduction in the acreage even below that figure is contemplated in 1952.

4. A reduction in peanut acreage of 50 percent or more, together with the reduction in cotton acreage in an equal amount, will make idle millions of acres of land in the cotton-peanut areas and will make it impossible for the farmers in those areas to produce sufficient crops for the support of their families.

5. It is not contemplated, nor would it be worth while, for any farmer to plant only excess peanut acreage, because the price of peanuts to be crushed into oil is not sufficient to cover cost. But, as the farmer must have the labor and equipment to plant his allotted acreage, he can in some cases plant additional acreage as excess peanuts for oil without any great additional expense and possibly at a small profit.

6. Mention has been made that the production of the peanuts for oil would be unfair inasmuch as this additional vegetable oil would be made available. But there are no controls of any kind on soybeans and the small quantity of oil produced from excess peanuts would be insignificant compared to the oil derived from soybeans. Cotton growers are not permitted to plant the acreage taken out of cotton and peanuts but reports reaching us indicate that millions of acres to be taken out of corn production this year under the corn-acreage-allotment program will be planted in soybeans and will quite substantially increase the soybean production for this year. Certainly it would be most unfair to permit the corn growers to put their idle acres in soybeans and to refuse the cotton growers to put some of their acreage in peanuts for oil.

7. Nor is there any control of any kind on the production of hogs, from which lard is made. Reports indicate that there is a substantial increase in the pig crop, which will result in more hogs and more lard. The small quantity of oil produced from excess peanuts will not equal the increased lard derived from the increased number of hogs.

8. For years efforts have been made to establish a market for refined peanut oil,

both for edible and cooking purposes. Peanut oil is a superior oil, more nearly like olive oil. These efforts have resulted in the establishment of a market for refined peanut oil and this needs to be greatly expanded. There is a good market today for a blend of peanut and olive oil. Peanut oil is needed for the cooking of peanuts for the salted-peanut processors. Peanut oil is needed where high-temperature cooking is required inasmuch as peanut oil will not smoke as quickly as lard and other oils. Peanut-oil-refining plants have been established and represent considerable investments. Peanut-oil mills where peanuts are crushed into oil are located all over the peanut-producing area and represent millions in investment.

9. But, under the peanut marketing quota law no provision of any kind is made for the production of peanuts for oil. The Peanut Marketing Quota Act requires the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to reduce the peanut acreage until only the exact amount needed for edible purposes can be produced. This will mean that there will be no peanuts to crush into oil; there will be no peanuts to crush for these plants; there will be no peanut oil to refine in the peanut-refining plants; there will be no peanut oil in which to cook salted peanuts; there will be no peanut oil for cooking purposes, for salads, or for any other purposes. Certainly we must not wreck the economy of these people or deny the public a commodity they want.

There are one or two areas which have never produced anything but edible peanuts and the growers in those areas are not interested in the production of excess peanuts for oil. But they have been broad-minded enough to understand the problems facing the peanut growers of other areas and they are not objecting to this amendment.

However, they are asking that the last paragraph of the amendment be enacted. This paragraph provides that any acreage planted in excess of allotted acreage shall not be considered in the future in establishing acreage allotments. We believe this provision is fair and have incorporated it in this amendment.

I may add that under the present law, the acreage planted in excess peanuts may after 3 years be taken into account to a limited extent in determining the peanut acreage allotment for the farm on which such excess peanuts have been grown. The language of the present law on the subject is as follows:

SECTION 358 (D)

"Any acreage of peanuts harvested in excess of the allotted acreage for any farm for any year shall not be considered in the establishment of the allotment for the farm until the third year following the year in which such excess acreage is harvested and the total increases made in farm-acreage allotments in any year based on such excess acreage shall not exceed 2 percent of the national acreage allotment for such year: *Provided*, That in the distribution of such increases based on such excess acreage the total allotments established for new farms shall not be less than 50 percent of such increases."

The last paragraph of the pending amendment changes this so as to provide that the excess acreage shall not be considered in establishing future farm acreage allotments for the farm at any time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is ready to proceed with the wheat amendment, I yield to him whatever time he may desire, up to 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, my colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], is present; and I prefer to have him proceed now.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Very well; I yield 15 minutes to the senior Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Colorado and myself, to the pending resolution, House Joint Resolution 398, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. MILLIKIN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the farm acreage allotment of wheat for the 1951 crop for any farm shall not be less than the larger of—

(a) 50 percent of—
(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1949, and

(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1948 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1949, or

(b) 50 percent of—
(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1948, and

(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1947 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1948;

adjusted in the same ratio as the national seeding for the production of wheat during the calendar year 1950 (adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trend in acreage) bears to the national acreage allotment for wheat for the 1951 crop; but no acreage shall be included under (a) or (b) which the Secretary, by appropriate regulations, determines will become an undue erosion hazard under continued farming. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no allotment increased by reason of the provisions of this section shall exceed that percentage of the 1950 allotment for the same farm which (1) the acreage allotted in the county to farms which do not receive an increase under this section is of (2) the acreage allotted to such farms in 1950. To the extent that the allotment to any county is insufficient to provide for such minimum allotments, the Secretary shall allot such county such additional acreage (which shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments otherwise provided for under the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended) as may be necessary in order to provide for such minimum farm allotments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the pending joint resolution that is a continuation of a relief plan which the wheat growers of the country worked out last year for the purpose of affording relief in the matter of wheat acreages. Until 1948 the Department of Agriculture had been calling upon the wheat growers to increase their acreages of wheat, and thereby to increase the production of wheat. In 1949, however, the tune was changed very suddenly, and wheat growers were threatened with a restriction and a reduction of acreage. It so happens that in producing agricultural crops it is not a matter of turning on the faucet and then turning it off, at will; the process is more complicated than that. Especially is that true in the light of modern farming practices, including crop rotation on the one hand, and, on the other hand, summer fallowing. It

requires more than 1 year in which to raise a crop of wheat. In many instances, under crop rotation procedures and practices, it requires a great many years in which to produce a crop of wheat. So when the world came very suddenly in 1949 that the crop would of necessity have to be reduced, it meant of course a considerable readjustment, a readjustment which would adversely affect many of the farming practices of the country.

When the veterans returned from the war, many of them purchased wheat farms. Wheat land is relatively cheap, compared with other farming lands. The veterans purchased the land. They did it innocently enough, not anticipating that changes would be made and restrictions imposed and insisted upon in the reduction of acreage. So the veterans are left in a very bad way. Last year the Congress acted to ease the situation, to work out a gradual reduction in the wheat acreage, so as not to inflict particularly heavy punishment upon wheat growers who had come into the picture very late.

During the past few years we have had favorable wheat-growing seasons in Kansas, Nebraska, and eastern California, especially. In eastern Colorado large acreages have been plowed up and planted to wheat. In Colorado we are new growers of wheat. The older growers of wheat in other sections are taken care of more or less in the plans of the Department of Agriculture to reduce the crop, but the new grower found himself completely wiped out, his business completely destroyed, should he comply with the suggestion made by the Department of Agriculture with respect to the reduction of his acreage. He was not given a place in the picture at all.

The amendment which we were successful in having adopted by the Congress a year ago gave some wheat farmers in certain areas advantages over so-called old growers receiving allotments on their 10-year adjusted acreage. It also provided for the addition of too many acres to the 1950 allotments, to fulfill the requirements of the amendment.

The amendment we are offering today meets these two very serious objections. It provides that the basis of adjustment to the proposed allotment for 1951 shall be compared to the seedings in the fall of 1949 and spring of 1950, for the 1950 harvest. The act passed last year, Public Law 272, in section 5 provided that the allotment should be compared to the 10-year average, adjusted for trend. The provision this year requires that no farm shall be given more acreage than the average of the other farms in a county receiving allotments on the 10-year adjusted acreage formula of the 1948 AA Act.

Had this plan been adopted last year, 10 percent less acres would have been required, or 1,712,000 instead of the 4,507,000 that were needed. Approximately 7.6 percent represented reduction on so-called new farms, and this formula would have brought the national average reduction to a little over 17 percent.

So, Mr. President, it can be seen that the amendment we are offering today is very modest, when compared with the amendment offered a year ago.

While the amendment was adopted primarily to assist those States which were responding to the pleas of the Department of Agriculture by sharply increasing their acreage, and was believed at the time to be limited to six or seven Western States, it actually assisted wheat farmers in 40 of the 48 States whose plight was such that a formula based on 50 percent of their wheat land being fallow or involved in rotation and soil conservation practices helped them out.

I shall read a list of certain of the States which received assistance. The figures are those of the Department of Agriculture:

Ohio.....	71,846
Indiana.....	118,285
Illinois.....	170,222
North Dakota (estimated).....	300,000
South Dakota.....	243,856
Nebraska.....	303,527
Kansas.....	398,278
Montana.....	473,109
Idaho.....	305,424
Colorado (the largest).....	789,225
New Mexico.....	59,070

From the beginning of the war years until 1948, the Department of Agriculture, as I have already said, asked for increased production. For the first time, in 1948, caution was suggested. Acreage was not reduced in 1948, but farmers were cautioned that it might become necessary.

During this period, much new ground was broken and sold to returning veterans, who were not aware of allotments or quotas or controls of any kind, and who bought the land in good faith. It is this group who require time in order to make their adjustments. They are the States showing the greatest additional number of acres under the provisions of the summer fallow amendment.

The purpose of an allotment program is to bring voluntarily the supply into relation with the demand. The programs, to be effective, must receive compliance. The real test of the summer fallow amendment is whether seedings were reduced.

It is one thing to issue orders and make suggestions; it is another thing to obtain compliance of the orders and suggestions. The Department of Agriculture figures, based on a limited survey, show 561,000 less acres were planted than would have been the case otherwise. In other words, had the Congress not adopted the amendment last year with respect to wheat acreages, the farmer would have planted 561,000 more acres than were actually planted as a result of the amendment.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter received today from a wheat grower in eastern Colorado, which explains how the formula operates. The letter is addressed to me. It is dated Arapahoe, Colo., February 22, 1950, and reads as follows:

Your support of the agricultural summer fallow bill is hereby recommended. This letter is in confirmation of my recent wire to you and to expand on same a bit.

The writer telegraphed me saying he was supporting the summer fallow amendment which the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and I have been sponsoring. The letter continues:

My planted wheat acreage for harvest this year is 1,047. If it had not been for the summer fallow bill passed by Congress late last summer I would have planted 2,200 acres for 1950 harvest. The first wheat-acreage restriction bill passed by Congress in 1949 only permitted me to plant about 750 acres for 1950 harvest or approximately one-third my total cultivated acres. Of course, I would rather have taken a chance on the production from 2,200 acres at an open-market price than be assured of a Government-support price on one-third my total cultivated acres.

I hope Senators will catch the significance of that statement. It is simply this: The only punishment inflicted on a farmer if he plants more acres than permitted under the Department regulations is that he is not assured of a Government support price. So long as his neighbors are getting a Government support price for their wheat, the farmer who has not complied can take chances and may sell his wheat at a pretty good price. If he sells it for less than the support price, it will, of course, make it more difficult and more expensive for the Government, and will increase the support price of all other wheat. That, I think, ought to be evident. So it is to the advantage of the country, to the advantage of the Department of Agriculture, and to the advantage of everyone else concerned with the problem, to find a solution in an orderly way, and effect compliance. Had we not adopted the amendment last year, the amount of wheat grown, the amount of acreage planted would have been a great deal more than it was. The same thing is true now. The amendment we are offering today carries as it should carry, greater limitations than the amendment adopted the last year.

The philosophy used in agreeing to the amendment last year was that it would gradually ease off the problem, and we are carrying out that same philosophy at this time.

To proceed with the letter:

I am only one of many wheat farmers in Colorado operating under similar circumstances. A serious handicap to the thriving new wheat industry of Colorado will be a terrific blow to the continued prosperity of all other Colorado business.

Most of us farmers are only asking to plant 50 percent of our total cultivated acres. We want to conserve our land, if possible, but we must make a living and be able to pay off our mortgages too. That would be difficult to do on only about one-third or less of our possible productive capacity.

The farmers are fighting for their life in my State. This man's letter makes it specific as to just how this amendment would apply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Oklahoma yielded me more than 10 minutes. He is not present at this time, but he told me to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The farmers found it to their advantage to retain this allotment after Congress passed the bill, because that is what they want to do; they do not want to do other than that. Congress met their problem squarely and gave them an increase which they could accept in a reasonable way and still make a living on their farms. They accepted it and went ahead.

The compliance would have been better if the amendment had been adopted 30 days earlier. Some early plantings were in and the farmers, in many instances, had ignored their allotment. In other instances, land prepared for seeding had to be planted. The amendment pleased the farmers because it provided a means to consider their particular problem on the basis of the farm and to get away from inequities resulting in distorted acreage statistics.

If a farmer goes outside the program, under allotments his only penalty is that he does not receive a Government loan to support the price he receives. His production adds to the total supply and must be considered when computing, under the formula, the next year's allotments. The end result is that those farmers who do comply are compelled to take a deeper cut; that is, to divide up a smaller number of allotted acres. The mere fact that a farmer is not eligible to a loan is of no help to cooperators. Actually, what happens is that when a man knows he is not going to get support and is going to have to sell his wheat on the market, and it is expected to be sold under the support price, he plants more acres to make up for the lower price he expects to receive. So that failure to provide a "livable" program actually results in aggravating the supply program.

I hope Senators will realize the force and the logic of that argument. The only penalty is that the farmer does not have the loan privilege. He can grow any amount of wheat he wants to grow, under the law, but he cannot get a Government loan on his wheat. He must sell the wheat on the open market. When the price of wheat is held up to a higher level, the farmer who grows it outside the program will not have very much difficulty selling his wheat. He will possibly sell it at a slightly reduced price.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a digest of letters received and comments on this subject.

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

DIGEST OF LETTERS IN THE FILES OF THE COLORADO GRAIN GROWERS ASSOCIATION AND THE NATIONAL WHEAT GROWERS ORGANIZATION

Please reenact the summer-fallow amendment as it made it possible for me (us) to plant within the allotment.

There were many thousands of acres of land not sown because Congress granted us sufficient acreage so it was possible for us to comply.

Its wheat growers and the State of Colorado itself were being unduly penalized by the first wheat allotment and I know that only a

small percent of the farmers could cooperate. Under the present program, section 272.5, I don't know of but one farmer who is not cooperating and he will another year if the program remains as it is at present.

As I am a small-grain grower, the first cut would have about put me out of business. I sure welcomed the amendment. To my knowledge, all of my neighbors have complied with their new allotments.

I was much pleased with the last wheat allotment which our Congressmen got for us wheat farmers. I have stayed under the last allotted acreage granted me and I believe that most of my neighbors have.

If these allotted acres had not been raised to a reasonable level, I would have disregarded the whole thing and planted twice the acres I now have in. In my fall plowing, I let my idle acres lay fallow.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Wheat is not perishable and the Government has usually made money on the stocks it has taken over as it takes only a small disaster, drought, or disease, to wipe out surplus.

There is adequate storage and CCC has contracted to rent and pay for space whether it is used or not. The problem of storing a commodity such as wheat is not great.

Wheat is a food used throughout the world. The Asia situation is such that wheat may be a deciding factor in a cold war.

There has been 15 unbroken years of bumper crops. The high plains area of eastern Colorado and western Kansas is droughty now.

The farmers desire to cooperate and are in accord with the provisions of House Joint Resolution 398. They are willing to go along.

Wheat farmers cannot stand a huge slash in operations in any one year and must have the opportunity to adjust their operations to a declining income. Large machinery replaced with lighter; lands sowed to pasture with income from livestock takes time.

Soil conservation requires gradual adjustment of acreages, otherwise an erosion hazard is created as well as a weed problem.

Important: One more year of a provision such as House Joint Resolution 398 will bring the adjustments for trend up to a point where relief will not be needed. This request is to bridge the adjustment period.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. How much time has been consumed by the senior Senator from Colorado?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield the remainder of 20 minutes to the junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to lend my endorsement to the very fine presentation of the subject made by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The question of allotments for wheat is vital in Colorado and in a number of other Western States.

Pursuant to the request of the Department of Agriculture to meet the food needs of the Nation in time of war and in the readjustment period after the war, many persons went to the eastern prairies of Colorado and to the western portions of Kansas and Nebraska, opened up new land, and planted it to wheat. Those persons included many veterans. They spent their own money or borrowed money for the purchase of the heavy

and expensive machinery required. They perhaps should have known, but they did not know, about allotments, quotas, controls, and so forth and so on. Perhaps they thought they were fighting a war for freedom. But, in any event, they went into that country and opened up new lands. By opening up new lands they did not have the benefit of the 10-year formula which applies to the old wheat farmers, and, under the law as it was last year, prior to the amendment which was adopted last year, those farmers would have had their acreage cut as much as 80 percent of what it had been. It would have been a ruinous thing. It would have been disastrous to a great part of the State of Colorado and of other States finding themselves in the same situation. In the heavy wheat-growing sections of Colorado the economy of dozens of towns turns on the money received from the production of wheat. That, in turn, fertilizes the economy of that whole portion of the State. The figures are large enough and the money is important enough so that it can favorably or very adversely affect the economy of the entire State.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Is not that condition generally true in the two or three western tiers of counties in the State of Kansas adjoining the State of Colorado?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say the situation is precisely the same, and for the same reason.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the position which the senior and junior Senators from Colorado are taking in this most important situation which affects the western third of the State of Kansas.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I appreciate the Senator's statement very much indeed.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I gladly yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not also true of the western counties in Nebraska? The Senator knows well that there are several counties in western Nebraska which can be placed in the same category with those counties in Colorado of which the Senator is speaking.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The situation is exactly the same. In fact, it has happened that men have been in western Kansas and in the part of Nebraska to which the Senator is referring, thinking they were in Colorado, or vice versa. There are some classic campaign stories with reference to Colorado politicians who wound up in Kansas or in Nebraska trying to convert voters to our own causes in Colorado. The line which has been laid between the States is an invisible one. The soil is the same, the climate is the same, and economic conditions are the same.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment offered by the distinguished senior and junior Senators from Colorado is an extension of what was done in the prior Congress, is it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. I may say to the distinguished Senator that it is an improvement over what was done last year. The distinguished senior Senator from Colorado has pointed out that by interpretation of the amendment which was adopted last year, or possibly by a misinterpretation of it, we took in more than we intended to take in. We benefited 40 out of 48 States. We did not intend to reach that far. We were aiming to encourage the practice of summer fallowing in the dry-land States.

But the amendment of last year was interpreted by the Department of Agriculture to include also the situation resulting from the normal practices of crop rotation in States other than dry-land States. The result was that much acreage was added which we never anticipated would be taken in. This year we have tailored our new amendment in the light of the facts we have learned, so that it will more nearly meet the special situations which we are discussing. I do not see how there can be any possible objection to it. The over-all effect on the allotment does not exorbitantly increase it, but it meets an extreme emergency in the parts of the country to which the distinguished Senators from Kansas and Nebraska have referred.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It is the principle I am talking about.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The principle is the same. We have an amendment here which is intended to promote soil conservation by promoting summer fallowing. We are not giving the benefit of the amendment to those who come in and in one big single shot break up the sod, and possibly open a large extent of country to a future dust bowl. We are trying to restrict the benefits to those who follow sound dryland farming practices.

In that connection it should be added, perhaps, that out in the western section of the country it is impossible to turn from wheat to oats, to barley, to potatoes, or follow the usual rotation routines of the older parts of the country. It is wheat country. Perhaps in the course of time it may be possible to put some of it in grass and turn it into livestock country. However, it takes money to buy livestock, and it takes time to get a grass coverage going. These veterans, these people we are talking about, are already in debt paying for the machinery necessary to grow wheat.

I believe that brings me fairly to a point which was touched upon by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. We believe that within another year, if we could have this amendment for one more year, the farmers in Colorado will then be in shape to adjust themselves to the regular formula, and will not need special consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the junior Senator from Nebraska is well aware of farming practices in his State, and I think I am quite familiar with the prac-

tice of summer fallowing, to which both Senators from Colorado have referred. However, for the record, I wonder if the Senator would expand a little on summer fallowing. Just what does it mean? I suppose every Senator knows what it is, but I know there are some Senators who are wondering about summer fallowing, and they would like to know how it helps the land, and why it is a soil conserving practice. If the Senator would care to do so, I think it ought to be made clear.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not hold myself out as an expert agronomist. But the point is, first, that we want to keep out those who rush in, trying to take advantage of the high price of wheat, opening up large areas of land without regard to conservation of the land, and putting all of it in wheat, and making a single shot at a good market and pulling out and leaving the country to blow away. Our practice is to put roughly half our land into fallow for 1 year, and to work it the next year, to rotate it in that way. We have better crops, and better cover on our land. It enables us to avoid, at least in part, the dangers from "dust bowling" and from losing our topsoil.

Mr. WHERRY. The purpose is to induce the farmer to do that. Of course, the good farmer does that voluntarily. In some cases it is the practice to use one-half the land, and in other cases it is the practice to use one-third the land. In my section of the country, it is usually a third of the land which is summer fallowed and taken out of production. So in reality the farmer is actually producing only on half his farm, if he takes half for summer fallowing, or he is producing only on two-thirds, if one-third is out of production. Fallowing builds up the soil. It gets rid of weeds, and it makes for a sound farming program. Is not that true?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is exactly correct.

The formula which we are presenting this year assumes that half the land would be so treated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The formula which we are discussing this year gives this top advantage to the farmer who puts half his land in summer fallow. I do not believe any soil conservationist could ask for a fairer dedication of land to conservation purposes than that.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Is it not generally advocated by men who are well versed in conservation practices that an owner in the western section of the country should utilize half of his land and summer fallow the remainder?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is my understanding that that is the constant preaching of the experts on soil in that part of the country, that half the land should be allowed to fallow in alternate years.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to clear up the discussion of summer fallowing. Is it not true that those who summer fallow the land do not get any benefits from any crops on that land?

Mr. MILLIKIN. They do not get the benefit of a single acre. Credit is given on the land which is planted. Let us assume a total of 1,000 acres. Credit is given on the 50 percent planted in wheat, let us say. On the other 50 percent, which is idle, no credit is given. However, if 50 percent of the land is not fallowed, the program does not apply, and the farmer does not receive the benefit of the 10-year formula or the benefit of price support.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no return to the owner of land on the part that is summer-fallowed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is no return to the owner of the land on the part that is summer-fallowed. I should like to emphasize again that, unless a man follows sound practice, if he puts all his land in wheat, he does not get the benefit of the formula I am discussing, and does not get the benefit of the 10-year formula, and his wheat is without support.

Mr. President, that brings me to something the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado emphasized several times, and I do not feel there would be any harm in mentioning it again, because there may be one or two Senators now in the Chamber who were not present when it was referred to.

We are trying to encourage the wheat farmers in the western section of the country to adopt conservation practices, and we found, by the operation of the amendment last year, that if we give them a little incentive, a little encouragement, they will abide by those practices and follow the formula, whereas if they do not have that encouragement there will be a different result. I think all those from the older States who are interested in wheat should pay particular attention to this. It is possible to open up a great deal of the land in the area to which I am referring with heavy machinery, and the cost per bushel of producing is relatively cheap.

What do they do? They beat the game by opening up two or three times more land than if they were following the formula. The distinguished senior Senator from Colorado made that very clear. What is the consequence? It is that the base of wheat production is increased, with the result that when we come to make next year's national allotment, we have to reduce the allotment to everyone. So that it is distinctly in the interest of every "old grower" to approve the formula which we have proposed, because it tends to hold down the gross national production of wheat, and, in addition, tends to encourage sound conservation practices.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know how much this amendment would increase the national wheat-acreage allotment?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I can give the distinguished Senator an estimate. Assuming

that everything remains the same as it was last year, there would be added approximately 1,250,000 acres, as distinguished from approximately 4,500,000 acres added by last year's amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. What in the Senator's amendment would cause him to believe that would result?

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, because last year's amendment was tied to the 10-year average. This year we are tying it to the relation of 1950 to 1951. The change in that part of the formula, plus the change in interpretation by the Department of Agriculture, would, I believe, cause that reduction. We have designed the amendment to produce that very result.

Mr. ELLENDER. My reason for asking the distinguished Senator the question is that I have a letter from the Department which I think challenges the statement, and I expect to read it in a few moments, for the information of the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the Senator will find that the amendment last year overreached more than we had intended, for two reasons. First, it was tied to the 10-year average instead of being tied to a later and more limited period. Second. As I said a while ago, they interpreted conventional rotation in the old wheat States to be the same as dry land summer fallowing, which let in acreage which we did not intend to be included.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am informed that when the present law, Public Law 272, was enacted, in which is contained virtually the same amendment as is now proposed, the evidence produced showed that the amendment would not have the effect of increasing acreage over the national average to more than about 2,000,000. Is that not so?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I forget what the estimate was, but I very frankly say that the acreage under last year's amendment exceeded what we had anticipated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. My information is that there was some evidence to the effect that the increase over the national acreage allotment would be less than 2,000,000, or about 2,000,000. But as the record shows, it was increased 4,600,000 or 4,700,000, as I remember. As I recall, the amendment, when enacted last year, was supposed to take care of certain counties in western Kansas, in Oklahoma, some in Idaho, but when it came to apply it, it had to be applied to every State in the Union. Therefore, the greater increase over the national average resulted.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In view of the Senator's statement, let me say that the benefits under the act were larger than we anticipated. That came about through an error in the formula, which I have explained, and it came about through interpretations of the formula which counted in normal rotation, whereas we intended to limit it to dry-land summer fallowing.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator has already explained that, I do not want him to go into it further.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The next thing I should like to emphasize is that in this year's formula we have drafted a provision to get away from that. We have

also provided specifically—which overcomes another defect—that no farmer benefiting from this formula can benefit more than the old-wheat farmer in the same county. We found some situations where under the formula of last year a new wheat farmer might take 7½ percent reduction, and the old-wheat farmer 17½ percent. We intended nothing of that kind, and we place a specific limitation in the measure this year whereby the new-wheat farmer will not have a greater benefit than the average of the old-wheat farmers in the same county. I think that is a very equitable solution.

I should like to emphasize again, for the benefit of the Senator from Louisiana, who was momentarily called off the floor, that with this limited amendment, and with 1 year of it, we believe we can get ourselves adjusted so we can fit in with the national pattern.

There has been some objection to this amendment on the ground that some organizations were studying the whole wheat problem. We have no objection, of course, to people doing skull practice on the wheat problem. I should like to emphasize that the organization which proposes to start next week to study this subject, is studying a long-range program for wheat. We are limiting this amendment to meet a short-term situation, an emergent situation. We encourage their study of the long-term wheat problem as we encourage the study of all similar problems. But we think it is a confusion of an important subject matter to ask us to give up a position we must take to meet an emergency situation in the Western States, which will solve itself within a year or so, simply because someone is thinking on long-range problems. The same is true in the House of Representatives. They are engaged in a comprehensive study of the wheat problem. They have made a start with it. They will probably be continuing the study all through the remainder of the session, and I hope good will come from it. But our people must know what they can plant. They must know what machinery they must obtain. They must know about seed. They must finance themselves. The amendment is intended to meet that temporary purpose, as distinguished from measures which I hope will turn out to be better long-range wheat problem solutions.

I believe the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] amply emphasized the fact that we really do not solve our problem by withholding this temporary aid. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana whether he heard the discussion having to do with what will happen if we do not bring these people within the formula?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I did not. I am sorry I was not on the floor at that time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thought the senior Senator from Colorado developed a very striking point. We want to bring farmers within the formula so they will adjust and follow proper soil service practices. If they are left without the formula, the way for them to beat the game is to open three or four times more land than would otherwise be planted; therefore three or four times more wheat will be produced than otherwise, which in turn will in-

crease the national gross production, which in turn will make necessary deeper cuts in the next national allotment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Gladly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The only penalty for increasing the acreage is that a Government loan cannot be obtained on the support price. That is the only penalty the grower suffers if he goes outside the program.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. There is no prohibition against his doing it at all, but if he does so he does not obtain the support price for wheat. He may have to sell it for less, but he can sell it for considerably less if he doubles and trebles and quadruples his acreage, and can still come out with as good a financial result. But we have found that the effect of the amendment has been to encourage the growers to comply, and they have complied. It has had a very wholesome result.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator taken into consideration the suggestion that was made last year, and again recently, by the Department of Agriculture, and I read from a letter, as follows:

That a national reserve of approximately 1 percent of the national allotment would be adequate to provide additional acreage needed to relieve distress areas. This national reserve would be apportioned by the Secretary to such counties as he finds would suffer undue hardships under allotments determined under existing legislation.

In other words, rather than have the Senate adopt an amendment which would be applicable to the country as a whole, the Department would set aside, as I understand, 1 percent of the national allotment and use that in order to take care of such cases as the Senator has discussed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. My objection to the 1 percent does not necessarily go to the principle of a reserve. The 1-percent reserve is regarded as inadequate by the wheat farmers with whom I have discussed this matter.

They do not like to have the thing completely within the discretion of the Department of Agriculture. The present formula is a formula which can be followed by all who can read. It applies uniformly wherever it applies, and hits everyone equally, and without discrimination, who finds himself in the situation to which the amendment is applicable.

Mr. ELLENDER. The only difficulty, as I understand, stems from the fact that the adoption of the amendment would increase considerably the national acreage allotment. As I shall point out in a few moments, the amendment differs from the pending so-called cotton amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would respectfully answer the Senator by saying that in real effect I do not believe it would result in any increase. By its first initial impact there will be an increase but this year's formula reduces by perhaps 60 or 65 percent the increase resulting from the amendment of last year. The reason

I say that in ultimate effect I do not believe it in fact would increase anything is that if we do not give the farmers in question the benefit of securing this compliance they will multiply their wheat lands, grow more wheat, and ultimately we will have a larger national wheat production on which we will have to figure our national allotment, and no one will come out to the good on that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I made an attempt to compare the language contained in the law respecting the 1950 crop with the language in the pending amendment, and I do not see much difference. Can the Senator specifically point to the new language in the pending amendment which will cause the acreage to remain stationary rather than to increase it over the national average?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me invite the Senator's attention to the language of the amendment beginning on page 2, line 2. After setting out the summer fallowing formula—

Mr. ELLENDER. Which is the same as in the present law?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes. After setting that out—and there is a slight difference in comparison, and I will bring that to the Senator's attention—I read beginning in line 10 on page 2, as follows:

Adjusted in the same ratio as the national seeding for the production of wheat during the calendar year 1950 (adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trend in acreage) bears to the national acreage allotment for wheat for the 1951 crop;

Last year we tied that to the 10-year acreage. This time we have a limited comparison between the 2 years which are mentioned in that language. The experts who have consulted with me tell me that that will produce the effect we desire.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the basis for the reduction, from a national standpoint, will be decreased by using the 1951 acreage planted, rather than the 10-year average.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there anything else?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It was tying ourselves into the 10-year average that caused a great deal of our trouble. I assure the Senator that it was entirely unintentional. It caused some windfall results which none of us anticipated, and which we did not want.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator concedes, however, does he not, that the language of the bill will be beneficial to all wheat growers, and will not be confined to those in Idaho, Colorado, and Kansas who now are suffering because of the lack of a provision of this sort in the law?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It will apply to those who come within the following provisions:

(a) 50 percent of—

(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1949, and
(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1948 which was fallowed

and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1949, or—

As an alternative—

(b) 50 percent of—

(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1948, and

(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1947 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEFFEL in the chair). The time of the junior Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma will grant more time to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield one additional minute to the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield now to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I hope the Senator in charge of the bill will take the amendment to conference and will see what can be worked out there. The Department of Agriculture has offered an alternate plan. Perhaps when the conferees on the part of both Houses meet in conference, they will be able to work out a satisfactory provision, as between this plan and the alternate plan proposed by the Department. I most sincerely urge upon the Senator from Oklahoma that he give us at least the consideration of taking the amendment to conference. Of course, if the conferees on the part of the Senate are not able to work out the matter with the conferees on the part of the House, that will be one thing. Perhaps the conferees will adopt the language proposed as an alternate plan, providing for about 700,000 acres, I think; or perhaps the conferees will adopt the language which we think proper, permitting the acreage we think necessary, namely, just twice that much. The Senator said 1,250,000. Perhaps there will be some meeting of the minds of the conferees and the matter can be worked out and adjusted in conference. Certainly that is the place where adjustments should be made, rather than here on the floor of the Senate.

So I hope the Senator who is in charge of the bill will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to add my own earnest solicitation to the same effect.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute further to the junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator. I shall take a part of that minute to add my plea to that of my distinguished colleague. I hope the great chairman of the committee will take the amendment to conference and will see whether it will be possible for the conferees to work out something to relieve the distress of our people in that area of the country.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I understand that the Depart-

ment of Agriculture proposes an amendment. I yield now 15 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana, for a presentation of the Department's viewpoint.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to state at the outset that I am very sympathetic with the situation which exists in Colorado and in several other of the wheat-growing States in the western part of the country.

After a study of this amendment, I find that it does not accomplish the same purpose that it sought to be accomplished with respect to the cotton amendment. As to the cotton amendment, both the House version and the Senate version of the joint resolution were studied by the committee in the light of a considerable amount of evidence which was adduced by the growers, by the Farm Bureau, and also the Department of Agriculture itself. A reading of the hearings, will disclose that all witnesses, including those from the Department of Agriculture, are in agreement that the adoption of the cotton amendment will not increase the 21,000,000-acre ceiling which has been fixed in Public Law 272. The evidence shows that although a 21,000,000-acre ceiling was fixed, yet there will be in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 so-called "frozen" acres; in other words, acreage which will not be planted by the farmers, although they could plant it if they desired to do so.

It is a portion of the 2,000,000 "frozen" acres which the cotton amendment seeks to distribute among the cotton growers of the cotton-producing States, so as to adjust the inequalities which resulted from the present statute.

With respect to the wheat amendment, I desire to inform the Senate that in the committee we heard no witnesses on this amendment. There is no way to judge from the record how much the amendment will increase the wheat acreage. As I pointed out a moment ago, when a similar amendment was added to Public Law 272 the evidence produced then indicated that the increase in acreage would be less than 2,000,000 acres, as I recall the figure. However, it developed as I shall point out in a few minutes, when I refer to a report from the Department of Agriculture with respect to this amendment, that instead of increasing the acreage by 2,000,000 acres, which was the top estimated figure, the so-called wheat amendment in fact increased wheat acreage more than 4,000,000 acres. Further, the amendment which was adopted and passed as a part of Public Law 272, applied not only to the areas for which my friends, the Senators from Colorado, tried to make adjustments, because of inequalities, but also to the country as a whole. The letter which I propose to read shows that the amendment had the effect of giving wheat acreage to a number of localities which did not deserve it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, when we had the amendment before us a year ago, we had no idea that it would be applied to crop rotation States, where summer fallowing is not practiced at all. Alabama, Michigan, and many of the other States, in various sections of the country, which never practice summer fallowing, received large acreages for wheat, and that increased the amount of wheat produced.

Actually, we were thinking about summer fallowing. But the Department of Agriculture interpreted summer fallowing to be crop rotation, which is quite a different matter, and one which we did not contemplate.

A year ago we did not think the amendment would increase the wheat acreage by more than 2,000,000 acres. We are very certain this time that the acreage will not be increased more than a million and a quarter acres, at the most, a million and a half acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is referring to the national acreage, is he not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; the national acreage.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. According to Mr. Trigg, the Administrator, in the memorandum he presents on this matter:

It is estimated that continuation of the Public Law 272 provisions with respect to wheat, as proposed in H. J. Res. 398, would result in an increase of approximately 4,000,000 acres over and above the national acreage allotment for the 1951 crop of wheat, assuming a national allotment equal to that proclaimed for 1950.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I intend to submit to the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. President, as I understood the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], he sought to change the law so as to have it provide that instead of making the 10-year average the yardstick, the Administrator would use for that purpose the wheat planted in 1949. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Or in 1950.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, whichever year is used does not make a great deal of difference for the purpose of my question.

I should like to know how that would change the situation. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator be permitted to give me an answer to that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection permission is granted.

Mr. ELLENDER. The summary following is included in the amendment, with which we are now concerned, just as it was included in the amendment which was previously added to the present law. The language itself is not changed in that respect, hence the Administrator is apt to put the same interpretation on summer fallowing as he did in Public Law 272. Unless the Senator can point out in his amendment some language which would change that

situation, I doubt that the amendment would have the effect the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHN-SON] just pointed out.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In last year's amendment, after going through what we have referred to as the fallow-acreage part, the amendment provided—

Adjusted in the same ratio as the national average of seeding for the production of wheat during the 10 calendar years 1939-48 (adjusted as provided by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended)—

And then it continued, as follows—

bears to the national average allotment for wheat for the 1950 crop.

In this year's amendment, the comparable language is:

Adjusted in the same ratio as the national seeding for the production of wheat during the calendar year 1950—

We know what the national seeding is—

(adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trend in acreage) bears to the national acreage allotment for wheat for the 1951 crop—

Which is the forthcoming allotment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me point out that the distinguished Senator said the Department misinterpreted the use of the provision regarding fallow land; that is to say, instead of using what we know as fallow land, the Department included all other land not put into cultivation, including crop rotation. My question is this: Is there in this amendment language which will cause the Department not to follow the same interpretation of fallow-land as it did under Public 272?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should think the debate here itself would cause the Department not to follow the same course.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator think it would be better to make specific provision for that in the law?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is No. 1. There were several departmental interpretations. In the State of Colorado, for example, they required a man to choose; they gave him a choice as to whether he wished to come under the 10-year formula or under this formula. In many of the States the procedures were rigid, and that choice was not made available—perhaps through a misconstruction of the act. I am not challenging anyone's good faith; but through the whole series of constructions and interpretations, we found ourselves with something on our hands much bigger than we thought it would be. I am told that the difference between tying it in the way I have said—in other words, to a short period of recent years, rather than to a 10-year average—will perform the principal function of saving acreage for us.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to read for the information of the Senator the letter to which I referred a few moments ago. The letter is dated February 27, and is addressed to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. It reads as follows:

This is with reference to House Joint Resolution 398 which, in effect, proposes exten-

sion of the essential provisions of Public Law 272 with respect to wheat to be applicable to the 1951 crop of wheat.

We have carefully reviewed this proposed legislation and have come to the conclusion that its enactment would result in inequitable wheat acreage allotments and a needlessly excessive increase in the total wheat acreage allotment such as resulted from the application of Public Law 272 in 1950.

Our position is based on the following considerations:

1. The provisions of Public Law 272 were originally designed to relieve producers in summer-fallow areas where, because of material expansion in the acreage seeded to wheat, the regular trend formula as provided under basic legislation, did not permit adequate adjustments for such acreage expansion. The principal areas for which this legislation was to bring relief were the summer-fallow areas of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, and Idaho.

2. The provisions of Public Law 272 which were applicable to all farms in the United States, resulted in additional farm wheat acreage allotments totaling about 4,500,000 acres over and above the original national wheat acreage allotment as proclaimed. Analysis of the distribution of this additional acreage as between the different States reveals that at least half of the total increase was allotted to farms and areas where there did not exist a problem of adjustment of the original allotments as determined under the provisions of basic legislation. The provisions of Public Law 272, taking the higher of the acreage seeded to wheat in 1948 or 1949 as a basis for determining minimum farm acreage allotments, proved to be particularly objectionable in that it granted allotment increases where the wheat acreage was abnormally high because of unfavorable weather conditions having interfered with the normal planting of other crops.

3. A study of the areas for which relief was needed, and to which Public Law 272 was principally intended to apply, indicates that there were only about 50 counties where such adjustments were justified. These counties are largely in eastern Colorado, western Kansas, southeastern Idaho, and north-central Montana.

A map is attached showing the location of these distress counties.

I may say I have the map on my desk, and any Senator who may be interested has the privilege of looking at it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, if this is a convenient place?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Returning to the difference between the revised average we are using this year as compared to the one we used last year, the 10-year average is substantially under the high average which was planted in the past 2 or 3 years. The 10-year average is about 74,000,000 plus acres. The 10-year average figure made a reduction of 7.6 percent on the basis of the 10-year average, whereas on the basis of last year, compared with this year, it would have been a 17-percent reduction. That was the enormous slippage which occurred according to an erroneous comparison.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I see.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to invite the Senator's attention again to the fact that we specifically say in the pending amendment that—

Notwithstanding the foregoing, no allotment increased by reason of the provisions of this section shall exceed that percentage of the 1950 allotment for the same farm which (1) the acreage allotted in the county

to farms which do not receive an increase under this section is of (2) the acreage allotted to such farms in 1950.

That in itself will have a very restraining influence so far as enlarging the acreage is concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think there can be any doubt about that, I may say to the Senator; but the thing that puzzles me is why the Department had to allow so much of the acreage to States other than the ones for whose benefit the law was enacted. It interpreted "fallow land" as being any land not in cultivation, even crop rotation; in fact, the sky appeared to be the limit under the Department's definition of so-called fallow land. I understand there is nothing in the pending amendment to change the definition, or that would require or even induce the Secretary of Agriculture to interpret the term "fallow land" differently from the way he interpreted it last year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The debate last year, just as it has done this year, stated exactly what we meant by "summer fallow land." I do not know how it could be made more definite, even though we were to use 500 words to define it in the joint resolution. I doubt whether it can be made any clearer than it has been made in the course of the debate. Is the Department of Agriculture completely immune from the debate and the interpretations which are to be put upon laws as a result of what takes place in the Senate?

Mr. ELLENDER. Evidently it is, in this case.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Department not only applied normal legislation affecting farming in sections where fellows are operating perhaps on a 5-year plan, but it applied all kinds of soil-conservation practices as being within the conception of "summer fallow." It did not have to do a number of things it did, things which caused a lot of trouble to the Department itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. The greater part of the trouble resulted from the inability of the Department to determine the meaning of "fallow land." It appears to me that you Senators, the proponents of this amendment, should give consideration to a definition of what is meant by "fallow land," so that acreage will not be increased to the extent that it was increased under Public Law 272. You should not rely on what is said in debate. The Senator admitted a few moments ago that when Public 272 was debated fallow land was discussed in debate, but the Department took no heed of the interpretation placed thereon as Senators understood.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, it is as clear to us in our section of the country as the word "cotton" is to the distinguished Senator who has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. But it may not have the same meaning in Ohio, and it may not have the same meaning in Louisiana.

We have fallow land in the rice fields in Louisiana. There may be some land with characteristics similar to the rice land in Louisiana or the wheat lands in Colorado, but such land given a different name, or a different interpretation is placed thereon when considered in the light of fallow land. The Department found itself obligated to treat all lands alike, if they had the same characteristics.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I may make the statement, the Department felt itself obligated, not found itself obligated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I presume the Senator from Louisiana will be a conferee on the part of the Senate when the joint resolution goes to conference with the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. I imagine so; I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I hope he will be.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished chairman has just informed me that I probably will be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is good news to all of us, because we know how capable the Senator from Louisiana is and how well qualified to work out the question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield three additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield, getting to the point, will he consider taking to conference the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Colorado and myself, for the purpose of working out the solution to the problem, and will he also take with him the staff from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to see what can be worked out as between the two proposals? Would the Senator object to doing that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Speaking for myself, not for the committee, I would consider doing that. But I should prefer that the matter be left to Senators, and that is my reason for stating the views of the Department, in order that Senators in turn may make their own decisions. The Department, as I shall show in a few moments, does not favor the amendment, because it will not accomplish the purpose the distinguished Senator has in mind, but, on the contrary, will further aggravate the enormous wheat surplus we now have on hand. That is the difficulty.

If the proposal could be worked out in a manner whereby the national wheat acreage would not be increased, there might be some justification in our endeavoring to reach some kind of an agreement in conference. With that in mind, if the Senate should approve this amendment, I wish to state to the distinguished Senator that I shall work to that end. But I also want to state to my good friend that I was at first opposed to the cotton acreage resolution now pending before the Senate, believing that it might increase the ceiling fixed in the present law. However, when evidence was introduced to show that the

measure would add about 800,000 acres of the 2,000,000 acres which were frozen, and would leave a balance of 1,200,000 acres, under the ceiling fixed by the Department, I then decided to support the joint resolution. I understand that under the pending wheat amendment, in the light of information furnished to me by the Department, the wheat acreage would be increased in excess of 4,500,000 acres.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course we do not agree with that interpretation, but the 2,000,000 acres of frozen cotton of which the Senator speaks is, I think, comparable to the 4,500,000 acres of wheat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yield two additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shall continue reading from this letter, for the information of Senators. I think it is very important. There were no hearings on the amendment, and I should like the Senators present to have the full benefit of the views expressed by the Department after a study of the amendment. I read further:

Instead of confining the allotment increases essentially to these areas, the application of the provisions of Public Law 272 resulted in allotment increases for all wheat-producing States, and in most cases the additional allotments outside of the distressed areas were totally unwarranted, and have given rise to problems of inequities as between farm allotments. Furthermore, the needlessly large increases in the total wheat acreage allotment assigned to farms, if continued, would seriously impair the effectiveness of the adjustment and price-support programs.

4. It is estimated that continuation of the Public Law 272 provisions with respect to wheat, as proposed in House Joint Resolution 398, would result in an increase of approximately 4,000,000 acres over and above the national acreage allotment for the 1951 crop of wheat—

That is a far cry from the estimate just made by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, of approximately a million and a quarter acres. It is three times more—

assuming a national allotment equal to that proclaimed for 1950. A smaller national wheat acreage allotment for 1951 than for 1950 would not materially reduce the estimated additional allotment required to meet the minimum farm acreage allotment provisions of the proposed legislation. In fact, a lower national allotment may even cause a larger increase in the additional acreage because of the greater number of individual farms which would become eligible for adjustment under these provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the letter be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

5. The change in the 10-year base period, by which the national wheat-acreage allotment is apportioned to States and counties, from 1939-48 to 1940-49 as applicable to the 1951 crop of wheat, will, of itself, result

in a natural shift of larger acreage to the distressed areas. For example, the State of Colorado would receive approximately 210,000 acres more than in 1950, assuming the same national allotment. Obviously, the problem of providing special adjustments for these areas will be less acute in 1951 than it was in 1950.

6. The Department is taking the position, and has testified to that effect before a subcommittee on wheat of the House Committee on Agriculture, that a national reserve of approximately 1 percent of the national allotment would be adequate to provide the additional acreage needed to relieve distress areas. This national reserve would be apportioned by the Secretary to such counties as he finds would suffer undue hardships under allotments determined under existing legislation.

For the foregoing reasons, the Department recommends that the provisions of House Joint Resolution 398 not be enacted.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this afternoon, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will vote on House Joint Resolution 398 and all amendments pending. At that time, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself I shall call up our amendment H in the hope that the Senate will give it favorable consideration.

This amendment proposes to reduce the support prices on all so-called basic commodities by repealing, effective immediately, the rigid 90-percent support formula and making all agriculture commodities subject to the sliding scales of support levels set up in subsections (a) and (b) of section 101, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949. This is the so-called flexible formula.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 provides price support at 90 percent of parity for the 1950 crop of any basic agricultural commodity, if marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect and marketing quotas have not been disapproved. Paragraph (2) of such subsection (d) provides price support at not less than 80 percent of parity for 1951 crops under the same circumstances. Repeal of these two paragraphs would make the sliding scales of support levels set out in subsections (a) and (b) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 effective immediately, instead of waiting until January 1, 1952.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as a part of my remarks an analysis of this amendment as prepared by the legislative counsel:

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

Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 provides price support at 90 percent of parity for the 1950 crop of any basic agricultural commodity, if marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect and marketing quotas have not been disapproved. Paragraph (2)

of such subsection (d) provides price support at not less than 80 percent of parity for 1951 crops under the same circumstances. Repeal of these two paragraphs would make the sliding scales of support levels set out in subsections (a) and (b) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 effective immediately. The support level for tobacco whenever marketing quotas are in effect would, of course, continue to be fixed at 90 percent of parity by subsection (c) of such section 101; and any price-support levels announced by the Secretary prior to repeal of paragraphs (1) and (2) would not be affected by such repeal. I was advised by the Department today that no support level has been announced as yet for the 1950 crop of any basic agricultural commodity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In October 1949 when Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, the Anderson farm bill, was passed, I voted against the bill and pointed out at that time my reasons:

First. That the cost would be prohibitive from a taxpayer's standpoint,

Second. Under the rigid controls proposed it would mean the complete regimentation of our farmers, and the ultimate socialization of American agriculture,

Third. I warned then that the proposed high support prices for the basic agriculture commodities would benefit none but the large landowners in established areas. The cut-back in acreage necessitated by the high support price that would have to be imposed upon the small farmers would force many of them out of business.

The fact that I was correct is borne out by subsequent developments. The fact that here today we have the different groups—cotton, wheat, peanuts, and potatoes—all seeking corrective legislation to increase their acreage allotments for the small farmers proves that the law has not been satisfactory.

But I repeat my previous warning that the enactment of this bill today increasing acreage allotments for all these interests will not permanently correct the situation. Without adopting a provision to lower the support prices it might well prove to be the straw that broke the camel's back and destroy the entire farm program.

The American taxpayers are revolting against the enormous cost of this farm program. The consumers are becoming enraged at the wholesale destruction of food by the Government for the sole purpose of creating artificial shortages and thereby maintaining high prices.

Every acre added to the wheat, cotton, and peanut allotments under this bill will be directly at the additional expense of the taxpayers and prove of no benefit to the consumer unless we take some action to lower the support prices.

Already under this program of high support prices, as of December 31, 1949, the Government had accumulated under loans and inventories agricultural commodities totaling \$3,645,129,317.

The joint resolution before the Senate today proposes to increase the cotton acreage by 800,000 acres over what the Department of Agriculture lists as necessary, notwithstanding the fact that as of December 31, 1949, the Government already had in inventories and un-

der loans over \$955,000,000 worth of cotton. Nearly \$1,000,000,000 in cotton has been purchased at a price approximately 5 cents per pound more than the 10-year average farm price for this product.

We are also being asked, with the understanding that the Government will buy all the output, to increase the wheat acreage. Yet on December 31, 1949, the Government was holding under loans and inventories over 465,000,000 bushels of wheat at a cost of \$996,719,026.

We are being asked to increase the peanut acreage; yet the Government has spent over \$55,900,000 since June 30, 1949, alone to hold the market on peanuts at its high price of 10½ cents per pound against an average farm price, 1940-49, of only 7½ cents.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] charged this morning that this amendment proposes to go back to 1932, but I call his attention to the fact that the adoption of this amendment, assuming the lowest support price would be in effect, would still leave the support price higher in most instances than the prevailing prices at the farm in the past 10 years. This period includes the wartime years. That certainly is not depression legislation.

The same situation is true of practically all agricultural commodities under the support program and in order to save time I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record a chart listing over \$3,645,000,000 in commitments as of December 31, 1949, which includes \$1,725,064,794.27 in actual inventories and \$1,920,064,523 in outstanding loans under price-support operations.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Inventories

Program, commodity branch, and commodity	Quantity	Value (cost)
PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM		
Cotton:		
Cotton, American-Egyptian.....bales.....	582	\$166,251.16
Cotton, upland.....do.....	3,711,811	617,712,330.47
Cottonseed.....tons.....	66,352	3,342,280.18
Flax fiber.....pounds.....	178,145	84,019.76
Dairy:		
Butter.....do.....	96,260,088	59,518,796.82
Cheese.....do.....	23,148,193	7,780,437.48
Milk, dried.....do.....	215,779,300	27,399,459.87
Fats and oils:		
Linseed oil.....do.....	394,827,620	111,337,599.73
Peanuts:		
Farmers stock.....pounds.....	70,594,445	7,440,793.50
Shelled.....do.....	2,131,420	314,041.88
Fruit and vegetable:		
Fruit, dehydrated or dried:		
Prunes.....pounds.....	49,985,455	5,006,203.64
Raisins.....do.....	22,972,380	2,210,133.26
Potato starch.....do.....	10,632,658	630,095.76
Potatoes, Irish.....hundredweight.....	2,199	2,864.14
Grain:		
Barley.....bushels.....	24,626,019	35,088,095.71
Beans, dry edible.....hundredweight.....	4,850,795	42,859,926.40
Corn.....bushels.....	76,099,828	116,817,457.77
Flaxseed.....do.....	13,943,222	88,344,527.19
Grain sorghum.....hundredweight.....	6,151,995	17,314,716.92
Oats.....bushels.....	11,258,146	9,596,728.32
Peas, dry edible.....hundredweight.....	2,048	10,306.32
Rice.....do.....	431,820	2,936,252.60
Rye.....bushels.....	775,905	1,379,900.18
Seeds, hay and pasture.....pounds.....	725,422	146,515.37
Soybeans.....bushels.....	3,028,865	7,497,729.94
Wheat.....do.....	162,114,483	398,776,466.37

Inventories—Continued

Program, commodity branch, and commodity	Quantity	Value (cost)
PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM—continued		
Livestock:		
Wool:		
Appraised.....pounds.....	61,090,168	\$48,843,993.62
Unappraised.....do.....	8,313,732	4,666,473.47
Poultry:		
Eggs:		
Dried.....do.....	69,036,207	89,317,232.90
Liquid or frozen.....do.....	6,264	2,028.48
Turkeys.....do.....	725,480	309,173.80
Tobacco:		
Naval stores:		
Rosin.....do.....	210,837,798	17,110,995.49
Turpentine.....gallons.....	2,032,177	1,100,967.77
Total price-support program.....		1,725,064,794.27

Loans

Commodity	Quantities of collateral pledged	Value loans outstanding
Wheat.....bushels.....	303,112,461	\$597,942,560
Corn.....do.....	434,554,857	596,311,277
Cotton.....bales.....	2,324,777	337,397,041
Tobacco.....pounds.....	367,258,290	151,891,629
Other.....do.....		236,522,016
Total.....		1,920,064,523

Included under "Other" above were loans on flaxseed, peanuts, soybeans, potatoes, barley, dry edible beans and peas, grain sorghum, oats, rice, rye, rosin, turpentine, etc.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, immediately following this list of inventories I ask unanimous consent to have inserted another chart showing the actual support price of these commodities as compared with the 10-year average price the farmer received for the same commodities.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Support levels and 10-year average prices received by farmers on commodities now being supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation either under 1949 or 1950 price-support programs

Commodity	Unit	Support price ¹ (actual price)	10-year average price received by farmers 1940-49
Corn.....	Bushel.....	\$1.40	\$1.16
Peanuts.....	Pound.....	.105	.0755
Rice.....	Bushel.....	1.78	1.80
Wheat.....	do.....	1.95	1.49
Dry edible beans.....	Hundred-weight.....	6.55	6.30
Dry edible peas.....	do.....	3.07	2.42
Potatoes.....	Bushel.....	.96	1.24
Sweetpotatoes.....	do.....	1.72	1.86
Cotton.....	Pound.....	.272	.225
Cottonseed.....	Ton.....	49.50	53.20
Wool, shorn.....	Pound.....	.423	.406
Tobacco, flue-cured.....	do.....	.425	1.363
Barley.....	Bushel.....	1.09	.98
Grain sorghums.....	Hundred-weight.....	2.09	1.88
Oats.....	Bushel.....	.69	.656
Rye.....	do.....	1.27	1.19
Soybeans.....	do.....	2.097	2.03
Tung nuts.....	Ton.....	60.00	79.30
Butter.....	Pound.....	.60	.498
Eggs.....	Dozen.....	.37	.366
Milk.....	Hundred-weight.....	3.07	(9)
Cheddar cheese.....	Pound.....	.31	.278
Turpentine.....	Gallon.....	.40	1.582

See footnotes at end of table.

Support levels and 10-year average prices received by farmers on commodities now being supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation either under 1949 or 1950 price-support programs—Continued

Commodity	Unit	Support price ¹ (actual price)	10-year average price received by farmers 1940-49
Rosin (grade N).....	Hundred-weight	\$6.72	² \$4.87
Flaxseed.....	Bushel.....	3.744	3.46
Hay and pasture seed:			
Clover:			
Alsike.....	Pound.....	.25	² .235
Ladino.....	do.....	1.25	1.113
Red.....	do.....	.35	² .279
Sweet.....	do.....	.12	² .086
Grasses:			
Orchard.....	do.....	.15	² .168
Sudan.....	do.....	.05	² .045
Timothy.....	do.....	.06	² .054
Northern alfalfa.....	do.....	.32	² .284
Common lespedeza.....	do.....	.16	² .194
Turkeys.....	do.....	.31	² .291
Hogs:			
January 1950.....	Hundred-weight	14.90	15.20
February 1950.....	do.....	15.50	-----
March 1950.....	do.....	16.20	-----

¹ Support levels listed are those most recently announced. 1949 support price listed if 1950 program not yet announced.

² 1939-48 average.

³ Not available.

⁴ Certified seeds only.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unless some action is taken by Congress in the immediate future to correct this situation no one dares estimate the amount of next year's inventories.

The wholesale destruction of food and give-away programs which are inevitably a part of continuing this unrealistic program will prove to be a major national scandal, and might well result in complete repudiation of all agricultural benefits.

Not only are the taxpayers and the consumers clamoring for some action to correct this odious situation, but the eastern dairy and poultry farmers are also being forced out of business through the unwarranted high support on grain products.

We cannot continue this policy of supporting the western farmers at a level of wartime prosperity at the direct expense of the eastern farmer and city consumer. As evidence that this situation is being viewed with alarm by the eastern farmers I read into the RECORD a copy of a telegram received from Mr. J. A. McConnell, general manager of the GLF, of Ithaca, N. Y.:

ITHACA, N. Y., February 20, 1950.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,

Senate Office Building:

Following is the text of a telegram sent today to New York and New Jersey Senators and other Congressmen from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania: "Position of dairymen, poultrymen, and other northeastern farmers is rapidly deteriorating under present price squeeze. Grain prices supported at artificially high levels in the face of falling milk and eggs are making an intolerable situation. While consumers are benefiting from lower milk and egg prices, production of these foods cannot be maintained indefinitely unless costs can be reduced. Most Members of Congress are on record against further restrictions on food production, yet present situation is heading us right toward such.

CCC has been pushed by existing support legislation into asking for \$2,000,000,000 more, to lock up more grain supplies, which will further aggravate squeeze on animal industries and half of which will be almost certain further loss to the taxpayers. Dairy and poultry farmers, already pinched, face worse prospects ahead. Egg prices now scarcely cover cost of feed alone, hens almost unsalable. Milk prices continues downward. Present situation of vast grain surpluses held in dead storage with further action of same kind looming is intolerable. We urge immediate congressional action to lower grain support prices to 75 percent of parity or to a point that will unlock those vast frozen supplies."

J. A. MCCONNELL,
General Manager, Cooperative GLF
Exchange, Inc.

The adoption of our amendment advancing the effective date of the flexible provisions of the parity formula from January 1, 1952, to read "effective immediately," will not solve all of this problem, but it will be a step in the right direction.

I think Congress should start working toward the elimination of all wartime subsidies, and this farm subsidy is only one of the many affecting various segments of our industries, and which are being carried forward at an enormous annual expense to the American taxpayers. Now that we are enjoying relatively high prosperity, they are unnecessary.

Mr. President, now what would be the effect of making the flexible provisions of the Anderson Act effective immediately? It would mean that instead of maintaining a rigid 90-percent support level, the support price would be allowed to fluctuate between 75 percent and 90 percent on the basic commodities with the actual level depending upon supply. With today's heavy investments the support price on many of the basic commodities would drop to the 75-percent level.

Corn at 90 percent parity is being supported at \$1.40 per bushel. Under the flexible formula the support price of corn would fluctuate between \$1.22 and \$1.40. This minimum of \$1.22 would still be 6 cents higher than the 10-year average farm price for corn.

Wheat at 90 percent parity is being supported at \$1.95. Under the flexible formula the price of wheat could fluctuate between \$1.60 and \$1.95. I call attention to the fact that this minimum price of \$1.60 is still 11 cents higher than the 10-year average farm price for wheat. The 10-year period includes the war years.

Cotton, instead of being supported at rigid 90 percent, or 27.2 cents per pound, would be allowed to fluctuate between 22½ cents and 27 cents, depending upon supply. This minimum of 22½ cents on cotton is still equal to the average price the southern farmers have received for cotton during the past 10 years.

I will not take the time to enumerate how this amendment will affect all commodities, but these are fair examples. It is understood that the amendment will directly affect only those commodities now under the rigid 90 percent support. However, all other commodities not under the 90 percent formula which are

supported at a lower level will be lowered somewhat, in that one of the factors used in computing their base is their price relationship to the basic commodities, and as other commodity prices are lowered, the result is a general lowering across the board.

In view of the Government's huge commitments under this program, representing over \$3,500,000,000, and in view of the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has already warned the Congress that he will need an additional \$2,000,000,000 to continue this farm program at its present level, I feel that Congress has no alternative except to take some immediate steps to lower the cost of the program. We must do this not only to protect the consumer and to avoid the loss of billions of dollars, but we must take immediate action to safeguard the future security of every American farmer. That is what our amendment proposes to do.

Under this wasteful and destructive program of planned farming—and planned distribution—the American farmer is gradually losing his previous marketing system represented by free enterprise. Many of his traditional markets are being taken over by foreign producers. The producers of substitute products are taking over much of the domestic market. I know of no better way to illustrate this than to cite how the Canadian potato farmers have profitably increased their acreage, and at the same time increased their sales in American markets, at the expense of our domestic producers.

Again I cite how the manufacturers of rayon and nylon have expanded the use of their products, both in this country and abroad, at the expense of cotton and wool. This rapid expansion for their products has been possible largely as a result of cotton and wool being withheld from normal channels of trade through Government monopoly. Prices of cotton and wool are being maintained at artificially high levels and as long as this situation exists substitutes will continue to make inroads on their markets.

Mr. President, I have before me today's issue of the Wall Street Journal, on the front page of which an article calls attention to the fact that rug manufacturers and many garment manufacturers are using substitute products because of the excessively high costs of cotton and wool.

The farmers have lost many of their normal export markets since recently their former cash customers have been educated to expect American agricultural products as free gifts. They now refuse to even consider outright purchases.

Peanuts have been converted into oil for export because that procedure was more profitable under the existing high-support program. This has resulted in a gradual reduction in the consumption of peanuts through normal distribution channels.

Today farmers in all sections of the country are directing their attention to the production of high level supported crops, with the result that unless these

artificial high-support prices are lowered soon the western and southern farmers are going to wake up and find their monopoly on production gone never to be regained. Peanuts, cotton, tobacco, wheat, and corn are all being produced today by farmers in areas never intended to produce these crops under normal conditions.

The day of reckoning will be hard not only for these marginal producers, but also for the farmers in the South and Midwest, for unless they soon recognize the danger, they will never again regain their present position.

The American people should not be fooled by the socialistic proposals of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan. He has presented as a perfect solution for the agricultural problems a proposal whereby he promises to—

First. Give the farmers more money than they now receive;

Second. Give the consumer lower food prices; and

Third. Cost the American taxpayers less money.

At a later date I shall discuss this fantastic plan in detail. In the meantime I would suggest that if anyone is interested in knowing how the Brannan plan of Government-controlled production and Government-controlled distribution will affect American farmers, he should read the farm program as it is now functioning, under the socialistic regime in England.

I urge that the Members of the Senate join with us today in removing the farmers from the political auction block by taking this first necessary step toward restoring some degree of sanity in our agricultural program. Let us begin a systematic reduction in the unrealistic support prices. Let us put a stop to the scandalous policy of wholesale destruction of good edible foods in a country where many of our own people do not have the actual necessities of life.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware and his colleagues would bring into operation in the present crop year the reduced sliding scale of parity protection which would come into operation in 1952 under the normal operation of the so-called Anderson bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Would it be considered to be what has been described as an orderly procedure for getting an equitable adjustment for the farmer by dropping him sharply as much as 15 percent in 1 year?

Mr. WILLIAMS. This would apply only in one or two instances. For instance on wheat it would apply because it is in excess supply. I point out to the Senator from South Dakota, however, that there is nothing wrong with our changing the rate at this time. It was in October of last year, after the 1949 crop had been harvested and after the winter

wheat crop which will be harvested in 1950 had been planted, that Congress took action to extend the 90-percent provision. Congress increased last October the parity guaranty on this crop last October after it was planted and we have now a perfect rate to reduce it to its previously scheduled rate. Had the Congress not taken that action last October the flexible provisions of the Hope-Aiken law would have gone into effect on January 1, 1950, which would have provided a sliding scale between 60 and 90 percent, a little lower than that now proposed.

What is proposed today is the putting into effect of the flexible provision of the Anderson Act, at a time prior to the planting of the 1950 corn or cotton or spring wheat. We are within our rights to change the law before these crops are planted, in exactly the same manner as we increased the rate in October 1949 after the fall wheat crop was planted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that since the enactment of the Steagall amendment, in 1938, the farmer has been operating under one set of regulations guaranteeing him a firm parity support price of 90 percent. The Senator now proposes to drop that by 15 percent, especially in the case of crops produced and harvested in the Midwest, therefore precipitating what I am sure would result in farm-operating chaos in that section of the country. When the prosperity of this great farming area in the Middle West is adversely affected or destroyed, the entire structure of our economy and prosperity throughout the country are jeopardized, because seven times the production of this section of the country each year amounts to the total national income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think I have used only 20 of the 30 minutes which had been allotted to me and I will yield the remainder to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WHERRY. How much time does the Senator want? Does he desire 10 minutes more?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 more minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to point out to the Senator from South Dakota that there is nothing proposed under our amendment which would in any way affect the normal prosperity of the farmers to whom he refers. If the amendment shall be agreed to, the support price on corn at the 75-percent minimum would still be \$1.22 a bushel. That certainly is not a depression price. The average price the farmers have received for the past 10 years for corn, including the war years—was \$1.16 a bushel. The support price at the minimum would still be 6 cents higher than the average price they had received in 1940-49.

The average price of the wheat sold in the West was \$1.49 for the period between 1940 and 1949. The amendment would drop the support price from \$1.95, so it could fluctuate as low as \$1.60. This

is 11 cents higher than the 10-year average farm price. We cannot continue to maintain these prices in the Midwest at 25 to 30 percent higher than the wartime level, at the expense of the taxpayer and the eastern dairy and poultry farmers, and the city consumers.

Mr. MUNDT. In the interval the Senator has described, however, the prices which the farmers have been compelled to pay have steadily gone higher instead of going lower. When the Steagall amendment was written, the farmer, who is the greatest consumer in this country, was paying his fair share of a 40-cent minimum wage, and now he is paying a 75-cent minimum wage throughout the country.

Correspondingly, all his other prices are going up, at a time when the Senator from Delaware proposes to drop his support price 15 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that while that is true, at the same time the prices at which the eastern farmers, the eastern poultrymen and dairymen, are selling poultry and dairy products in the East have been declining. At the same time, the Government has been taking their tax moneys and supporting the western farmers at an extraordinarily high level. Their earning power has been reduced and their taxes increased as a result of this extravagant and wasteful program. We surely do not want a repetition of 1932. I agree with the Senator in that respect. But that does not mean that we can afford to continue to take money out of the Treasury and support a level of prosperity for the western farmers higher than that which they enjoyed during the war.

I should like to have the Senator from South Dakota answer me this. What plan does he have to get rid of the \$3,500,000,000 of surplus agricultural products which we have today—it may be \$5,500,000,000 worth next year, since the Secretary says he needs two more billion dollars? What are we going to do with these products unless we destroy them? Surely the Senator from South Dakota does not advocate that we destroy them? You cannot overlook the fact that our inventories are continuously to grow larger under the present program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for the very eloquent and articulate manner in which he defends the poultry farmers of the East. Looking at the sponsorship of this particular proposal I recognize it to be from among Senators who are particularly interested in the poultry interests of the East.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In reply, I will say that the poultry and farmers to whom he has referred, whose interests I have at heart, yes, have so far operated without coming to the Government and asking for any subsidy; which is more than the Senator from South Dakota can say for his farmers. I wish the Senator from South Dakota would join with me in taking his farmers off the back of the taxpayers. The eastern poultrymen voted again the other day that they did not think the answer to their problem was Government subsidy. They went on

record again against asking the Government to underwrite their losses. I feel that the least the western farmers can do is to accept a lower support price—to take some of their own risk. Do not expect the Government, out of the Treasury, to guarantee the farmers of the Midwest a margin of profit greater than that which existed during the war. A continuation of this unsound policy will ultimately result in repeal of all farm-support legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator's farmers in Delaware are to be commended for being able to continue on their own. I do not blame the Senator one bit for defending his farmers. The poultry farmers of America have their own organization, and they can speak for their own industry. But it certainly seems to me there must be some other solution to the problem than facing the dire prospect of an immediate depression affecting the great portion of our population represented by the diversified farmers of the Midwest.

If the Senator from Delaware will yield to me a little longer, because I have some measure of interest in the 10 minutes additional time allotted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I should like to point out further to the Senator that I concur with him that the Anderson bill does not provide good, adequate, permanent farm legislation. I think we must have better legislation than that. I think the Anderson bill misses entirely some of the features that farm legislation should have. But obviously, in a 10-minute postscript to the speech of the Senator from Delaware, we are not going to devise a comprehensive farm bill for America. Until we have such legislation available, however, I do not think we should drive the dagger into the back of the American farmer in the Midwest and say, "You take this 15 percent cut. You get into the slough of depression. You go ahead and make it easier for the poultry farmers of the East." The poultry farmers of the East have their problems, but after all they are not the majority of the farmers of the country, and their problems do not represent the greater portion of the farm problems of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are not proposing to bankrupt the farmers in the West. Also, the poultry farmers in the East are not solely the ones interested in this problem. One hundred and forty million Americans, as taxpayers and consumers, are interested in the bill. They are becoming greatly concerned over the fact that the Government is piling up huge surpluses of agricultural products respecting which no one apparently has a program of disposal, except one of destruction.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not asking the Department to destroy them. There is now enough legislation on the statute books to provide for disposition of the surpluses in an orderly and economic fashion. The fact that the Department does not do so is no reason why they are authorized under the law to refrain from properly disposing of the surpluses.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no way to dispose of \$3,500,000,000 of agricultural

commodities except to lower the price. I point out that what we are proposing to do today is to lower the price from the artificially high level at which it is now being maintained, higher than the wartime level of prices. Even then the prices would be higher than those received during the past 10 years. The minimum, under our amendment, would in many instances be higher than the price the farmers of the Midwest received during the war. The Senator cannot tell me that his farmers in the Midwest went broke during the war. The farmers of the Midwest have simply been spoiled.

Mr. MUNDT. The costs which the farmers are paying are rising steadily. The prices of things the farmers had to buy were fixed during the war years. OPA fixed prices and wages. Now control of such prices have, rightfully, been taken off, and the prices of the things the farmers are buying are skyrocketing. While the prices of goods the farmers buy are skyrocketing, the Senator from Delaware proposes to bring down the prices of products he is selling. I cannot, right in the middle of a Monday afternoon, think of a better way to bankrupt the farmers than the proposal which is now made to bring down the prices of the commodities he has to sell.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If they cannot operate efficiently, some of them should go out of business. If they cannot produce corn today as cheaply as during the war, there is something wrong.

Mr. MUNDT. There is nothing wrong with the farmer. What is wrong is the economy of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are headed for even more severe postwar inflation unless Congress takes recognition of and acts to stop the many spending programs proposed to be put into effect. Programs which are going to cost billions and billions of additional dollars of the taxpayers' money. We will have the inflationary spiral which the Senator has been describing and lamenting this afternoon unless we begin reducing the cost of government.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the Senator agree with me that the way to deal with postwar inflation is to push prices down horizontally, and not simply permit certain prices to remain at their artificially high level while the prices paid to the farmers for their products are driven down?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the Senator that wherever we begin there will be those who say, "Begin with the other fellow first." We must begin somewhere, sometime, if we are going to restore any degree of sanity in the cost of government. There is no better time to begin than now.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is now absent from the Chamber, allotted me 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to speak in support of the amendment of the Sen-

ator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] designed to require the President to exercise the power which he very clearly has under the existing law, but which during the past year he has failed to exercise. I share the concern of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] as to economy in Government. While I cannot agree with him on the repudiation of what I believe to be the Government's obligation in connection with the current program on potatoes, it is plainly within the province of the administration, and the exercise of authority it possesses, to exclude the potatoes from our neighbor to the north, which are simply adding to the surplus we now have. Some five or six million bushels have already come in, and it is estimated that eight or ten million additional bushels will come in, which will cost us from ten to fifteen million dollars. While I realize that ten to fifteen million dollars is a small sum, in view of our current deficit, the saving of that amount, at any rate, would be a substantial contribution, and one which could be achieved without doing injustice to anyone.

A good deal of question was raised as to our relations with Canada. The suggestion was made that this was one of the ways that Canada could pay her debts to the United States; that her trade balance was adverse; that she was buying here more than we bought from her; therefore that this was one way to permit her to accumulate her balances. I can appreciate the force of that argument, but at the same time I think our first obligation is to make sure the maintenance of a strong economy here at home, and one which shall not unduly tax us.

In addition to the annual trade balances, which are adverse as between us and Canada, there are the very large sums which are being invested in Canada by Americans. More than 500,000,000 American dollars are invested in Canada in various enterprises. While that does not appear in our current trade statistics, it is a very substantial contribution to the balance of payment, and explains some of the reasons why we find that Canada during the past year has exercised a prudence in this matter which is conspicuous by its absence in our own agricultural and trade policies.

I am very happy to quote from the Foreign Commerce Weekly, published by the United States Department of Commerce, Charles Sawyer, Secretary, Office of International Trade, Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., Director. This covers the field surveys of the Department of Commerce, and it contains a report on the policies pursued by our Canadian friends, which are in glittering contrast to the policies pursued here. To those who are concerned as to whether we will injure the Canadian economy by prohibiting the importation of potatoes which we do not need, and which simply contribute to our surplus, I would commend the careful consideration of this report by the Department of Commerce, on page 15, of the issue of November 15, 1948, entitled "Tariffs and Trade Controls—Import Restrictions Relaxed on Certain Fruits and Vegetables."

The article shows us the policy pursued by Canada.

Lettuce and tomatoes may be imported into Canada from any source under open general permits, effective November 1, 1948, according to an announcement of the Canadian Minister of Finance in Ottawa, on October 19. Later in the winter similar general permits will be authorized for cabbage, carrots, celery, and spinach.

I ask Senators to note carefully what follows:

These latter relaxations will be timed so as not to prejudice the normal marketing of Canadian produce.

We should consider that carefully, Mr. President.

I read further:

Imports of each of the commodities will be authorized only when advancing prices or short supplies indicate depleted domestic stocks.

Mr. President, if that is good policy for Canada, why is it not good policy for the United States? If the Canadians have the intelligence to protect their own agricultural economy, why have not we here in the United States? The President exhibited that intelligence a year ago when he took steps to stop this inundation. I am wondering whether the curious inaction of the administration in the face of these mounting surpluses, with the inundation from Canada threatening our own economy, is a result of stupidity, is a result of ignorance, or is a result of a calculated determination to accentuate the potato problem for the benefit of those who are advocating solutions of our agricultural problem other than the one we have been seeking to pursue. If this was a deliberate attempt to sabotage the existing farm program, it could not be better calculated to accomplish that objective.

So, Mr. President, Senators on either side of the aisle who suggest that we must not under any circumstances stop the importation of Canadian potatoes, because that is the only way by which the Canadians can get United States dollars, may well take a lesson from our Canadian cousins, who recognize that their primary responsibility is to the people and the industries and the agriculture of their own area.

Mr. President, I read further:

For specified periods during the summer months, imports of cabbage and carrots were permitted under general permit. Lettuce, celery, tomatoes, and spinach, however, have been prohibited importation since November 18 of last year.

There we have it operating.

I note the very interesting report on their own economy and their own farm income:

For the fourth quarter of 1948, import quotas for citrus fruits, fruit juices, potatoes, onions, and apples—

I call the reference to apples to the especial attention of my good friends the Senators from Virginia—

have been increased from the present 50 percent to 70 percent of imports during the base year, July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947.

In other words, all the commodities about which our friends express so much

concern are under automatic restrictions and quotas in respect to what can be sent into Canada. I commend the Canadians for their wisdom and foresight and patriotic self-protection.

I read further:

Also for the last quarter, grapes—

I think they have been mentioned in connection with California—

which have been wholly prohibited importation, may be imported under quota on the basis of 70 percent of the dollar value of each importer's base year imports.

All the above products will be subject to maximum mark-up controls under the Canadian wartime prices and trade regulations.

Mr. President, so much for the question of whether we have a right and a duty to restrict importations, if we follow the Canadian policy, inasmuch as the Canadians are under the same trade agreement that we are.

Now let us look at the record in respect to how this is operated for the Canadian farm income. I read further:

A cash return of approximately \$974,212,000 was realized by Canadian farmers from the sale of farm products during the first 6 months of 1948, according to preliminary estimates of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. This amount compares with cash returns of \$620,193,000 and \$732,704,000 during the corresponding periods of 1946 and 1947, respectively.

In other words, their income was rising to maximum heights.

I read further:

With the inclusion of supplementary cash payments (i. e., cash payments made under the provisions of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act in 1946, 1947, and 1948; the Wheat Acreage Reduction Act of 1946 and 1947; and the Prairie Farm Income Act in 1946), cash receipts during the first 6 months of 1948 amounted to \$989,572,000—

Practically a billion dollars—

as compared with \$742,626,000 for the corresponding period a year ago and \$636,244,000 in the first half of 1946.

Mr. President, I shall not read further figures; but the article also states:

The rising return from the sale of farm products is paralleled by the upward trend in prices received by Canadian farmers for agricultural products. The index of farm prices registered a new high of 250.8 (1935-39=100) during the month of July as compared with 248.6, the previous high, recorded in June 1948, and 203.1 in June 1947.

In other words, the Canadians not only are conducting their own affairs prudently, with regard to their international trade relations, but also they are demonstrating their success by the results in terms of their own farm income.

So I earnestly hope the appropriately drawn amendment of the Senator from Nebraska will receive the support of the Senate, and that we will tell the President in no uncertain terms that there is no reason for buying 10,000,000 bushels of Canadian potatoes, while at the same time dumping 10,000,000 bushels of American potatoes. Certainly, Mr. President, he who runs may read the significance of that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire how much time I have remaining.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] is recognized.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly in behalf of the amendment which has been offered by the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], in behalf of himself, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and myself. That amendment would make effective immediately the flexible price support provision in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. President, I listened with considerable interest while the able Senator from South Dakota was questioning our colleague, the Senator from Delaware. In that connection, I point out that the great problem with which we in the Northeast are faced, when it comes to the cost of grain, is the problem confronting the dairy industry, and only in part the problem confronting the poultry industry. The price of grain has become so high that the cost of production of milk is completely out of line with what the producers of milk are now receiving for it. That comment also applies to the present situation in the poultry industry and to the prices that poultry producers are now receiving.

I do not think the Senator from South Dakota was in the Chamber when the Senator from Delaware read the telegram from Mr. J. A. McConnell, general manager of the Cooperative GLF Exchange, Inc. I wish to read a couple of statements appearing in that telegram, as follows:

Position of dairymen, poultrymen, and other Northeastern farmers is rapidly deteriorating under present price squeeze. Grain prices supported at artificially high levels in the face of falling milk and eggs are making an intolerable situation.

Mr. President, I happen to know that the farm conditions in the Northeast are worse today than they have been at any time for at least 15 years. That is how badly this price support situation is affecting the Northeast.

It is unfortunate that in formulating the agricultural bill last fall, we stopped where we did, or perhaps that we went as far as we did, depending upon how one desires to view it. In this connection, I am constrained to quote in part from my remarks during the debate on that bill, as some may remember, was passed by the Senate on October 19. I read the following from the speech I made in the Senate at that time:

There is not a Member of the Senate who believes that this bill is a fair bill. We all know that it is not. There is not a Member of the Senate who does not know that it has serious defects.

I would be strongly in favor of this conference report or any other bill of this type, for that matter, if it were only to provide high prices for the producers. But, much as this bill may conform to that requirement, there is much more to it than that. If that were all there were to it, our problem would be a very simple one.

This bill may provide high prices for producers. That is expected. That is its pur-

pose. But at the same time it means even higher prices for consumers. It means ever higher governmental expenditures.

It is high time for us to take stock of our position and to come down to earth and consider existing conditions. We want as high prices as reasonably can be obtained for the producer, but at the same time we must recognize the rights of the consumer and the taxpayer, as well as the rights of the American people generally. All these rights are not being recognized in this particular piece of legislation.

This legislation is not geared for the welfare of all the American people. It is not even geared for the ultimate welfare of those in agriculture. As surely as we are in session here today, if this bill is enacted and left in force, Senators who support it * * * will be haunted by the action they are taking.

Mr. President, again I am constrained to observe that, verily, chickens do come home to roost, because if there is anything that is evident today, in the light of what has happened, insofar as potatoes are concerned or insofar as other crops are concerned, it is that the statement I made at that time was absolutely correct. Of such is my chief objection to the bill now before us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. IVES. May I have two more minutes?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield the Senator from New York two more minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes more.

Mr. IVES. This legislation, Mr. President, is going to make the conditions which I have cited even worse, if such a thing be possible. There is no cure for anything in the pending measure. It seems to me that we should now be taking action to correct conditions and not to make them worse. This is why I feel so strongly that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware is so much in order. I do not say the amendment, in and of itself and alone, provides a complete solution to the problem; but very definitely, any solution, if there is ever to be one, must lie in the direction toward which the amendment points. For that reason I am especially glad to give it my wholehearted support.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it seems to me the arguments we have been listening to from the Senator from Delaware and New York demonstrate very clearly the fact that we do not presently have adequate farm legislation in the Anderson bill. With that I concur completely. It is a piece of legislation which removes from the statute books the Hope-Aiken bill, which I thought was exceedingly bad legislation, which was passed in the hurly-burly hours of the closing days of the Eightieth Congress, and which I opposed and voted against.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware and other Senators associated with him would put us right

back where we were, with the Hope-Aiken bill, plus 10 percent, because it would drive down the prices of certain commodities, especially in the middle-western area and certain regions of the South, to 75 percent of parity. The Hope-Aiken bill theoretically would have permitted them to fall to 65 percent of parity. So it puts us back to the Hope-Aiken level, plus only 10 percent, and, with or without the 10 percent, and with the formula devised under the Hope-Aiken bill, with its low production floors, there might be precipitated a national crisis and a world-wide depression. If we start tampering with the economy of America, resting as it does upon farm prices and farm prosperity, by casually adopting in the middle of a debate on potatoes an amendment which will revolutionize the entire farm program, under which the country has been operating for more than a decade, we are then flirting with a fate which may be far beyond the boundaries of anything envisioned by the two fine eastern Senators, with their interests, and their understandable interests, in the chicken farmers and the dairy farmers of the Northeast.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will agree with me, will he not, that in 1952, January 1, the same bill will go into effect, and if it is such a dangerous piece of legislation that it is going to bring all the dire circumstances the Senator has just described, how does he account for the fact that we are going to operate as proposed in 1952?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the Senator raised that question, because I have addressed a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who is on the floor, suggesting that as one Senator I feel that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should bring forth a new bill, new legislation which will better provide for a farm program than the Anderson bill. I have received a nice letter from the chairman, indicating that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is giving the idea some thought and consideration, thus at least affording some hope that that kind of legislation is going to be forthcoming from the committee before the present session of the Congress adjourns.

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

Mr. MUNDT. In a moment.

I hope, however, it will receive more consideration, as I am assured, than a revolutionary approach to the farm program, tossed into the debate in the middle of a Monday afternoon on what to do about potatoes in Maine, Idaho, South Dakota, and a few other potato-raising States.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator recognizes, however, does he not, that the crisis among northeastern farmers is, as the Senator from New York has indicated, and that the crisis has been brought about largely because of the

present farm law, particularly that portion relating to farm prices?

Mr. MUNDT. I recognize that there is a crisis. I do not think the Senator has put his finger on the cause of it, because in testimony recently given before the House committee Secretary Brannan pointed out that about 50 percent of all the consumers pay for the products of the dairying business and egg business of the East is added to it after it reaches the limits of the cities in which they are distributed. I think there is a considerable amount of correction to be done in the processes by which milk, eggs, and butter are distributed in the eastern cities.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MUNDT. Not at the moment, because I do not want the two Senators to believe that it is only the farmers of the East who are in difficulty, or the consumers. I quote now from a statement recently made by Secretary Brannan in testifying before the House Committee on Appropriations, requesting appropriations for agriculture for 1951. Says the Secretary of Agriculture:

Farmers have been making less every year for the past few years. Last year they had less than four-fifths as much as in 1947. Next year they may have only two-thirds as much as in 1947.

Since 1947 gross farm cash income has fallen more than \$2,000,000,000, and cash expenses have gone up by more than \$1,000,000,000.

The statement of the Secretary bears out the fact I was stating a little earlier in my colloquy with the Senator from Delaware, that the farmer of the great agricultural area of the Middle West is caught between a very vicious pair of mill stones, one of which is constantly raising against him the pressure of prices going higher on the things he has to buy; the other, the pressure pushing down against him from people wanting to sell his products at less than 90 percent of parity; yes, at less than 85 percent of parity, down as low now as 75 percent of parity; abruptly changing in the course of a few months a situation which he is envisioning as coming along by 1952, and which he and many of us hope to correct before that time, a situation which would precipitate the farmer into chaotic conditions as of 1950.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to point out at this time to the Senator from South Dakota that those conditions do exist now to a substantial extent in the dairy industry area of the Northeast, and in part for the reasons the Senator has pointed out. The real difficulty is that the cause is due largely to the high prices which are required to be paid by those farmers for the feed that must be fed to the cattle and poultry. It is not a matter of distribution that the condition is largely attributable, not at all. The Senator from New York has had considerable

experience going into that subject. Efforts have been and are being made to curtail those costs of distribution. They are being curtailed. But when it comes to the minimum point of distribution costs, below which it is impossible to go, the dairy farmers and the poultry farmers of the Northeast are still out of luck, due to the high costs of feed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. May I have two additional minutes?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield five more minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for five more minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. I should like to say it is unquestionably true that some progress is being made in reducing the costs and the complications of distribution, but a greater amount of correction is still to be done in that area, and certainly it cannot be expected if the grain-producing farmers of the Middle West are going to have to operate consistently at a loss, in order to correct a situation existing in the dairying and egg-producing region; all of which it seems to me tends to build up an argument for the consideration by this body of new farm legislation, which is comprehensive, which is equitable, which recognizes the farmers' right to a full parity price, certainly for that portion of his crop which is domestically consumed.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Before yielding further, I should like to point out a few more melancholy facts revealed by the Secretary of Agriculture concerning the farmers of the country. He said:

Last year—

That was 1949—

farm operators had about \$14,000,000,000 after paying production expenses. This was 15 percent less than they had in 1948, and at least 20 percent less than in 1947.

I should like to call attention in passing, and particularly the attention of Republican Senators, to the fact that in this testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, Secretary Brannan appeared in the rather unusual and novel capacity of a great witness in support of the kind of prosperity existing under the Republican Eightieth Congress, because he says that consistently and without exception the farmer has been getting worse treatment steadily since the adjournment of the last session of the Eightieth Congress.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Before yielding, I want to continue with a few more facts from the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture:

The farm-family purchasing power, in terms of 1947 dollars, dropped about \$2,000,000,000 in 1948, and about \$2,000,000,000 more in 1949. It could drop another \$2,000,000,000 in 1950 or another 15 percent if farm prices aren't improved. Farm living expenses, of course, are not coming down as fast as net income.

So the farmers of the great farming area confront the inevitable fact that the prices of everything they buy are steadily rising, in part because, out of consideration for a vast portion of the population on the eastern coast, people who are naturally and understandably concerned about the 75 percent wage minimum, the farmer has had to have that additional burden shouldered upon him. It is simply impossible for him to continue to pay more and more money for a tractor, more and more money for an automobile, more and more money for the combines and other machinery he needs, and at the same time have his prices pushed lower and lower.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A few minutes ago the Senator described the amendment which is now pending, the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, the Senator from Delaware, and other Senators as being revolutionary in character. I point out to the Senator from South Dakota that there is nothing revolutionary in our proposal. The flexible provisions which we are proposing to advance, effective immediately, were acted upon after lengthy hearings last year by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senate voted on the measure. The pending proposal is exactly the same as that which the Senate has approved, effective immediately. However, when the bill came back from conference last year the provision had been eliminated.

Mr. MUNDT. May I point out the reason for its having gone to conference?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Both political parties have endorsed the flexible provisions. So has the Farm Bureau, the greatest farm organization in the country.

Mr. MUNDT. If I may point out the reason why it went to conference, in the first instance, it was because, by the help of the Vice President, a tie vote was broken and there was written a firm parity floor under farm prices. The bill went to conference, and when it came back it contained again the old sliding parity formula, which looked so bad that even its sponsors said, "While we ask Senators to vote for it, we cannot possibly expect them to go home this summer and explain it. We cannot hope the farmers are going to accept it. We think it is so distasteful, so unworkable, we do not want to put it into effect until 1950 or 1951. It would immediately disrupt the whole farm program, including the farm price-support program."

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

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot yield at the moment, because I have already given my good friend a greater percentage of my 10 minutes than he gave me. I want to keep the thing equitable.

The Secretary of Agriculture, testifying through his assistants, pointed out that the farmers today are not the fine, privileged characters they have been described, but that they have less stay-on-the-farm income, less money for themselves, than they received in 1947, 1948, or for a long time prior to that. The

testimony points out that most of the farm commodities are bringing less than parity—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield one more minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot yield if I have only 1 minute. Prices are now unfairly low. Prices have dropped 23 percent since the high point in January 1943, and 12 percent in the past year.

Let me point out how illogical we shall appear before the farming population of America if, in the middle of a debate to solve an urgent problem regarding potatoes, we should casually adopt an amendment which would change the whole program under which the farmers have been operating since 1938.

I urge Senators to reject emphatically the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. How much time do I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eight minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able senior Senator from Georgia what his attitude would be regarding the peanut amendment which would permit the growers of the Virginia type of peanuts, which are raised in North Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and South Carolina, to have increased acreage allotments so that the production would meet the market demand.

Mr. GEORGE. I would not oppose it, because I believe in permitting our farmers to meet the actual demand for their own products. The amendment does not increase acreage at all. It merely permits the sale of the product from excess acreage at the market price. No subsidy is involved.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield the remainder of my time to the majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have listened rather attentively to the debate on the various farm problems which we have been discussing in the Senate for the past week. I am somewhat disturbed at the trend which the debate has taken and by the convictions which have been expressed by a number of Senators with reference to different commodities in which their sections of the country are vitally interested.

We find coming over from the House a joint resolution which seeks to increase the acreage of peanuts. The resolution which is before the Senate seeks to increase the acreage of cotton, and there is justification for that increase, because it has been definitely stated before the committee that under no circumstances

would there be more than 21,000,000 acres planted to cotton. On that theory I supported the cotton amendment. We now find an amendment offered by the two distinguished Senators from Colorado increasing the wheat-acreage allotment by approximately 4,000,000 acres, which, according to the Secretary of Agriculture, on an average of 16 bushels to the acre, would cost the Treasury of the United States approximately \$60,000,000, assuming that the wheat yield will be the same as it was last year. Last week the Senate of the United States decided that it was not advisable to save \$60,000,000 with respect to the potato farmers, after a rather lengthy debate the Senate defeated the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois which would have eliminated price supports until marketing quotas were in effect. This action demonstrated that those Senators who are particularly interested in the potato farmers are more interested in seeing that those farmers get what they think they are entitled to, rather than in saving many millions of dollars for the taxpayers of the country.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I have only 5 minutes, but I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Illinois just stated that the amendment offered by the Senators from Colorado would increase by approximately 4,000,000 acres the wheat-acreage allotment.

Mr. LUCAS. That is one estimate, and it has also been stated that it would increase the acreage approximately 1,000,000 acres.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Secretary of Agriculture is incorrect in his estimate.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my good friend from Colorado that even if it is only a million acres there can be no question that it is another increase in the acreage allotment, so far as wheat is concerned. The Farm Bureau Federation and the Secretary of Agriculture are both against the amendment.

Mr. President, I repeat what I previously said, that I am disturbed when I see Senators from various sections of the Nation asking for more acreage on which to raise certain commodities, when we have all the acreage we can take care of at the present time, when it comes to disposing of the surpluses grown on this acreage.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot help yielding to my friend, because I have great affection for the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The junior Senator from Colorado is disturbed about these conditions, but he is also disturbed about the plight of farmers in western Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Idaho, and Colorado who will be out of business if they do not receive an equitable share of the whole allotment.

Mr. LUCAS. The same argument was made last year by the distinguished Senator from Colorado. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to have the

amendments go to conference and let the conference wrestle with them. I am merely trying to point out to the Congress what we are doing with the present agricultural program, I am greatly disturbed about the proposed increases in acreages of the various basic commodities. I was certainly disturbed by our failure to take vigorous action on potatoes a few days ago. Most of the 43 votes against my amendment were cast by Senators who are the first to cry "socialism." They are the ones who are the most vocal in their denunciation of Government subsidies, and in their protests against Federal spending. They justified their stand on continuing the potato subsidy by declaring that there was an implied contract for the 1950 crop. That argument was answered, to all intents and purposes, by the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] during the debate. Despite this fact, the supporters for more potato subsidies said, "We must go on giving this subsidy to the potato growers of the country at the expense of the taxpayers of the Nation."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senators who cry "economy" and then vote for another agricultural subsidy of \$60,000,000 or more will have difficulty justifying their actions to the taxpayers of America.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, those who cry "economy" on one hand and then vote and continue to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska are just as inconsistent if not more so, because the majority leader is against the amendment which would prevent surpluses caused by imports of foreign nations in which there are no restrictions or marketing quotas, from being dumped on to the markets of the United States of America.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska is now the pending question, and it will probably be voted upon first. I say once again that it has nothing to do with reciprocal-trade agreements. It has not a thing to do with peril points. There is a provision under article XI, subsection (c), paragraph 2, which provides for the very thing asked in the amendment of the junior Senator from Nebraska. Last year the Secretary of Agriculture was in favor of the amendment. This year he is not in favor of it. We receive conflicting stories with reference to the State Department not agreeing with the Agricultural Department. I shall not go to Nebraska and talk to the potato farmers and tell them I was willing to vote marketing restrictions against them and, at the same time, permit those who produce potatoes in a foreign country to send them to our market without any quotas or restrictions and receive the complete benefit of price supports about which the majority leader has been speaking. The amendment I have offered is completely consistent with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It is only a temporary measure; it is not a permanent measure.

Regardless of the estimate given by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Department of Agriculture advises me that the imports of Irish

potatoes this year, if they should continue at the present rate, will be 15,000,000 bushels. That is more than one-third of the entire surplus about which we are speaking. If we are going to start to do anything about eliminating surpluses, certainly the place to start is with importations from nations which impose no restrictions and no marketing quotas but are able to take advantage of our markets under price supports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired. All time for debate has expired.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Brewster	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Humphrey	Mundt
Butler	Hunt	Myers
Byrd	Ives	Neely
Cain	Jenner	O'Connor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Darby	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Leahy	Stennis
Eastland	Lehman	Taylor
Eaton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	Long	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Lucas	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hendrickson	Malone	
Hickenlooper	Maybank	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the committee amendment the following new section:

That whenever the supply of Irish potatoes in the United States is, or is practically certain to be, in excess of the goal of production or national production allotment set by the Secretary of Agriculture, pursuant to section 401, Public Law 439, Eighty-first Congress, the President shall proclaim that fact, and thereafter, until such time as the President may determine and proclaim that such a surplus no longer exists, no Irish potatoes or products thereof shall be imported into the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNNEY] is unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Florida

[Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—31

Brewster	Gurney	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Butler	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Jenner	Tobey
Cordon	Langer	Watkins
Darby	McCarran	Wherry
Donnell	McCarthy	Wiley
Dworshak	Malone	Williams
Eaton	Millikin	
Ferguson	Morse	

NAYS—46

Byrd	Connally	Ellender
Chapman	Douglas	Frear
Chavez	Eastland	Fulbright

George	Knowland	O'Connor
Graham	Leahy	O'Mahoney
Green	Lehman	Robertson
Hayden	Lodge	Russell
Hill	Long	Sparkman
Hoey	Lucas	Stennis
Humphrey	McClellan	Taylor
Hunt	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Colo.	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Tex.	Magnuson	Tydings
Johnston, S. C.	Maybank	Withers
Kerr	Myers	
Kilgore	Neely	

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken	Holland	Saltonstall
Anderson	Kefauver	Taft
Benton	Kem	Thye
Capehart	McFarland	Vandenberg
Downey	Martin	Young
Flanders	Murray	
Gillette	Pepper	

So Mr. WHERRY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer my amendment lettered H, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. For the crop year of 1951 and thereafter no price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

Mr. ELLENDER. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the roll was called.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—64

Byrd	Connally	Douglas
Cain	Cordon	Downey
Chapman	Darby	Eastland
Chavez	Donnell	Eaton

Ellender	Kerr	O'Connor
Ferguson	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Frear	Knowland	Robertson
Fulbright	Leahy	Russell
George	Lehman	Schoeppel
Graham	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Green	Long	Sparkman
Hayden	Lucas	Stennis
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	McKellar	Tobey
Humphrey	McMahon	Tydings
Hunt	Magnuson	Watkins
Ives	Maybank	Wiley
Jenner	Millikin	Williams
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Withers
Johnson, Tex.	Myers	
Johnston, S. C.	Neely	

NAYS—14

Brewster	Gurney	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Langer	Taylor
Butler	McCarran	Wherry
Dworshak	Malone	

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken	Holland	Pepper
Anderson	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Benton	Kem	Taft
Capehart	McFarland	Thye
Flanders	Martin	Vandenberg
Gillette	Murray	Young

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and myself, I offer the amendment lettered H, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

That paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (Public Law Numbered 439, Eighty-first Congress) are hereby repealed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I am informed that if he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold by vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and

the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent and his pair has been announced previously by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—17

Bricker	Hendrickson	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Ives	Tobey
Byrd	Knowland	Tydings
Cain	Lodge	Watkins
Ferguson	O'Connor	Williams
Frear	Robertson	

NAYS—59

Brewster	Hoey	Malone
Butler	Humphrey	Maybank
Chapman	Hunt	Millikin
Chavez	Jenner	Morse
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Darby	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Douglas	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kilgore	Russell
Dworshak	Langer	Schoeppel
Eastland	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Lehman	Sparkman
Ellender	Long	Stennis
Fulbright	Lucas	Taylor
George	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Graham	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Green	McClellan	Wherry
Gurney	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	Withers
Hill	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—20

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Anderson	Holland	Saltonstall
Benton	Kefauver	Taft
Capehart	Kem	Thye
Connally	McFarland	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Young
Gillette	Murray	

So the amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS, on behalf of himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer and send to the desk an amend-

ment, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and myself, to repeal paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of section 101, effective January 1, 1951. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

That paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (Public Law No. 439, 81st Cong.), are hereby repealed effective January 1, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If he were present and voting, I am informed that he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Penn-

sylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent and his pair has been announced previously by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—20

Bricker	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Tobey
Cain	Lodge	Tydings
Cordon	McCarran	Watkins
Ferguson	Morse	Williams
Frear	O'Connor	

NAYS—55

Brewster	Hoey	Maybank
Butler	Humphrey	Millikin
Chapman	Hunt	Mundt
Chavez	Jenner	Myers
Darby	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Donnell	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Downey	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	Leahy	Stennis
Ellender	Lehman	Taylor
Fulbright	Long	Thomas, Okla.
George	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Graham	McCarthy	Wherry
Green	McClellan	Wiley
Gurney	McKellar	Withers
Hayden	McMahon	
Hill	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—21

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Pepper
Benton	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Taft
Connally	McFarland	Thye
Flanders	Malone	Vandenberg
Gillette	Martin	Young

So the amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS, on behalf of himself and other Senators, was rejected.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment, which I have modified, and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) That section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(g) Beginning with the 1950 crop of peanuts, payment of the marketing penalty as provided in subsection (a) will not be required on any excess peanuts which are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated each year by the Secretary. Any peanuts received under this subsection by such agency shall be sold by such

agency (i) for crushing for oil under a sales agreement approved by the Secretary; (ii) for cleaning and shelling at prices not less than those established for quota peanuts under any peanut diversion, peanut loan, or peanut purchase program; or (iii) for seed at prices established by the Secretary. For all peanuts so delivered to a designated agency under this subsection, producers shall be paid for the portion of the lot constituting excess peanuts, the prevailing market value thereof for crushing for oil, less the estimated cost of storing, handling, and selling such peanuts. Any person, who, pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, acquires peanuts for crushing for oil and who uses or disposes of such peanuts for any purpose other than that for which acquired shall pay a penalty to the United States, at a rate equal to the marketing penalty prescribed in subsection (a), upon the peanuts so used or disposed of and shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both, for each and every offense. Operations under this subsection shall be carried on under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"(h) For the purposes of price support with respect to the 1950 and subsequent crops of peanuts, a 'cooperator' shall be (1) a producer on whose farm the acreage of peanuts picked or threshed does not exceed the farm acreage allotment or (2) a producer on whose farm the acreage of peanuts picked or threshed exceeds the farm acreage allotment provided any peanuts picked or threshed in excess of the farm marketing quota are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (g) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"(i) The provision of this section shall not apply with respect to any crop when marketing quotas are in effect on the corresponding crop for soybeans."

(b) That the second sentence in paragraph (d) of section 358 is amended to read as follows: "Any acreage of peanuts harvested in excess of the allotted acreage for any farm for any year shall not be considered in the establishment of the allotment for the farm in succeeding years."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator ask to be recognized?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a statement of one sentence respecting the pending amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The House joint resolution carries a provision respecting peanuts, and the committee has no objection to the pending amendment, because the question will be considered in conference, anyway.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. TOBEY. Could this be characterized as peanut politics? [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. [Laughter.] The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—49

Byrd	Hunt	Millikin
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Douglas	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kilgore	Robertson
Eastland	Leahy	Russell
Eaton	Lehman	Schoeppel
Ellender	Long	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lucas	Stennis
George	McCarran	Taylor
Graham	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McMahon	Tydings
Hill	Magnuson	Withers
Hoey	Malone	
Humphrey	Maybank	

NAYS—28

Brewster	Gurney	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Ives	Tobey
Cain	Jenner	Watkins
Cordon	Knowland	Wherry
Darby	Langer	Wiley
Donnell	Lodge	Williams
Dworschak	McCarthy	
Ferguson	Morse	

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken	Holland	Saltonstall
Anderson	Kefauver	Taft
Benton	Kem	Thye
Capehart	McFarland	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Young
Frear	Murray	
Gillette	Pepper	

So Mr. GEORGE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 16.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understand the Senator in charge has no objection to the amendment's going to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is not in order.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the farm acreage allotment of wheat for the 1951 crop for any farm shall not be less than the larger of—

(a) 50 percent of—

(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1949, and

(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1948 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1949, or

(b) 50 percent of—

(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1948, and

(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1947 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1948;

adjusted in the same ratio as the national seeding for the production of wheat during the calendar year 1950 (adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trend in acreage) bears to the national acreage allotment for wheat for the 1951 crop; but no acreage shall be included under (a) or (b) which the Secretary, by appropriate regulation, determines will become an undue erosion hazard under continued farming. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no allotment increased by reason of the provisions of this section shall exceed that percentage of the 1950 allotment for the same farm which (1) the acreage allotted in the county to farms which do not receive an increase under this section is of (2) the acreage allotted to such farms in 1950. To the extent that the allotment to any county is insufficient to provide for such minimum allotments, the Secretary shall allot such county such additional acreage (which shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments otherwise provided for under the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended) as may be necessary in order to provide for such minimum farm allotments.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a telegram received from the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is in the nature of an argument for or against the joint resolution, it would not be in order.

Mr. GURNEY. I am not asking to read it; I am asking that it be printed in the RECORD at this point. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a point of order. Would it be in order by unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it would be in order.

Mr. GURNEY. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

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

LAMOURE, N. DAK., February 27, 1950.

Senator CHAN GURNEY:

I believe Senate approval of Millikin-Johnson amendment would be serious blow to whole wheat support program and may well lead to another surplus situation which the same as we now have with respect to potatoes. If we are to maintain present price support, production must be reduced and not by favoritism to any particular area. Present legislation adequate to permit Secretary of Agriculture to make necessary adjustments. Secretary has 4,507,000 acres to make adjustments between States. Colorado received from this pool 789,225 acres, North Dakota 300,000 acres, South Dakota 243,856 acres. Historically, Colorado ranks lower in production of wheat than either North or South Dakota. There is widespread dissatisfaction in spring wheat area now on part of wheat farmers. They feel, and rightfully so, they are being discriminated against. Acreage this area has remained approximately constant for many years, while other areas have increase. Extension of Millikin-Johnson amendment as contained in Public Law 272 would make our producers in spring wheat area bear an unreasonable share of necessary reduction while other areas would be given increased base. Most reliable authorities here predict that if Millikin-Johnson amendment is approved, at least 25 percent of farmers in spring wheat area will not comply with acreage reduction requirements. This area already bearing brunt of reduction program and in greater need of special legislation than most other areas. Millikin-Johnson amendment was not presented to Senate Agricultural Committee. Did hold hearings, but refused to take a permanent action. Hope you can make this telegram a part of records.

Regards.

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 16, offered by the Senators from Colorado.

Mr. LODGE and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SAL-

TONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—49

Brewster	Hayden	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Myers
Butler	Hill	Neely
Cain	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Hunt	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Darby	Kerr	Stennis
Downey	Long	Taylor
Dworshak	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Eaton	McClellan	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Watkins
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wherry
George	Malone	Withers
Graham	Maybank	
Gurney	Millikin	

NAYS—24

Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Byrd	Kilgore	O'Connor
Donnell	Knowland	Robertson
Douglas	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Green	Lehman	Tobey
Hickenlooper	Lodge	Wiley
Ives	McMahon	Williams

NOT VOTING—23

Aiken	Holland	Murray
Anderson	Humphrey	Pepper
Benton	Jenner	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kefauver	Taft
Cordon	Kem	Thye
Flanders	Lucas	Vandenberg
Frear	McFarland	Young
Gillette	Martin	

So the amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. MILLIKIN was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendments, the question is on committee amendment as amended.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which has been sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, at the end of section 2, it is proposed to add the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to offer for sale at the point of storage any potatoes produced in surplus areas and now in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation to wholesalers, jobbers, retailers, or consumers, for distribution and consump-

tion in deficit areas, at prices per bushel which will return to the said Commodity Credit Corporation its total investment in such potatoes, including handling and carrying costs: And provided further, That the Secretary is authorized to define surplus areas with respect to the production of potatoes and also deficit areas where such potatoes may be distributed: And provided further, That this proviso shall be complied with prior to either giving away or the destruction of any potatoes now in the possession of the said Commodity Credit Corporation."

(On request of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and by unanimous consent granted earlier during the course of today's debate, the following letter, addressed by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to the Secretary of Agriculture, was ordered to be printed at this point in the RECORD:)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 24, 1950.

HON. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the hearings and consideration of the so-called Anderson farm bill, I made two suggestions which did not meet with the approval of your Department.

The first suggestion was that an Assistant Secretary be provided for the express purpose of developing and supervising a marketing department for the disposal of commodities taken over under the CCC loan and purchase program.

The second suggestion was that in communities where surplus commodities have been or are being taken over, that such commodities should be made available to citizens in the deficit areas.

At the present time potatoes have been or are being taken over at approximately \$1 per bushel, while the average price received by farmers throughout the entire country is some 81 percent of parity, or \$1.36 per bushel. In some parts of the country potatoes are selling as high as \$2.85 per bushel, as in Florida, and \$2.45 per bushel in Mississippi; such prices are being received by farmers.

Insofar as I can learn, potatoes are not being sold at any point in the United States at a figure as low as the Government's support price. To me this means that with a little effort the potatoes on hand could be distributed throughout the United States and sold in deficit areas at such a price as would enable your Department to either make a profit or lose but little money in the handling of such commodities.

The argument against this policy heretofore has been that if the Government initiated a policy of distributing its surplus commodities, that such commodities would come in direct competition with like products produced locally and that such a policy would, in effect, defeat the over-all price-support program.

If my information is correct, I do not believe this argument is sound. In the past we have taken over great quantities of cotton and later the Government has disposed of such cotton locally and, in many cases, at a substantial profit.

I understand that the CCC is now selling corn and other products taken over under loans at prices below the loan or support price.

My motive for making this suggestion with respect to potatoes is to try to check an obvious uprising of criticism against our entire

support price policy. I have been in my State recently and everywhere I went I was confronted with this potato problem. The people are unable to understand why they have to pay 3½ to 5 cents per pound for potatoes at a time when our Government has millions of bushels on hand and is seeking a way to destroy the product, rather than trying to distribute the potatoes among the people who are in need and want such product.

I am advised that the CCC has recently made a contract with the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. wherein such railroad company has granted a substantial reduction in freight rates on shipments of potatoes sold and delivered to the Publicker alcohol plant located at Philadelphia. I am further advised that the Publicker plant is receiving the potatoes at the cost of 1 cent per hundredweight, plus the reduced freight rate that has been secured by the CCC.

Of course, I think it better to dispose of the potatoes as indicated rather than to destroy them, however, such program cannot be explained satisfactorily to the people who are having to pay rather high prices for this commodity. Further, it is my opinion that under the Agriculture Act of 1949 you have the authority to dispose of these potatoes either by destruction or by sale at a nominal price, or at any price you can get for such commodity.

Under section 407 of such act the CCC may sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at any price not prohibited by said section.

Under subdivision (D), it is provided that "sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is a danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage"; which means, as I understand the law, that there is no restriction against the sale of such commodities at any price that may be obtained for same.

If my interpretation of the law is correct, then the issue resolves itself into a question of policy, and inasmuch as the Government has heretofore sold and distributed commodities domestically, it occurs to me that such a policy should be worked out and carried into effect with respect to potatoes.

I submit the foregoing suggestions to you for such consideration as they merit.

Yours most cordially,

ELMER THOMAS.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SAL-

TONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—71

Brewster	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bridges	Hill	Morse
Butler	Hoey	Mundt
Byrd	Hunt	Myers
Cain	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Jenner	O'Connor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Darby	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Downey	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Leahy	Sparkman
Eastland	Lehman	Stennis
Ecton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McCarran	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tydings
George	McClellan	Watkins
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	McMahon	Williams
Gurney	Magnuson	Withers
Hayden	Malone	

NAYS—6

Donnell	Knowland	Taylor
Ellender	Long	Wherry

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Anderson	Kefauver	Taft
Benton	Kem	Thye
Capehart	McFarland	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Young
Gillette	Murray	
Holland	Pepper	

So the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the

Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—53

Byrd	Hunt	Mundt
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Darby	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Kilgore	Robertson
Douglas	Leahy	Russell
Downey	Lehman	Schoeppel
Eastland	Long	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	McCarran	Sparkman
George	McClellan	Stennis
Graham	McKellar	Taylor
Green	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hendrickson	Malone	Tydings
Hill	Maybank	Withers
Hoey	Millikin	

NAYS—24

Brewster	Ferguson	Lodge
Bricker	Frear	McCarthy
Bridges	Gurney	Morse
Butler	Hickenlooper	Tobey
Cain	Ives	Watkins
Cordon	Jenner	Wherry
Dworshak	Knowland	Wiley
Ecton	Langer	Williams

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Anderson	Kefauver	Taft
Benton	Kem	Thye
Capehart	McFarland	Vandenberg
Flanders	Martin	Young
Gillette	Murray	
Holland	Pepper	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) was passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary be authorized to make the title conform to the text of the joint resolution.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution relating to farm acreage allotments for cotton and wheat under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and to price support for potatoes and peanuts."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution, as passed, be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

Resolved, That the joint resolution from the House of Representatives (H. J. Res. 398) entitled "Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended," do pass with the following amendments: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 344 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) Any part of the acreage allotted to individual farms in any county under the provisions of this section which will not be planted to cotton in the year for which allotted and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotments to such farms and may be reapportioned within the State in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, preference being given to other farms in the same county receiving allotments which the Secretary determines are inadequate and not representative in view of their past production of cotton. Any transfer of allotment under this paragraph in any year shall not operate to reduce the allotment for any subsequent year for the farm from which acreage is transferred; except in accordance with paragraph (1) (B) and the proviso in paragraph (2) of this subsection: *Provided*, That any part of any farm acreage allotment may be permanently released in writing to the county committee by the owner and operator of the farm and may be reapportioned in the manner set forth above.

"(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and without reducing any farm acreage allotment determined pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, each farm acreage allotment for 1950 shall be increased by such amount as may be necessary to provide an allotment equal to 60 per centum of the average acreage planted to cotton (or regarded as having been planted to cotton under the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) on the farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948; but no such allotment shall be increased by reason of this provision to an acreage in excess of 40 per centum of the acreage on the farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation, determined in the same manner and with the same exclusions as provided for by paragraph (2). Determination of the average acreage planted or regarded as planted on any farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948 shall be made by the county committee after consideration of such evidence as may be submitted by the owner or operator, and shall be subject to review by the State committee. An increase in any 1950 farm acreage allotment shall be made pursuant to this paragraph only upon application in writing by the owner or operator of

the farm within such time as may be prescribed by the Secretary, and the amount of any such increase shall not exceed the amount requested in such application. The acreage allotment computed in accordance with paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection (f) for each year subsequent to 1950 for each farm receiving an increase in its 1950 acreage allotment pursuant to this paragraph shall be increased by such amount as may be necessary to provide an allotment equal to its allotment for the preceding year increased or decreased, respectively, in the same proportion that the county acreage allotment is greater or less than the county acreage allotment for the preceding year; but no allotment shall be increased by reason of this provision to an acreage in excess of the largest acreage planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) to cotton on such farm during any of the preceding 3 years. To the maximum extent possible, the Secretary, and State, and county committees shall carry out the provisions of this paragraph in 1951 and subsequent years by use of the acreage reserved under sections 344 (e) and 344 (f) (3) and by reallocated acreage under paragraph (4) of this subsection. The additional acreage required to be allotted to farms under this paragraph shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota.

"(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section and without reducing any farm-acreage allotment determined pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection, in the case of any State with an allotment for 1950 amounting to less than 3,000 acres, the allotment for such State shall be increased by an additional acreage of 2,000 acres to be used for establishing allotments for new farms in 1950. The additional acreage required to be allotted under this paragraph shall be in addition to the county, State, and National acreage allotments and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota."

"Sec. 2. No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes harvested after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas hereafter authorized by law, or marketing agreements and marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to offer for sale at the point of storage any potatoes produced in surplus areas and now in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation to wholesalers, jobbers, retailers, or consumers, for distribution and consumption in deficit areas, at prices per bushel which will return to the said Commodity Credit Corporation its total investment in such potatoes, including handling and carrying costs: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to define surplus areas with respect to the production of potatoes and also deficit areas where such potatoes may be distributed: *And provide further*, That this proviso shall be complied with prior to either giving away or the destruction of any potatoes now in the possession of the said Commodity Credit Corporation.

"Sec. 3. For the crop year of 1951 and thereafter no price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

"Sec. 4. (a) That section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(g) Beginning with the 1950 crop of peanuts, payment of the marketing penalty as provided in subsection (a) will not be re-

quired on any excess peanuts which are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated each year by the Secretary. Any peanuts received under this subsection by such agency shall be sold by such agency (i) for crushing for oil under a sales agreement approved by the Secretary; (ii) for cleaning and shelling at prices not less than those established for quota peanuts under any peanut diversion, peanut loan, or peanut-purchase program; or (iii) for seed at prices established by the Secretary. For all peanuts so delivered to a designated agency under this subsection, producers shall be paid for the portion of the lot constituting excess peanuts, the prevailing market value thereof for crushing for oil, less the estimated cost of storing, handling, and selling such peanuts. Any person who, pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, acquires peanuts for crushing for oil and who uses or disposes of such peanuts for any purpose other than that for which acquired shall pay a penalty to the United States, at a rate equal to the marketing penalty prescribed in subsection (a), upon the peanuts so used or disposed of and shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both, for each and every offense. Operations under this subsection shall be carried on under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"(h) For the purposes of price support with respect to the 1950 and subsequent crops of peanuts, a "cooperator" shall be (1) a producer on whose farm the acreage of peanuts picked or threshed does not exceed the farm acreage allotment or (2) a producer on whose farm the acreage of peanuts picked or threshed exceeds the farm acreage allotment provided any peanuts picked or threshed in excess of the farm-marketing quota are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (g) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"(i) The provision of this section shall not apply with respect to any crop when marketing quotas are in effect on the corresponding crop for soybeans."

"(b) That the second sentence in paragraph (d) of section 358 is amended to read as follows: 'Any acreage of peanuts harvested in excess of the allotted acreage for any farm for any year shall not be considered in the establishment of the allotment for the farm in succeeding years.'

"Sec. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the farm-acreage allotment of wheat for the 1951 crop for any farm shall not be less than the larger of—

"(a) 50 percent of—

"(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1949, and

"(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1948 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1949, or

"(b) 50 percent of—

"(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1948, and

"(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1947 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1948;

adjusted in the same ratio as the national seeding for the production of wheat during the calendar year 1950 (adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trend in acreage) bears to the national acreage allotment for wheat for the 1951 crop; but no acreage shall be included under (a) or (b) which the Secretary, by appropriate regulations, determines will become an undue erosion hazard under continued farming. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no allotment increased by reason of the provisions of this section shall exceed that percentage of the 1950 allotment for the same farm which (1) the acreage allotted in the county to farms

which do not receive an increase under this section is of (2) the acreage allotted to such farms in 1950. To the extent that the allotment to any county is insufficient to provide for such minimum allotments, the Secretary shall allot such county such additional acreage (which shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments otherwise provided for under the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended) as may be necessary in order to provide for such minimum farm allotments."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HOEY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. THYE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Because of the importance of the joint resolution which has just been passed, and the interest in it which is prevalent throughout the country, I ask that as many copies as the Secretary of the Senate may deem proper be printed for use of the Folding Room and the Document Room.

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

COMMUNISTS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE— FIRST REPORT OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for two or three minutes. It will be recalled that a few days ago the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 231, dealing with charges as to loyalty of employees in the State Department, and so forth. The Foreign Relations Committee met on last Saturday and authorized the chairman to appoint a subcommittee. The Senator from Texas, as chairman of the committee, appointed the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to be members of the subcommittee.

The subcommittee met today and formulated a statement which it desires the chairman to make on the floor of the Senate. I send the statement to the desk, and ask that it be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

FIRST REPORT OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 231

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 231, herewith makes its first report.

1. The committee met Saturday, February 25, and appointed the following subcommittee to pursue the work encompassed in said resolution. The subcommittee is as follows: Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, chairman; Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island; Senator McMAHON, of Connecticut; Senator HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa; Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts.

2. In order that the subcommittee and the full committee may discharge their task in accordance with said resolution, the subcommittee was instructed as follows:

"To make a full and complete study and investigation of all Government employees now in the Department of State and former employees of the Department of State now in other agencies of the Government against whom charges are made in order to determine whether or not said employees are or have been disloyal to the United States, and to use the power of subpoena whenever necessary."

3. It was further resolved by the subcommittee and later by the full committee that the scope and procedure outlined above be brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the second paragraph of the report purport to follow the terms of the resolution under which the committee was directed to act?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say, first, that the subcommittee was unanimous, and the full Committee on Foreign Relations was unanimous in making this report. The subcommittee made it for the reason that, as Senators will understand if they read the first section of the resolution adopted by the Senate, we did not know how far back we should go. We could go all the way back to Thomas Jefferson, and, of course, no one assumed that the Senate would want the committee to go back that far. The resolution provides for an investigation of all charges made against persons who are now employed or who have been employed by the State Department and have gone to another agency of the Government. The committee instructed the subcommittee to do that, though it was not necessary, so as to try to inform the Senate that we were going to do what the debate seems the Senate wanted us to do, although the resolution, in the ambiguous way in which it was drawn, might leave us under the impression that we were to do things the Senate did not have in mind when it adopted the resolution.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was on the floor at the time of the adoption of the resolution and was present during the debate on it and I offered an amendment to the resolution. In view of that fact, the Senator from Michigan cannot see how the report complies with the resolution itself. One amendment was offered to extend the language from "then in the employ of the State Department" to "or have been in the employ of the State Department," for the specific reason, as was said in the debate, that charges have been made against persons who have been in the employ of the State Department and who have been discharged.

Under the present interpretation by the committee, it is apparent that if an employee left the Department before the date of the adoption of the resolution—even the day before—he or she would not be investigated, under the interpretation by the committee, unless he or she went to another department.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it the purpose of the Senator to have us investigate persons who are not now in the employ of the State Department, who are not employed by any other agency of the Government, and who have been out of the Department for 10 or 15 years?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, what length of time shall we consider? The resolution does not specify any length of time. That is the point. If the Senate wants us to investigate all persons charged who have left the Department, and who are not now employed by the Government, or have not been within a 5-year period or a 3-year period or a 10-year period or a 25-year period, we can do that. But as it stands we do not know whether we ought to go all the way back, as I have said, to the time of Thomas Jefferson, or where we ought to start.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was clear by the language of the last amendment adopted that investigation should be made of all persons against whom charges were made or against whom charges had been heard. Charges were placed in the record of the Senate by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] against numbers rather than particular persons. As I understand, the Senator from Wisconsin indicated that he will give to the committee the names of all those persons. It was the intention of the Senate, as I read the resolution, that all persons against whom charges were made were to be investigated, whether they then were in the State Department, in other agencies, or were out of Government.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Since the Senator from Michigan offered the amendment, and since that is what he expected to be accomplished by the adoption of the amendment, and since the amendment was adopted without calling the committee together, I think I can say to the Senator on behalf of all the members of the committee that whatever charges the Senator from Wisconsin brings against present or past employees of the State Department, irrespective of where they are now, will be investigated even though not physically included in the charges presented to the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is a fair explanation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I only wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate this matter which I submitted to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that there ought to be some limitation, and

the Senator from Michigan has marked out the area which I will be glad to pursue. I think the Senator will see that without this discussion, however, the committee might conceivably have been charged with bad faith in not going back beyond the McCarthy charges.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I think the debate clearly indicated that the resolution meant to include persons against whom charges have been made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a moment before he yields to the Senator from California?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator from Michigan and to others who are interested, that all the charges preferred by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCarthy], whether the employees are now in the Department, whether they have left the Department and are not employed by the Government, or whether they have gone to some other agency, will be fully investigated. I do not want, however, to leave the resolution with no bottom, because the first paragraph is so general that the committee was afraid there might be an ambiguity, which it wanted cleared up before it launched its investigation.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator whether he will yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum. I believe it is most important that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCarthy] be present.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Wisconsin knows about this.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have him present. If a quorum call is had, I shall be glad to have the order for the calling of the roll rescinded if the Senator from Wisconsin comes to the floor. We have sent for him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment—

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment, Mr. President; I have the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. There are other Senators, in addition to the Senator from Michigan, who have requested that I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have asked the distinguished Senator from Texas whether he will yield to permit the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not do so at the moment. I think we probably can get one.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am endeavoring to find in the RECORD the de-

bate I had with the distinguished Senator from Michigan last Monday, as I recall, when I called to his attention the very point which has been raised by the Senator from Maryland. At that time I asked whether the committee would be compelled to go back 50 years in making the investigation. The Senator from Michigan replied "No." As I recall he said the question as to how far back the investigation would go would be left to the discretion of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan also said in the debate that he was including in the language of the amendment the words "against whom charges have been heard," and at least those persons were to be investigated.

Mr. CONNALLY. Those words are in the resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. The same applies to the subpoena. The language of the resolution, as adopted by the Senate, is that—

The committee is directed to procure, by subpoena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files.

And in the language submitted in the first draft of the resolution, we find the words:

To use the power of subpoena whenever necessary.

The debate on the floor of the Senate indicated that subpoenas were to be issued, and not wherever the committee thought it necessary to do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield, to permit me to interrupt the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose I were to ask the Secretary of State or any other official to give our committee the loyalty files, and suppose he were to do so. Would the Senator from Michigan then want us to issue a subpoena anyway, notwithstanding that what we had requested was presented to us?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; if the Senator had the loyalty files, I would not expect him to issue a subpoena.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I have said. In other words, we would expect to use a subpoena wherever necessary. Of course, if we make the request and the material is presented, there is no sense in issuing a subpoena.

Mr. FERGUSON. But I do not understand that is the language which has been used.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, yes; that is the language.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that is what the Senator has in mind, namely, that the request will be made first, and that if the files are not delivered, then a subpoena will be issued, in the regular course, to obtain the files—

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course; but we do not wish to start out by issuing a subpoena when it is not necessary to do so. At least we should submit a request to the head of the Department and should obtain either an adverse or a favorable answer.

We do not want to take the position that they will not give us what we ask for. I take the position that they will give us what we ask for.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that is the interpretation of the language, I think it conforms to the resolution.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On the point raised by the Senator from Michigan—and I think it should be very clearly understood here on the floor—let me say that the resolution as adopted by the Senate provides that—

In the conduct of this study and investigation, the committee is directed to procure, by subpoena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies against whom charges have been heard.

That is the language of the Senate resolution by which the committee was directed to make the investigation.

Are we now to understand that in conformity with the resolution adopted by the Senate, the committee is first going to request of the Department the complete loyalty and employment files of all Government employees in the Department of State—in other words, that the committee is not merely going to request a portion of them—a portion which the Department might present—but that the committee is going to request, in conformity with the Senate resolution, all the files? If they are not forthcoming, are we to understand that the committee then is going to proceed, under direction of the Senate resolution, to subpoena them, so that the net effect will be that, either by request or by subpoena, the committee will get all the records outlined in the Senate resolution? Is that correct?

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Insofar as the Senator from Maryland has any voice in conducting the investigation, he is going to assume in advance that any reasonable request made by the committee will be honored pronto, and that would include a request for everything the committee needed, whether it is within the purview of the resolution or beyond it. But the Senator from Maryland thinks he can be a gentleman without being a criminal persecutor and prosecutor at one and the same time.

So I would first make a request, in proper phraseology, for the full and complete files on any individual against whom charges have been made. If the request were not acceded to, I would then employ the power of subpoena.

But I certainly would not feel like insulting Government officials unnecessarily by having them summonsed or having them subpoenaed duces tecum, to bring the files in question, without first making a request in proper language.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say that the Senator does not need to feel affronted by the question raised by the Senator from California. I probably would not have raised the question if the newspapers had not carried stories to the effect that at a White House conference

the President of the United States said the Senate was not going to get the loyalty files. Inasmuch as that statement was made at a press conference by the President, I think the question is a perfectly pertinent one to raise on the floor of the Senate.

I am very happy if the Senator now has information that the President has reversed the position—

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment, Mr. President; I have no information. The Senator should not attempt to put words into my mouth.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, judging from the press conference held by the President at the White House, it appears that a subpoena will be necessary in order to get the information the Senator's committee has been directed to get.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. All I can say to the Senator from California and to all other Members of this body is that the Senator from Maryland—and he thinks he can speak for all other members of the committee—will do a full and complete job of investigation and will employ every power necessary, whether provided for in the resolution or not provided for in it, to make that kind of an investigation. It is not going to be a witch hunt or a whitewash or be made a partisan football.

So far as I can control it—and I believe the members of the subcommittee can control it—we are going to be fully on guard, in carrying out the evident and expressed intent of the Senate, in pursuing the objectives set forth by the resolution.

I have raised this point and have asked the chairman of the committee to bring this matter before the Senate simply because we wish to start with a full comprehension of exactly what we are going to do.

Now that the Senator from Michigan has pointed out what seems to be an area which should have been encompassed, I think I can say to him that we will take care of the matter he has suggested.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

REARMAMENT BY THE ARAB NATIONS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, less than 12 months ago, the sound of battle ended on the shores of the eastern Mediterranean, and a succession of agreements was signed between the Arab states and the new Republic of Israel. Those agreements were instruments of armistice. Since then, the government of Israel and the individual governments of the Arab nations have been holding conversations looking toward the negotiation of peace treaties. Those conversations have not been fruitful. The relations between those countries are still in the nature of an armistice.

While the struggle through which the people of Israel maintained and established their sovereignty was going on, the security council of the United Nations voted an embargo upon the ship-

ment of arms to any of the belligerents. On August 9, 1949, that embargo was lifted, despite the fact that the relations among the nations involved continued to be that of simple armistice. But in recognition of this circumstance, the security council declared that shipments of arms by the great powers to the middle eastern countries should not exceed "those necessary for the purpose of maintaining law and order by the governments concerned." The American representative of the security council, the Honorable Warren Austin, said at the time that these arms shipments should be "strictly limited to such arms as are within the scope of legitimate security requirements."

Today, and for the past several months, there has been going on a large-scale rearmament of the Arab nations most heavily involved in the fighting against Israel, namely, Egypt, Iraq, Transjordan, and Syria. Egypt, above all, according to authoritative reports, has been acquiring destroyers, corvettes, heavy tanks of the General Sherman type, and heavy bombers. The 1949-50 budget of the Egyptian Government provided roughly \$200,000,000, or one-third of the entire national budget, for armament.

Mr. President, it does not seem to me that such an expenditure for armaments is necessary to maintain internal order in Egypt. Internal order might be better assured in that country—though I am not presuming to give advice to Egypt on the ordering of her internal affairs—by expenditures for economic programs to raise the standard of living of the impoverished people of that country.

But, Mr. President, the point is that these arms are being furnished to Egypt and these other Arab countries largely by Britain, while Britain is, at the same time, turning to the United States for more arms. I am wholly in accord with the program of helping to arm Britain and our other allies in Europe and to make Europe better able to resist aggression from any quarter. But I am not willing to help arm Britain or any other country in order that such a country may arm Egypt to renew warfare against Israel, which is the focus and the center of the new democratic order in the Near East.

Today's newspapers, Mr. President, report that the Israel Government has asked the United States Government for permission to purchase additional arms in this country. Now the Government of Israel, so deeply absorbed with economic problems, must turn its attention to rearmament. This is the traditional pattern of the armaments race, productive of nothing but waste and war.

Mr. President, the simple facts appear to be about as follows:

First. During the past few months, Egypt has steadily increased her air power, originally consisting only of Spitfires, to include modern jet fighters and heavy bombers in considerable number.

Second. Egypt's ground forces are being reequipped with heavy mobile units. Egypt's surface forces have been vastly enlarged by the addition of heavily gunned destroyers, corvettes, and frigates of recent design.

Third. The armed forces of Iraq, Syria, and the Hashemite kingdom of Jordan have undergone less substantial, but still significant transformations into better-equipped and efficiently trained groups.

Fourth. The equipment involved in this rearmament program has come almost exclusively from Britain through the arms-assistance treaties which the United Kingdom has with Egypt, Iraq, and Jordan.

These are the facts. They are not denied either by the Arab Governments, by Britain, or by our own State Department. These facts must be weighed in connection with the further circumstance that some officials of the very governments which are being armed have recently been making statements of an increasingly warlike nature. The press of the countries neighboring upon Israel has again begun to be marked by its inflammatory tone, whipping up popular sentiment for a resumption of hostilities against Israel. Nor can these facts be denied.

The attention of our own State Department has been called to these circumstances. Secretary Acheson has replied that although the facts are largely as alleged, the State Department does not interpret them as indicating any new danger of an outbreak of hostilities against Israel.

Although our Government originally took the position that no arms should be shipped to these countries in excess of the needs for internal security, the State Department is now taking the position that this rearming of the Arab countries may be considered as part of the program for strengthening these countries against Soviet aggression. Our State Department thus recognizes the fact that this rearmament is in excess of the needs of these countries for internal law and order.

Mr. President, no one is more deeply committed than I am to the strengthening of all nations against the threat of Soviet aggression or of Communist subversion. But I do not see how, in view of all the facts, we can blind ourselves to the much greater threat of renewed aggression against Israel. The geographical and strategic factors are very clear and simple. There is no more imminent threat of a Soviet thrust across the Mediterranean into Egypt than there is a threat to Libya or to Saudi Arabia. The much more immediate threat is to Israel. Until the Arab nations make peace with Israel, and until the Middle East is stabilized as to the nations which comprise that region, the continuation of large-scale armament of the Arab states can only brew trouble and war. In that trouble and in that war lie the only immediate hopes which the Kremlin may have for successes in the Middle East.

I admit that the interpretation of these events is a matter of judgment and that the opinion of our State Department officials on this subject may be superior to that of others here and abroad who fear that these military preparations are directed at renewing the war against Israel. But in my view, the evidence at hand to support the war theory is weighty indeed.

In any case, the outbreak of war in this region would be a tragedy of world importance. We must not be responsible for such an event merely because of a mistake in judging the motives of nations that are openly and speedily re-arming.

Therefore, I must ask the State Department to review this potentially dangerous situation as quickly as possible in order to ward off the slightest chance of a renewal of the Palestine conflict.

The best means of averting such a conflict would be to make representations to the British Government to stop any further shipments of arms until a proper investigation of the entire arms situation in the Middle East is made by a United Nations committee.

Mr. President, I am addressing these words to the Senate, and also to the Secretary of State. I am asking him to reassess his judgment of the situation as I am asking the American public to beware of complacency.

Mr. President, we are about to consider amendments to our Displaced Persons Act. We are about to consider additional steps to help liquidate the tragic displaced-persons situation in Europe. But in the last year, Mr. President, the most dramatic contribution to the relief of that situation has been by the little Republic of Israel which has received almost 150,000 of these unfortunate people, and is now involved in the heroic task of resettling and assimilating these and 200,000 more of the uprooted and disinherited people of Europe.

Let us not strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Let us not close our eyes to the real danger in this situation. Let us hold fast to our real allies. Let us warn those who would break the peace in the Middle East, as we continue to warn those who would break the peace in Europe. Let us advise our friends in Britain that they must not permit political expediency and imperial diplomacy to lead them and us into a situation whose consequences would be tragic and intolerable.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 1274, Senate Resolution 228.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator prefer to make the resolution the unfinished business?

Mr. MYERS. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 228) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to employ additional personnel from March 1, 1950, to January 31, 1951, and increasing the limit of expenditures, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "subsection", to strike out "(g) (2) (B)" and insert "(k)"; in line 4, after the word "Senate", to

strike out "or any other duties imposed upon it" and insert "or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946"; on page 2, line 1, after the figures "\$80,000", to strike out "in addition to any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 177, Eighty-first Congress, first session, agreed to October 13, 1949"; and in line 5, after the word "committee", to strike out "or subcommittee, as the case may be", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on March 1, 1950, and ending on January 31, 1951, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$80,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1247, House bill 4567, a bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4567) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 4406, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4406) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate num-

bered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15; and agree to the same.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
BRIEN McMAHON,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN KEE,
JAMES P. RICHARDS,
ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MYERS. I move that 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 MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William A. Carroll, of New York, to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York, vice James E. Mulcahy, resigned, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

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

Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further reports of committees, the secretary will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ellis Campbell, Jr., of Dallas, Tex., to be a collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Oscar M. Jonas, of Milwaukee, Wis., to be a collector of internal revenue for the district of Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Craig Pottinger, of Nogales, Ariz., to be customs collector for customs collection district No. 26.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Louis T. Rocheleau, of Woonsocket, R. I., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stanford C. Stiles, of Texas, to be

United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed 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 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 27 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

William A. Carroll, of New York, to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York, vice James E. Mulcahy, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 27 (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Ellis Campbell, Jr., to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas.

Oscar M. Jonas to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Wisconsin.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Craig Pottinger to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz.

Louis T. Rocheleau to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R. I.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Stanford C. Stiles to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, grant us this day a vital and vivid experience of Thy presence and power as we address ourselves to responsibilities which are far beyond our own wisdom and strength.

May all our desires and decisions be a clear and commanding witness that we are striving to manifest the splendor and preserve the continuity of the Master's ideals and principles.

Give us the courage to believe that His kingdom of righteousness and peace, which we are called upon to seek and establish, is emerging and that the day is dawning when our quest will be a conquest and our hope a blessed reality.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 23, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2328. An act to increase the number of examiners in chief in the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4406) entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GREEN, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States, numbered 50-16.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of rule XI (2) (c), I call up House Resolution 321, which has remained in the Committee on Rules for more than 21 days without being reported.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4846) to promote the progress of science; to advance the public health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 67]

Allen, La.	Hall,	Murphy
Bailey	Leonard W.	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Halleck	Nixon
Boggs, Del.	Hand	O'Brien, Mich.
Brooks	Hart	O'Toole
Buckley, N. Y.	Havener	Pace
Bulwinkle	Hays, Ohio	Pfeifer,
Burton	Hedrick	Joseph L.
Byrnes, Wis.	Heffernan	Pfeiffer,
Canfield	Heller	William L.
Carlyle	Herlong	Phillips, Calif.
Carroll	Hill	Poage
Case, S. Dak.	Hoffman, Ill.	Powell
Chatham	Holifield	Redden
Chudoff	Jackson, Calif.	Regan
Corbett	Javits	Roosevelt
Coudert	Jenison	Sadlak
Davies, N. Y.	Jones, N. C.	Sadowski
Davis, Tenn.	Judd	St. George
Dawson	Kelley, Pa.	Secret
Dingell	Kennedy	Shafer
Dollinger	Keogh	Shelley
Donohue	Klein	Sheppard
Douglas	Kunkel	Smathers
Engle, Calif.	Latham	Smith, Ohio
Feighan	Lesinski	Taylor
Gamble	Lichtenwalter	Walsh
Gilmer	McGrath	Whitaker
Golden	McGuire	White, Idaho
Goodwin	Marcantonio	Widnall
Granahan	Morgan	Woodhouse
Green	Morrison	Yates
Gwinn	Multer	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, in support of the pending resolution, I desire to call attention to the long history of hearings and favorable actions taken by both Houses of the Congress with respect to National Science Foundation legislation.

In July 1946, during the Seventy-ninth Congress, a Science Foundation bill passed the Senate, but the House was unable, due to the pressure of business, to reach this legislation. During the first session of the Eightieth Congress both Houses of Congress passed a Science Foundation bill.

This bill, however, died by pocket veto because of administrative objections that the President entertained. He expressed regret, because otherwise he was favorable to the bill.

During the second session of the Eightieth Congress the Senate again passed a Science Foundation bill. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee favorably reported such a bill to the floor, but due to the pressure of other business it did not receive consideration by the House. Finally, during the present session, the Senate passed unanimously a Science Foundation bill, which is substantially identical with H. R. 4846 now before the House, which this resolution would bring up for consideration.

Mr. PRIEST, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health, Science and Commerce of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, introduced this bill and presided over the hearings conducted by the subcommittee. He

will explain in detail the provisions of the measure.

I desire to urge very earnestly upon the House that the House vote favorably to consider House Resolution 321 in order that the House may have an opportunity to consider H. R. 4846, the National Science Foundation bill, to which I have already referred.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no legislation that has been, or will be, passed by the present Congress that is more important or far reaching in its scope and possibility of enhancing the welfare of our Nation and its people than the bill now under consideration, H. R. 4846, entitled "A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes." It is generally known as the National Science Foundation Act.

This legislation has been thoroughly studied by both Houses of Congress over the past 5 years. I think most of the Members are familiar with the purpose of the legislation and the provisions of the bill. However, there are many new Members in the House who have not had the opportunity to hear the discussions that have taken place on previous occasions. I trust that what is now said will be helpful to them, as well as refresh the minds of those who have heard previous discussions.

The Congress has long been aware of the need for legislation of this type. It is my considered opinion that a National Science Foundation is more essential to the health, education, industrial progress, and security of the Nation today than it was 5 years ago when Dr. Vannevar Bush, then Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, and his aide, Mr. John H. Teeter, discussed the problem with a small group in June 1945. It was my privilege to be one of that group. We gathered together one evening and heard Dr. Bush review his report to the President known as Science, the Endless Frontier. This document has been the basis of the National Science Foundation legislation in the ensuing years.

The history of this legislation actually begins in November 1941 when President Roosevelt wrote a letter to Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director of the wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development, asking him to prepare for him a report on a postwar science program. President Roosevelt, however, had passed away when the report was finished in June 1945.

When, in September of 1945, President Truman called Congress into special session to enact a 21-point postwar domestic program, one of the points urged the establishment of a single Federal research agency. Following the President's request, hearings were begun in both Senate and House on the various Science Foundation bills which were introduced.

In the following year, the Senate committee reported out S. 1850, which would have made extensive changes in the patent laws of the United States with respect to inventions made with the financial support of the Federal Government. The bill also would have placed considerable control in the President of the United States.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce late in 1946 held hearings on H. R. 6448, introduced by Representative MILLS. This was a revised version of his original Science Foundation bill.

In July 1946 the Senate passed S. 1850 by a vote of 48 to 18. The House took no action and all bills died with the close of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

During the Eightieth Congress S. 526 was sponsored by a bipartisan group of six Senators and the House had also before it a number of Science Foundation bills. The Senate bill was passed by the Senate in May by a vote of 79 to 8.

In the House, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I then had the honor and privilege of serving as chairman, held extensive hearings, and, as a result of the hearings, H. R. 4102 was introduced by me as chairman, reported favorably by the committee, and passed by the House, its text being substituted for that of S. 526.

S. 526 and H. R. 4102 then went to conference and both Houses approved the conference report. The bill died by pocket veto. President Truman stated in a memorandum of August 6, 1948, that he had vetoed the bill with great reluctance for he was convinced of the urgent need for the establishment of a National Science Foundation, but he felt that the bill passed by Congress vested the determination of vital national policies and the expenditure of large public funds in a group of individuals who would be essentially private citizens. This, the President stated, was a marked departure from the sound principles for the administration of public affairs to which he could not give his approval.

In 1948, during the second session of the Eightieth Congress, new bills were introduced both in the Senate and in the House—S. 2385 and H. R. 6007 by me in the House. These bills were identical and constituted a compromise worked out following conferences between some Members of Congress and Presidential advisers. In May 1948 the Senate passed the new measure by a voice vote. In the House this committee held brief hearings and reported favorably H. R. 6007, which differed in a few respects from S. 2385, passed earlier by the Senate. The bill failed to reach the House floor because the Rules Committee did not grant a rule for its consideration, and therefore, the Science Foundation legislation did not materialize during the Eightieth Congress.

In the Eighty-first Congress, in the Senate, there was introduced S. 247 which is identical with S. 2385, the last Science Foundation bill passed by the Senate during the second session of the Eightieth

Congress. This bill passed the Senate without amendment and in the House was referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. In the House seven bills were introduced which fall into three categories. Four of these bills were identical with H. R. 6007, reported favorably by this committee during the Eightieth Congress, which differ in some respects from S. 247. These bills are H. R. 12, H. R. 185, H. R. 311, and H. R. 2751.

The second category consists of H. R. 1845 and H. R. 2308 which are in all respects identical with S. 247.

The third category consists of a single bill, H. R. 359, which differs substantially from the bills in the first two categories with respect to the organization of the foundation and patent provisions.

Although the 4-year history of proposed legislation on this subject encompasses over 1,200 pages of testimony by 150 of the Nation's leading authorities in science, education, and medicine, the committee further reviewed the legislation in public hearing, on March 31 and April 1, 4, 5, and 26, 1949. In the light of this additional information the committee modified slightly the Science Foundation bill that it reported favorably during the Eightieth Congress. As a result, a new bill, H. R. 4846, was introduced by Mr. PRIEST, chairman of the subcommittee on Public Health, Science, and Commerce. Hearings were held and the full committee approved H. R. 4846, as amended, and reported the bill favorably to the House. It is now before us for consideration. It meets the objections expressed by the President in his memorandum of August 6, 1948, with respect to S. 526, and, in form as well as content, provides a good workable law that should have the support of this House.

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

The bill provides for the establishment in the executive branch of the Government of an independent agency to be known as the National Science Foundation. The Foundation shall consist of a National Science Board and a Director and is authorized and directed—

First. To develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of research and education in the sciences;

Second. To initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering and other sciences, by making contracts, or other arrangements, including grants loans, and other forms of assistance;

Third. After consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense;

Fourth. To award scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

Fifth. To foster interchange of scientific information;

Sixth. To correlate the Foundation's scientific research program with those undertaken by Federal Government

agencies, by individuals and by public and private research groups;

Seventh. To establish such special commissions as the board may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of the act; and

Eighth. To maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel.

To carry out the purposes of the Foundation the bill provides that there shall be four divisions within the Foundation, as follows:

First. A Division of Medical Research;
Second. A Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences;
Third. A Division of Biological Sciences; and

Fourth. A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education.

There shall also be within the Foundation such other divisions as the Board may from time to time deem necessary.

WHAT THE ACT WILL ACCOMPLISH

The Foundation provided for in this bill is intended to aid scientists and institutions of science to contribute more rapidly and effectively to the store of knowledge and scientific principles needed as the foundation on which technological developments, industrial growth, and enhancement of the national economy rest.

It will aid in the development of medical science and thus lead to improvement in the national health.

It will aid in the development of basic sciences on which the national defense will rest in the future.

It will lead to the development of increased numbers of highly qualified scientists, engineers, physicians, dentists, and others who are essential to the accomplishments of the above-mentioned aims.

THE IMPORTANCE OF BASIC RESEARCH

The work of the Foundation is intended to relate entirely to basic scientific research in the natural sciences as distinguished from applied scientific research. The latter is merely ascertaining the ways and means to make practical use of the fundamental knowledge of natural laws resulting from basic research. Thus, basic research in electronics made possible, first, new industries: radio, television, for greater prosperity and pleasure; second, X-ray, electron microscope, and so forth, for better health; third, radar, proximity fuze, and so forth, for greater national security.

From these illustrations it can be readily seen that basic research adds to the stock pile of knowledge and understanding from which applied research obtains the fundamental information needed to make the developments which determine our progress in industry, agriculture, health, and security.

To the extent that basic research ceases or lags, applied research, is diminished or stopped. It is necessary to keep up the stock pile of basic knowledge or otherwise applied research would in time exhaust the stock pile of basic knowledge and stagnate. Thus our progress in health, economic welfare, and national security depends upon the extent to which we increase our stock pile of basic scientific knowledge. Thus basic research is the pacemaker of all

technological progress. As it explores new frontiers of knowledge it opens new possibilities for future progress and enjoyment of mankind.

PRESENT SITUATION AS TO BASIC RESEARCH

If time permitted a detailed study could be presented that would show the desperate need that exists today for basic research. Summarized it would show:

First. That during the war basic research was reduced in favor of applied research to such an extent that about 3 years' production of basic knowledge was lost so that our stock pile in 1947 was only what it would have been in 1944 without the war;

Second. That production of basic scientific knowledge was also greatly curtailed in Europe by the war;

Third. That, on the other hand, applied research was greatly stimulated by the war so that by 1947 annual expenditure for such research had increased to over three times that in 1940;

Fourth. That as a result of the combination of greatly increased applied research and greatly curtailed basic research, both here and abroad, our stock pile of basic knowledge has been seriously depleted, especially in certain areas;

Fifth. That there is, therefore, urgent need for doubling the amount of basic research currently being done; and

Sixth. That private enterprises and private institutions cannot be depended upon to increase basic research to the desired level.

BASIC RESEARCH IN OTHER COUNTRIES

In the past this country has depended largely on basic knowledge imported from other countries and has done less than its share of basic research. From Europe we imported most of the fundamental laws and discoveries in physics and chemistry upon which our technological progress during the nineteenth century and later has been based. Even such recent developments as the revolutionary sulfa drugs, penicillin, atabrine, and DDT had their beginnings in German, English, or Swiss laboratories; and the discovery of nuclear fission which enabled us to develop the atomic bomb was made in Germany.

The war greatly changed the situation in most European countries. Many of their laboratories were wrecked, many of their scientists were killed or dispersed, and they were impoverished. It will take years for these countries to restore basic research to the prewar level; moreover, results obtained in countries behind the iron curtain will largely not be available to us. Evidently, we can no longer depend upon Europe as the major source of new basic scientific knowledge.

SHORTAGE OF BASIC KNOWLEDGE

The increased amount of applied research since 1940 and the curtailed amount of basic research, strongly suggest that our stock pile of basic knowledge has been seriously depleted as a result of the war but do not prove that this is true. As direct evidence that important applied research is now hampered by a shortage of basic knowledge we have the testimony of scientists who were closely associated with Government re-

search during the war and are thoroughly familiar with the present research situation.

Vannevar Bush writes:

The tremendous effort in applied research exerted during the war has in many fields pushed the application of fundamental knowledge to the limit of that knowledge.

Karl T. Compton, as Chairman of the Research and Development Board of the National Military Establishment, wrote that the Board more and more often meets problems the solution of which is retarded or temporarily prevented by lack of basic knowledge, and that this is true also in the research activities of other Government agencies and of industry. "We have literally exhausted the stock pile of fundamental knowledge in many fields," he testified. According to Harry P. Hammond, a man from a very important laboratory at Wright Field stated that they were stalled in their attack on certain problems because of lack of basic knowledge. "We have seriously drained our storehouse of basic knowledge."

Lessons learned during the war period point clearly to the need for an appropriately constituted agency of the Government, to function in time of peace or war, to promote and foster fundamental research in the sciences which is not likely to be carried on privately because of the size and difficulty of the problems and because of lack of immediate promise of commercial value.

The committee is deeply impressed by the fact that while the United States has been for many years and still is eminent in the fields of applied research and engineering development, it does not occupy a comparable prominent position in the field of fundamental or pure research. Dr. Vannevar Bush, the wartime head of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, in his final report, entitled "Science: The Endless Frontier," states as follows:

Our national preeminence in the fields of applied research and technology should not blind us to the truth that, with respect to pure research—the discovery of fundamental new knowledge and basic scientific principles—America has occupied a secondary place. Our spectacular development of the automobile, the airplane, and radio obscures the fact that they were all based on fundamental discoveries made in nineteenth century Europe. From Europe also came formulation of most of the laws governing the transformation of energy, the physical and chemical structure of matter, the behavior of electricity, light, and magnetism. In recent years the United States has made progress in the field of pure science, but an examination of the relevant statistics suggests that our efforts in the field of applied science have increased much faster so that the proportion of pure to applied research continues to decrease.

Several reasons make it imperative to increase pure research at this stage in our history. First, the intellectual banks of continental Europe, from which we formerly borrowed, have become bankrupt through the ravages of war. No longer can we count upon those sources for fundamental science. Second, in this modern age, more than ever before, pure research is the pacemaker of technological progress. In the nineteenth century Yankee mechanical ingenuity, building upon the basic discoveries of European science, could greatly advance the technical arts. Today the situation is different. Fu-

ture progress will be most striking in those highly complex fields—electronics, aerodynamics, chemistry—which are based directly upon the foundation of modern science. In the next generation technological advance and basic scientific discovery will be inseparable; a nation which borrows its basic knowledge will be hopelessly handicapped in the race for innovation. The other world powers, we know, intend to foster scientific research in the future.

The field of pure or basic research has traditionally been left to institutions of higher learning. Private sources of support for these institutions have not kept step with the increased need for basic research.

I urgently recommend the prompt enactment of this legislation. Nearly 5 years have passed since the activities of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the proposed Foundation's wartime predecessor, was terminated. The need to establish a National Science Foundation is today more urgent than ever. No nation can long maintain its leadership without constantly renourishing its fund of basic scientific knowledge and its supply of scientifically trained manpower. The Nation's preeminence in applied science remains unquestioned, but we have seriously drained our storehouse of basic knowledge. Our national health, prosperity, and welfare, and, indeed, our national defense, are dependent on pushing forward the frontiers of basic science.

It is my sincere belief that few pieces of legislation have received more careful study and scrutiny than has been the case with respect to the science foundation bill. The need for this legislation has not been seriously questioned in these 4 years of study and scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to act favorably and promptly on this bill to create the National Science Foundation. I do so because of the firm belief that it will promote the welfare of our citizens and our security as a Nation in an age where science, both in peace and war, takes on an importance that cannot and must not be ignored.

THOSE WHO SUPPORT THE BILL

There is nothing that emphasizes more forcibly the need for scientific research of the kind contemplated by the provision of the bill than the great number of national associations of scientists, engineers, physicians, educational institutions, labor, manufacturers, and others, a partial list which is as follows:

SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATIONS

American Association for the Advancement of Science, represented by Dr. C. F. Kettering, president; Dr. F. R. Moulton, permanent secretary; and Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, secretary.
American Documentation Institute, Dr. Watson Davis, president.
Association of Oak Ridge Scientists (Manhattan project), Dr. H. J. Curtis.
Association of Los Alamos Scientists (Manhattan project), Dr. Robert Wilson.
American Council of Learned Societies, Dr. Mortimer Graves.
American Chemical Society, Col. Bradley Dewey, president-elect.
Engineers Joint Council (representing the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the American Insti-

tute of Electrical Engineers, and the American Institute of Chemical Engineers), Dr. Boris Bakhmeteff.

National Research Council, Division of Biology and Agriculture, Dr. Robert Griggs.
American Biological Society and Union of Biological Sciences, Dr. C. V. Taylor.

Ecological Society of America, Alfred C. Redfield, president.

Society of American Bacteriologists.

Mycological Society of America, Dr. Frank D. Kern, president.

American Medical Association, Dr. Morris Fishbein, secretary.

American Council on Rheumatic Fever, American Heart Association, Dr. David D. Rutstein.

Physician Forum, Dr. Henry B. Richardson.

American Pharmaceutical Association, Dr. Robert P. Fischelis.

American Osteopathic Association, Dr. J. S. Denslow.

EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS

American Council on Education, Dr. George F. Zook, president.

Guggenheim Foundation, Dr. Henry Allen Moe, secretary-general.

Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.

Engineers Council for Professional Development.

American Society for Engineering Education.

OTHER NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Congress of Industrial Organizations, Philip Murray, president.

National Association of Manufacturers, R. J. Dearborn, chairman of committee on patents.

American Federation of Labor, Lewis G. Hines, legislative representative.

National Farmers' Union, Russell Smith, legislative secretary.

American Veterans' Committee, Capt. Orville Freeman.

Disabled American Veterans, Dr. Harry Malliss.

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

(The official position held by the individual at the time his testimony was given is listed)

Vannevar Bush, president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington and wartime Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development.

Gen. H. H. Arnold, Army Air Forces.

Karl T. Compton, chairman, Research and Development Board (representing the National Military Establishment).

Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor.

John Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education.

Vice Adm. Ross T. McIntire, Surgeon General, Navy Department.

Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General, United States Army.

Carroll L. Wilson, general manager, Atomic Energy Commission.

Charles F. Brannan, secretary, Department of Agriculture.

Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War.

James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy.

Dr. J. C. Hunsaker, chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Harold D. Smith, director, Bureau of the Budget.

James E. Webb, director, Bureau of the Budget.

Maury Maverick, chairman, Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Paul A. Porter, chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

Casper W. Ooms, Commissioner of Patents.

A. N. Richards, Chairman of the Committee on Medical Research, Office of Scientific Research and Development.

Watson B. Miller, Federal Security Administrator.

Sumner T. Pike, acting chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

Oscar L. Chapman, Under Secretary of the Interior.

J. Donald Kingsley, acting administrator, Federal Security Agency.

Ernest A. Gross, assistant secretary (for the Secretary of State).

OUTSTANDING CITIZENS AND SCIENTISTS

(Institutions listed as of the date of testimony before congressional committee)

Bernard M. Baruch.

Dr. Harold C. Urey, University of Chicago.

Dr. E. G. Nourse, vice president, Brookings Institution.

Dr. Irving Langmuir, associate director, General Electric Laboratories.

Ralph McDonald, executive secretary, National Education Association.

James Bryant Conant, president, Harvard University.

Robert E. Doherty, president, Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Charles E. MacQuigg, Engineering College Research Association, dean of engineering, the Ohio State University, past president American Society for Engineering Education.

A. A. Potter, executive director, Patent Planning Commission, dean of engineering, Purdue University, past president, American Society for Engineering Education, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, American Engineering Council.

Roger Adams, chairman, board of directors, American Chemical Society.

H. P. Hammond, dean, School of Engineering, the Pennsylvania State College, past president, American Society for Engineering Education.

Thorndike Saville, dean, College of Engineering, New York University, president, American Society for Engineering Education.

Dr. R. J. Oppenheimer, director, New Mexico Laboratories, Manhattan project.

Dr. L. A. DuBridge, director, Radiation Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Bruce K. Brown, vice president in charge of development, Standard Oil Company (Indiana).

Edwin H. Land, president and director of research, Polaroid Corp.

R. E. Gillmor, Aircraft Industries Association; president, Sperry Gyroscope Co.

Dr. Henry DeW. Smyth, chairman, department of physics, Princeton University.

Dr. I. I. Rabi, Columbia Radiation Laboratory, Columbia University.

Dr. Abel Wolman, professor of sanitary engineering, Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. Walter Rautenstrauch, professor of industrial engineering, Columbia University.

Dr. Edmund E. Day, president, Cornell University.

Dr. John M. Potter, president, Hobart and William Smith College.

Dr. Louis H. Weed, National Academy of Sciences.

Dr. A. N. Richards, chairman, Committee on Medical Research, Office of Scientific Research and Development.

Dr. Francis G. Blake, dean, Yale School of Medicine.

Rev. J. C. S. O'Donnell, president, Notre Dame University.

Dr. L. C. Dunn, chairman, Department of Zoology, Columbia University.

Dr. D. W. Bronk, director, Johnson Research Foundation, University of Pennsylvania (later president of Johns Hopkins University).

Dr. Edmund W. Sinnott, director, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University.

Dr. W. M. Stanley, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.

Dr. Raymond Zirkle, director, Institute of Radiobiology and Biophysics, University of Chicago.

Philip R. White, associate, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.

Leonard Carmichael, president, Tufts College, former director, Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel.

Ewing Cockrell, United States Federation of Justice.

John T. Cox, Jr., American Institute of Chemical Engineers, Engineers Joint Council.

George E. Folk, National Association of Manufacturers.

Dael Wolfe, secretary, Intersociety Committee for a National Science Foundation.

M. H. Trytten, director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council.

Sidney D. Kirkpatrick, editor, Chemical Engineering, on behalf of the Associated Business Papers and the National Conference of Business Paper Editors.

Carl D. Anderson, Nobel laureate; professor of physics, California Institute of Technology.

A. G. Christie, past president, American Society of Mechanical Engineers; professor of mechanical engineering, the Johns Hopkins University.

Paul R. Elicker, executive secretary, National Association of Secondary School Principals.

F. Malcolm Farmer, fellow and past president, American Institute of Electrical Engineers.

Walter S. Rogers, director, Institute of Current World Affairs.

Robert L. Stearns, president, University of Colorado.

E. H. Volwiler, director of research, Abbott Laboratories.

Warren Weaver, director, The National Sciences, Rockefeller Foundation.

Robert E. Wilson, chairman of board, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana.

John H. Teeter, representing the American Cancer Society.

R. G. Gustavson, chancellor, University of Nebraska.

Dr. Hugh Wolfe, professor of physics, New York City College, Federation of American Scientists.

The above is an imposing list of individuals and organizations, leaders in their respective fields of activity, favorable to this legislation. I know of no one of similar character and standing opposed to this legislation. This legislation represents as near as any legislation can ever represent a unanimous opinion upon the part of those qualified to speak on this important matter. The bill is entitled to the support of this House. I earnestly and sincerely ask that you give it your support as a great forward step that will promote the welfare of our citizens and the security of our Nation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 68]

Allen, La.	Burton	Davis, Tenn.
Andresen,	Canfield	Dawson
August H.	Carlyle	DeGraffenried
Bailey	Carroll	Dollinger
Barden	Chatham	Donohue
Blatnik	Chudoff	Douglas
Boggs, Del.	Corbett	Engle, Calif.
Brooks	Coudert	Feighan
Buckley, N. Y.	Crawford	Fugate
Bulwinkle	Davies, N. Y.	Gamble

Gilmer
Golden
Goodwin
Green
Gwinn
Hall,
Leonard W.

Halleck
Hand
Hart
Harvey
Hébert
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Herlong
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Ill.
Jackson, Calif.
Javits
Jenison
Jones, N. C.
Kelley, Pa.
Kennedy
Keogh

Klein
Kunkel
Latham
Lichtenwalter
McCulloch
McGrath
McGuire
Marcantonio
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Multer
Murphy
Murray, Wis.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Toole
Pace
Pfeifer,
Joseph L.
Pfeiffer,
William L.
Phillips, Calif.
Poage
Potter
Powell

Ramsay
Redden
Regan
Rogers, Fla.
Roosevelt
Sadlak
Sadowski
St. George
Saylor
Secrest
Shafer
Shelley
Short
Smathers
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Steed
Stigler
Taylor
Walsh
Whitaker
Wickersham
Widnall
Withrow
Yates
Young

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Hollywood Citizen-News.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 4406) the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4846) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 4846, the National Science Foundation Act of 1949, with Mr. THOMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in the discussion of the rule the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member have given very excellent and complete statements on the background to this legislation. In reality we may say that this legislation started with the founding of the Republic, for George Washington, very early after he was inaugurated as the first President of the United States asked Dr. Benjamin Brush of Pennsylvania, if he did not believe, in the interest of the promotion of science for the Republic, that there should be established a University of the United States.

I shall not at this time attempt to trace down through the years since that period the development of this idea. The background for the present legislation has been very well developed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

I do want to call attention to the fact that this legislation, in very much the same form as the bill now before you, was passed by the Eightieth Congress. That bill, as you know, was vetoed or, rather, it suffered a pocket veto, largely because of an administrative feature of the bill which the President found to be undesirable.

Let me briefly mention this administrative provision. In the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress provision was made that the director of this Foundation should be selected by the Foundation itself. This director, of course, would have considerable responsibility in the disbursing of public funds, whatever public funds might be made available for carrying out the work of the Foundation. He was not to be confirmed by the Senate. The President felt that from the standpoint of good administration the director of such a Foundation and with such responsibilities should be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Very reluctantly he allowed the bill to suffer a pocket veto because of that administrative provision.

Following the death of that bill by pocket veto a number of conferences were held. The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] attended a great many of these conferences, in which discussions were held with the top-bracket scientists of the country and with members of the Senate committee, the House committee, and the executive office of the President. As a result of these conferences there has been pretty general agreement as to the administrative provisions of the present bill.

The need for this legislation has been stressed by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr.

CROSSER], and by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. In yesterday's New York Times I found a story with this headline: "Nation faces shortage of scientists." I shall not read the article, but it is fully in line with statements made by others who have spoken on the bill that insofar as scientists of the first rank are concerned, those with doctor's degrees and those well trained in pursuing basic research, we do face a tremendous shortage. Some figures have been given you that in 1941 we had 2,000 scientists who received their doctor's degree in that year. We have not yet anything like approached that number since the war. The number has fallen off considerably. We have gained a few. But a recent survey indicates that it will be many years before we can reach 2,000 doctorates that were conferred in the fields of science in 1941.

Mr. Chairman, the war taught us several important lessons. One thing we learned as the result of the war was that we can no longer depend on Europe to do our basic research for us. I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that the whole emphasis of this particular legislation is on basic research rather than applied research.

We have led the world, as it has been pointed out already, for generations in taking the discoveries of the laboratories, the basic discoveries, and doing something with them in applied research. But, we have lagged far behind in the question of basic research. What has been done in this country for quite a number of years prior to the war in the field of basic research largely has been done by institutions supported by private funds. I think all of us are aware of the fact that the income from private funds has dwindled to such an extent that we can no longer depend on institutions supported by private funds to do the amount of basic research that we feel the security of our country requires.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us why these funds have dwindled?

Mr. PRIEST. It is not necessary to belabor that point. Of course, we are all aware that income from private funds and endowments have dwindled considerably because of our present tax laws, made necessary to support the Nation, to support the Government, and to pay off a war debt that we had to make in order to remain free. I think that is the reason, and I would not belabor the point at all. I hope that answers the question.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the testimony before our committee indicates that there is likely to be a very acute shortage in the years ahead in the number of scientists who might well pursue basic research. In the remaining time I want to discuss just one or two other features in this bill that no doubt there will be some questions asked about later on.

A great many Members have asked me in the last few days "What will be the cost of this bill?" In the 1950 budget—on the belief that this bill would become

legislation in time for the 1950 fiscal year budget to be effective—an estimate was made of \$2,500,000 of direct appropriations and \$12,500,000 in contract authorizations.

However, in the 1951 estimate only half a million dollars is requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Now, as to the ultimate cost, the best estimate that anybody has been able to give on the subject of the ultimate cost of the legislation, is that it should level off in perhaps 5 years at a maximum of about \$25,000,000 per year.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder what would be the figure from which it would level off down to 25.

Mr. PRIEST. It would never go above. I used the words "leveling off." I intended to imply—and perhaps it was not the best phrase—that it would never go above that figure; that would be the ceiling, a maximum.

May I say also to the distinguished ranking Member of the Committee on Appropriations that in two or three particular places in the bill we have written in language that restricts any amount that can be expended to the amount of available funds so specified for such purpose in the appropriation. We did that in scholarships and in fellowships. The money is to be earmarked by the Committee on Appropriations for these particular expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I ask the gentleman in that connection, while you are restricting these expenditures in some respects, why it would not be well to put an over-all ceiling on this entire bill, because there is not any ceiling at all at the present time? Now, many Members are loath to vote for authorizations where the sky is the limit.

Mr. PRIEST. It has this language "such appropriations as may be necessary are hereby authorized."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is not any ceiling at all.

Mr. PRIEST. No, that is not a ceiling. The ceiling I give is an estimate of the cost of it. There is no ceiling on the Atomic Energy Commission, so far as I know. We do not know what the future will bring. I think it would be unwise to fix a rigid figure of any amount as a ceiling in a bill of this sort. I think the legislative history will indicate that the cost is not expected to run beyond the \$25,000,000, and always the Appropriations Committee is in charge in that respect. However, if the committee desires to limit the amount by language I shall not object.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I find on page 2 of the committee report, in subsection 5, under the subheading "Purpose of the bill," this language:

To foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries.

I am aware of patent interchanges and of the necessity for the interchange of scientific information generally. May I ask the gentleman what is the attitude of the committee with reference to this point, or whether it was discussed?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes, I assure the gentleman it was discussed rather considerably. It was felt, I am sure, by a great majority of the committee, that such an authorization would be very helpful insofar as interchange of information with those nations with which we have amicable relations—let us put it that way—are concerned, where there might be some mutual assistance going back and forth by exchanging the information. We felt the language in the bill was entirely safe insofar as safeguarding any information that we did not want to exchange with some nation that might not be on such friendly terms.

Mr. FLOOD. On the same point, did the committee direct its attention to the so-called Fuchs incident in connection with the atomic energy expose?

Mr. PRIEST. May I say that the so-called Fuchs incident had not developed when the committee was working on this legislation. This bill was reported last August, I believe, and this incident had not developed at that time. Of course, no consideration was given to such an incident as such, but the whole general picture of the exchange of scientific information was considered by the committee.

Mr. FLOOD. On the same point, in view of the developments of the Fuchs incident with reference to the exchange of scientific information and scientists, will the gentleman address himself to any special measures that might have to do with security dealing with the interchange of information or of scientists? What would be the gentleman's opinion? What does the gentleman think should be done with special provisions having to do with security on just this one thing?

Mr. PRIEST. Does the gentleman mean with reference to this legislation or in a general way?

Mr. FLOOD. No, this legislation and this particular section of it.

Mr. PRIEST. If the gentleman will refer to page 15 of the bill he will find this language:

The authority to cooperate in international scientific research activities as provided in subsection (a) of this section, shall be exercised only after consultation with the Secretary of State, to the end that such authority shall be exercised in such manner as is consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I would call my colleague's attention specifically to subsection (j) on page 20 of the bill which deals with that particular point.

Mr. PRIEST. Yes; I was going to call attention to that provision in the bill.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. On page 9, subdivision (4) we find this language:

A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall be concerned with programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

Some of us are concerned about the limitation of this measure. Did the committee try to confine this to the graduate level? Under this language you would go to the undergraduate level in granting scholarships. What I think we are trying to get at here is to take scientists at the graduate level. Certainly I am interested in that. I think it is necessary. But in granting scholarships to undergraduates, it seems to me that you are getting into a mighty wide field with no limitation on the number of scholarships.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman I do agree with his position. I want to make it part of the Record at this point that the emphasis is on graduate scholarships. It was felt, however, that it might well be left to the Foundation without tying it so rigidly.

Mr. DURHAM. But it is not confined to that. A man entering college could get a scholarship under this measure in his first year.

Mr. PRIEST. Under the terms of the bill as written it is possible.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman asked a question as to the possible cost of this undertaking. He indicated that there is at present in the budget \$500,000 for 1951.

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. There was suggested \$2,500,000 and \$12,500,000 of contract authority, or a total of \$15,000,000. He further stated it was expected it would level off at \$25,000,000.

I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact, and ask whether or not it is true, that the cost he is referring to is in addition to all present research costs that are being carried on by the Federal Government.

Mr. PRIEST. Certainly that is true.

Mr. KEEFE. And your report so states.

Mr. PRIEST. There is no question about that. That is true.

Mr. KEEFE. Therefore, when we are discussing costs on this thing it contemplates that the present level of expenditures for research supported by the Federal Government will be maintained and that this will be an ultimate \$25,000,000 in addition. Is that not true?

Mr. PRIEST. Insofar as the provisions of this bill are concerned, that is true. It is believed that by certain correlation of scientific research provided in this bill some of the others might be reduced and some duplication eliminated. But so far as this bill is concerned the gentleman has stated the situation correctly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those who may not as yet be familiar with the function and organization of the National Science Foundation, I want to outline briefly what H. R. 4846 provides in this regard.

The National Science Foundation would be established in the executive branch as an independent executive agency consisting of a National Science Board and a Director. The Board would consist of 24 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director who is likewise to be appointed by the President and to be confirmed by the Senate would be a member of the Board ex officio.

Members of the Board must be persons eminent in the fields of the basic sciences, medical science, engineering, agriculture, education, or public affairs, and are to be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service. Moreover, appointments are to be made in such a way that scientific opinion in all areas of the Nation is fairly represented. In making nominations for appointment, the President is requested to give due consideration to any recommendations which may be submitted to him by scientific and educational organizations.

The functions of the Foundation are as follows: The Foundation is directed to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences. The purpose of such a policy is to encourage governmental and private research agencies and educational institutions to adopt programs which will not conflict with each other and which will lie in the most fruitful fields. The Foundation will have no authority to exercise any dictation or control over research or education in the Nation.

The Foundation is directed to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences. It is to do this by making contracts or other arrangements, including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance for the conduct of such research.

The Foundation is directed to award scholarship and graduate fellowships in the basic sciences. It is directed to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and abroad. The Foundation is directed to evaluate scientific programs undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups, including programs of Federal agencies, and to correlate its own research programs with the programs of these others. The Foundation is directed to establish from time to time special commissions as it may deem necessary for the purposes of the act. Finally, the Foundation is to maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways to provide a central clearinghouse for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States.

The Foundation will be divided into several divisions, a Division of Medical Research, a Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences, a

Division of Biological Sciences, and a Division of Scientific Personnel and Education.

In order to increase the number of scientifically trained persons available to do advanced basic research, the Foundation, within the limits of available funds, is to inaugurate a scholarship and graduate fellowship program for scientific study at accredited nonprofit American or foreign institutions of higher learning. The selection of the institution is up to the recipients of the scholarships and fellowships. Only citizens of the United States are entitled to receive scholarships and fellowships and they are to be selected solely on the basis of ability.

After extended hearings in three different Congresses, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has become convinced that legislation of this character is essential to our security and general welfare. The committee has become deeply impressed by the fact that while the United States has for many years been eminent in the field of applied research and engineering development, it does not occupy a comparable prominent position in the field of fundamental or pure research.

Finally, some explanation of the patent provisions contained in H. R. 4846:

First of all, let me stress that the importance of patents in connection with Science Foundation legislation has been greatly overemphasized. Few, if any, patents are expected to materialize in connection with research sponsored by the National Science Foundation, since this research is to be concentrated on the basic sciences and patents related to the applied sciences rather than to the basic sciences. The patent provisions of H. R. 4846 have the support, among others, of the Commissioner of Patents, the patent adviser to the National Association of Manufacturers, and four major engineering societies.

The provisions are extremely clear and simple. They direct the Foundation to insert in all research contracts provisions with respect to patents which will protect the interests of the Government as well as the equities of the individuals entering into research contracts with the Foundation. Employees of the Foundation may not secure patents for inventions made in the course of their employment. The Foundation has the authority within the limits of available appropriations to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, personal property, and real property of all kinds necessary for the exercise of authority granted by this act. This authority would include the authority to acquire patents. However, no authority is granted to the Foundation to acquire patents through the power of condemnation.

In order to assure the fullest publicity with respect to all dealings of the Foundation in patents H. R. 4846 provides for the inclusion in the Foundation's annual report of a full and complete statement of all of the Foundation's activities with respect to patents.

This explanation of the patent provisions of H. R. 4846 should allay any suspicions which might be harbored in anyone's mind that the Foundation might

become a giant patent holding company or that the Foundation would be authorized to condemn valuable patents to the injury of individual patent owners and to the detriment of our national patent system.

In conclusion, I want to say that the creation of a National Science Foundation is indispensable in the interest of the national security and the national welfare. We cannot take the continuing satisfactory growth of our knowledge of basic scientific principles for granted. As Dr. Bush explained and as other scientists have emphasized, we have depended for such knowledge on the discoveries of European scientists. The European centers of science have been destroyed, or work under severe economic and political handicaps. Therefore, we must make a strenuous effort of our own to increase the stock pile of basic scientific knowledge in this country and toward this end the creation of a National Science Foundation can make an important contribution.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those pieces of legislation about which a good case can be made on either side. I have argued with myself a good deal about this bill and have come to the conclusion that I must support it. I quickly recognize that there are certain aspects of the bill which can be and probably will be attacked on the floor of the House.

Of course each Member of the House must make up his own mind as to how he proposes to vote. Already some of those aspects have been alluded to. For example, the financial aspect. Under the provisions of this bill the only real limitation on the amount of expenditure is the limitation placed upon it by the Congress in making appropriations. Certainly the bill may be subject to criticism on that score.

Likewise, there may be some criticism of this bill on the political basis. The Eightieth Congress passed a similar bill which was given a pocket veto by President Truman, on the ground that he was not satisfied with the administrative provisions of the bill. Likewise, some very serious objections can be made, upon that basis, to the provisions of this bill, in that it places in the hands of the Executive tremendous power.

The rationality that is behind my thinking on this bill goes beyond this. The last frontier in American life is the scientific frontier. Our forefathers came to this country, some of them 300, some of them 100, and some of them 5 years ago, perhaps. During the period of time that the North American Continent has been occupied by white people it has been conquered physically by them. The last remaining frontier for us is the scientific frontier, and unless we take all steps possible to enlarge our scientific frontier, inevitably, it seems to me, our kind of civilization must deteriorate.

This bill applies specifically to the idea of basic scientific research as contrasted with applied science. Recently I had an opportunity to observe a number of instances of application of basic science

to industry; such as oil, coal, shale, natural gas, and aviation. A great many applications of basic science appear in all these industries, and in others as well. Basic science is being profitably used by industry in the United States today. Of course that is their business.

For example, the oil industry spends millions of dollars annually to apply to their industry the basic scientific knowledge which comes out of our scientific institutions. But the place where we lag in the United States today, as has already been stated by Members who have spoken, is in the field of basic science; that is, into these esoteric areas:—those ideas which apparently have no practical application but may find practical application 20 years, 50 years, or 100 years hence. That is the field that this bill is designed to strengthen, and that is the field that is being neglected today in the American scientific world.

There was a time, as I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] pointed out, when in the universities in the Old World, Germany, Austria, Italy, England, and France, that basic knowledge was being accumulated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Alas, that is no longer the case. Scientific research in the Old World is virtually at a standstill, and the burden, therefore, comes upon us.

Somebody says, "Why not do this in a different way? Why not go out and insist that private charity and private philanthropy take care of this field? It has already been discussed in the colloquy between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] on this floor. The reason that is not possible today is because of the tax situation in this country. There are no funds available today from private philanthropy to carry on this work, because we have taxed that kind of money out of existence. The alternative, of course, is to revise the tax laws so that basic science may have some support. That is the question I struggled with. But I see no immediate prospect that tax revision or that reduction of the tax load would take place regardless of what party were in power. I now yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thought that the corporations today, in spite of taxes, were making greater profits than ever before in the history of the country.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Experience has been, and the evidence before our committee showed, that funds were not available from private sources for basic scientific research. There are ample funds from that source for applied scientific research, but not for basic science.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I come from the Second District

in Illinois, where is located the great University of Chicago. From the distinguished members of the faculty, the great scientists of the University of Chicago, I have received over 100 letters expressing approval of this bill. These men of learning who know the field of science and the requirements in that field tell me that there is no legislation pending that, in their opinion, is more necessary to continue the predominance of the United States in industry as well as in science, and to assure its security, as this legislation that we are now considering; so to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle I bring this message from these men of learning who have no concern except that which will bring benefit to America. They stand in support of this pending legislation.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I am very proud to say that in my district is located Northwestern University. I am proud to say that I have received only one or two letters from its learned professors advocating this bill. I come from a district and a university section where its people believe that private enterprise can do as well as it has done heretofore and better if taxes are reduced, instead of increased as this bill will do. Today the main complaint over the United States is: "You are taking away the individual's freedom; you are taxing industry in this bill and denying it its freedom to spend money for basic science—taxing them to death." So you ought not use more public funds for this kind of a bill. I am proud to have had not more than one or two letters from my great university pressing for the passage of this bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. In reply I say that I regret that my friend from Chicago is speaking for a school that I attended, Northwestern, has chosen this occasion to make a political speech. I shall be glad on another occasion when we have not such important legislation pending, to sit down with my friend and my colleague from Illinois and discuss these matters of politics.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman knows I am making no political speech, and he will realize that when I tell him that I have no opposition at the present time. I am sorry the gentleman takes that position. If he has a hundred letters from his people, who is making the political speech?

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CROSSER. Does the gentleman know that the president of Harvard, the president of Cornell, the president of Columbia, and the presidents of any number of the other big institutions that rank with the institution to which the gentleman from Illinois referred have been begging for this legislation?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution in making it perfectly clear that the great educators of the Nation are

pretty thoroughly in accord in their endorsement of the plan for a National Science Foundation as set forth in the measure before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked how I can possibly be for this bill which contains no limitation as to the expense involved with relation to the scholarship program. My answer is that I do not like the absence of any limitation, but I have every confidence in the Appropriations Committee. I wish it were not necessary for us to be relegated to that solution of the particular problem; however, I know of no other way by which this particular measure can be handled.

I am moved, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] was, by the evidence before the committee to the effect that there are no funds available from private industry to accomplish this purpose, that there are no funds which will permit the development of research in the basic sciences from private industry. I know that among organizations favoring this bill are the Disabled American Veterans, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the National Association of Manufacturers, chairman of the committee on patents. I am sure if it were felt by the manufacturers, for example, that funds for this purpose were available from industry they would have come to the committee and said so.

I am moved also by consideration of the provisions in the bill providing for a Medical Research Council. I am aware of the fact that the isolation of the virus of the common cold, for example, has not yet been accomplished, the prevention of which colds would save millions of man-hours of productivity that, even more urgently, the cause and the cure of cancer has not yet been discovered, that the treatment of or even the method of onset and the pathological course of unknown ailments of the human race which may develop in the atomic age are far beyond the limited means of a tax-ridden and tax-burdened economy.

For these reasons I may quarrel with myself on possible inconsistencies as regards the cost, but I am obliged, and reluctantly, to come to the conclusion that the bill ought to be supported, and I am going to support it. I cannot reconcile any other course with my conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred twenty-one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted here today with a fundamentally important issue. I am

painfully aware of the fact that I am not competent to discuss all of the details of this proposal. I am concerned about one or two aspects of it; deeply concerned.

Mr. Chairman, this is but one of a series of measures that is coming before the Congress which, if enacted, will increase the future financial commitments of the Government of the United States, this in spite of the fact that the Treasury is faced with a \$5,000,000,000 deficit for the fiscal year in which we are living; and in all probability a deficit of equal size will show up in the next fiscal year. We may say that this does not cost much, or that does not cost much, or that some other thing does not cost much, but every time we pass a bill of this sort we add to the national debt.

I listened with deep interest, indeed, to the observations made by some of the gentlemen supporting this bill who admit that our tax system has reached the point now where people cannot save enough money to endow efforts of this kind, and that therefore we must spend the money out of the Federal Treasury, which means of course, that eventually we must increase the tax burden. I leave that thought in your minds, having to do not only with this bill but several others that are on what might be termed the "conveyor belt," against which I have protested several times in the past. Whatever is the cost of this bill, we have not the money in the Treasury, whether it be \$15,000,000 or \$25,000,000; and I never knew any of these undertakings to stay within the limits estimated at the time they were authorized. Almost invariably they grow and grow just as bureaucracy always grows if you give it a chance.

This measure itself goes far beyond the objective emphasized by its supporters. You only have to read it to understand where it goes. The emphasis is placed by its supporters on subsidies, and that is what it means, subsidies or grants to encourage and support basic research.

But, the bill does not stop with basic research. It goes into any kind of scientific research. I could call your attention to some of the provisions which make that statement of mine perfectly clear. On page 2, line 15, we read:

After consultation with the Secretary of Defense—

Whatever "consultation" means, I do not know; it may be over the telephone—

After consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense—

The word "basic" is left out, although it is used in the preceding paragraph.

If we turn over to another provision on page 12, we find language that—the Foundation is authorized—

And that is a rather extraordinary proposal—to enter into contracts—

That means the payment of money in return for services—

or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other Government agencies of the United States and of

foreign countries, of such basic scientific research activities and such scientific research activities in connection with matters relating to the national defense.

They do not have to stop with basic research, they can go on with any kind of research. There it is in black and white.

I may call your attention to the fact that these contracts or other arrangements which can be made with foreign citizens, citizens of other countries, as well as with foreign governments, with respect to the national defense, may be entered into "without legal consideration, without performance or other bond, and without regard to section 3709 of the revised statutes." My recollection is, and my best information is that section 3709 of the Revised Statutes is that law which provides a contract shall be let in accordance with competitive bidding.

In other words, the lid is off. We might just as well understand it.

My position on this thing perhaps would not be so intense if literally this were confined solely to basic research and would not increase the future commitments of the United States Treasury. I think I am not violating a confidence when I say that I asked not only Dr. Vannevar Bush but others, and in correspondence with the Director of the Budget I asked, "Would it not be possible to promote this legislation or so amend it that it would not, if passed, add to the financial burden of the Treasury?" I have to say that I have received no encouragement.

Let us see what we are spending now and how much the passage of this bill will alter the picture. We are talking now of national defense. The Army had available funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, which is the last fiscal year, and I assume about the same sums are authorized for this year, of \$51,000,000 to spend in departmental laboratories for scientific research. The Navy was to spend \$60,000,000—I am giving the round figures—in departmental laboratories, and the Air Force \$52,000,000, in departmental laboratories.

Then when you get into other governmental laboratories where the three armed services are authorized to make contracts and expend money, the Army is to spend \$6,000,000, the Navy \$6,200,000, and the Air Force \$2,700,000.

The work of those departmental laboratories is costing \$163,000,000 per year, and in the other governmental laboratories \$15,000,000 a year.

Then when we go into the industrial field, the laboratories maintained by industries with which the Army, Navy, and Air Force make contracts, we find the Army is spending \$34,800,000, the Navy \$138,700,000, and the Air Force \$132,600,000—a total of \$306,000,000.

Then when we get to the contracts they are making and the money they are spending in university laboratories and nonprofit institutions, we find that the three forces—I shall not read the amount for each service—are spending \$59,000,000 a year.

The total being spent by the three armed forces is \$544,000,000 on scientific research.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, that is not the full picture. We should also add the expenditures made by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; there are many others. I am coming to them, although I may not have all the figures. They are astronomical.

In discussing this measure with eminent scientists who are most earnest and sincere in their support of it, but who, according to my way of thinking, do not look very far into the future with respect to what we can do financially in this country, I have been told that the expenditures now being made by the Army, Navy, and Air Force for scientific research are almost entirely in the field of applied science. But only a little of it is in the field of basic research. I have been told quite the opposite by other scientists who say a very considerable sum is being spent by the armed services for basic research.

However that may be, what does this bill accomplish in teaming up these agencies? I cannot see anything, for under this bill this foundation may issue grants and subsidies not only to basic research, but to applied science. I can get no assurance from anybody to the contrary. In other words, I cannot escape the conviction that this thing is going to add considerably to the burden of the Treasury and fail to accomplish the very things which some of these splendid people think it is going to accomplish. I do not mean to be impertinent in my observation concerning them, but the fact is that most of the scientists with whom I have talked about this bill have never read it. That is the trouble. It goes much further than they think it does.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman added in the list of figures that he has given the \$1,300,000,000 which the Air Navigation Board, the ANB, will spend in scientific research and for which we are now being asked to make an additional appropriation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; I have not. I confess my inability to make a list, without studying for weeks and weeks, of all the agencies of the Government who are spending money for research purposes.

May I call your attention to this important fact, when you consider this bill. This Science Foundation is to have nothing whatsoever to do with research in the field of atomic energy—nothing. If we are facing a crisis with respect to the A-bomb or the hydrogen bomb today, we are hard at work, through the Atomic Energy Commission, in an effort to keep up with that development. The passage of this bill will do nothing to aid or hasten that. It is already being done and at a cost of more than \$500,000,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to point out, and I have not done it completely,

some of the provisions of this bill which are extraordinary to my judgment. I was very much surprised to find, for example, that under this bill the Foundation is authorized to acquire real estate. What for? There is a doubt in my mind as to whether they can employ the right of eminent domain. The provision says they may purchase real estate if they make up their minds that its possession is necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. That looks to me like the establishment or the encouragement of the establishment of a permanent bureau engaged in something more than mere education. Why do they need real estate? I have never had an answer.

Another thing—they are authorized to maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and to provide a central clearing house for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States.

I may remind the members of the committee that that is already being done by the National Academy of Science.

Back in 1863, in the administration of Abraham Lincoln, the Congress incorporated, under a charter granted to the organization, the National Academy of Science. It was not incorporated as a part of governmental machinery. It is outside the Government, as contrasted with this Foundation which is to be inside the Government, and a part of Government operation.

The National Academy of Science, under its charter, is required to respond to the request of any department of the Government of the United States for aid and assistance in conducting scientific research. When so requested, and they must respond, they do so without any thought of gaining a profit. In order to keep the Government informed as to what men in the United States are the better able to engage in these research problems, the National Academy of Science maintains a list of the eligible scientists that the Government may call upon at any moment. There is not the slightest necessity for this Foundation maintaining another list.

But I am more deeply concerned as to the trend which this legislation indicates. Not all of you may agree with me, but I have long since reached the conclusion that when a Federal agency, a part of the Government, is authorized to distribute subsidies to colleges, universities, and perhaps to industrial laboratories, it will gain a measure of control over the activities of those institutions. It is almost inevitable. As human beings, you all know it to be so.

This Foundation is authorized, in effect, to coordinate—and that is a terrible word, we never quite know what it means—to coordinate scientific research over the country; to see to it that there is no duplication of effort as between the institutions; and, armed with the weapon of subsidy, it may say to a great university laboratory: "Here is a subsidy for you if you will follow a certain line of investigation"; whereas another institution may be tempted to take a subsidy if its line of inquiry does not duplicate the line of inquiry pursued by the first.

The objective of this bill, as I understand, is to spread around the country amongst the institutions, collegiate, and of university character, these different efforts of research in the scientific field. Obviously, institutions accepting the subsidies must obey the schedule. It would be folly for the Foundation to give subsidies for duplication of efforts. In other words, the Foundation will eventually become the master—the master of scientific research in the United States; because it will hold in its hand that very tempting bait, money, money.

We are already holding our own in the field of atomic energy. I am not familiar with the progress made in other fields of science, except I cannot escape the conclusion, for example, that we are making extraordinary progress in the field of medicine, more so than in any country on the face of the earth today. It is being done almost entirely without Federal funds. For example, pharmaceutical companies and Armour & Co. have only recently announced medical discoveries. We can get along better without this bill in the field of medicine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we have listened to several distinguished Members of the House speak in support of the passage of this bill. They have made able and convincing arguments. The gentleman from Iowa frankly said that he had weighed both sides of the bill in his own mind and resolved to support and vote for the bill. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], whom I consider to be one of the ablest and soundest and most courageous Members of the House, made a convincing argument that I believe is unanswerable. The gentleman from New York bases his opposition on the ground of cost, stating that the passage of this bill will add to the national debt. When I think of the 13 or 14 billion dollars that we appropriate for national defense—and repeatedly before I became majority leader did I follow the gentleman from New York in an effort to increase national defense appropriations—I hope the amount of money we are appropriating for national defense, for aid, Navy, and Army, will be sufficient; but, if not, we ought to recognize our duty in the world today and provide the necessary money to establish strength, strength that would be respected by the challengers of our way of life, respect because of their fear. My friend from New York said that we are holding our own in the field of atomic energy. I do not want to hold our own in that field, I want to be ahead; I want our country to be way out front in that field.

Reference was made to paragraph 3 of section 3 on page 2 of the bill. My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] said that the word "basic" was omitted. Of course, it is omitted, because it ought to be omitted.

Paragraph 3 states that after "consultation with the Secretary of Defense"—this consultation on defense matters. Scientific research is not only basic or pure, but to be of value must also be applied. The man who works in the field of pure science is the man who develops the ideas. These ideas must then be passed to scientists and technicians for testing and proof. After the discovery and proof of scientific principles they then go to engineers and designers who reduce the new discoveries to practical use. We must pursue research in the fields of basic science, but further than that we must put the basic scientific discoveries to practical application and development and operation.

It is most important to our national welfare that basic research in all scientific fields receive the Federal aid that is promised by the establishment of the National Science Foundation.

For many years our leading scientists and many of our military leaders have urged, over and over again, that we establish this foundation which is designed to assure that our country will maintain its preeminent position in advancing national health and welfare and to stimulate scientific discovery in national defense.

The National Science Foundation will provide vital basic information which military research and development can take and apply.

The establishment of the National Science Foundation does not involve the expenditure of great sums of money. As a matter of fact, while its influence will be great, its cost over what we are now spending, will be a relatively small annual expense.

We must go forward; we cannot stand still or fall behind. The National Science Foundation is a great step forward, a very necessary step—and while the results from its work may be 10 or 20 years ahead, we must no longer delay establishing it.

We constantly read in the public press of the steps being taken to protect our country against attack. Let me dwell briefly on one phase of our protection, which generally escapes wide attention, partly because it is the nature of the activity and the men engaged in it and because its work is shadowed in secrecy in the best interests of our country.

Our basic research scientists strive to discover new phenomena, and improve everything that goes to wage successful war. They are away out in advance in their pioneering and normally it takes about 5 years for their work to come to fruition.

Following them come the development scientists and technicians who must prove the value of these scientific discoveries and it usually means that these men are 3 years in advance of the day when the equipment is distributed to our fighting men.

Then come the engineers and designers who reduce the new discoveries to practical size and try the equipment or materials out in the field. Finally come the procurement agencies, who must then place the orders for the new equipment, figure out the quantities, delivery dates, and shipping points, so that

finally our Army, Navy, and Air Force receive the new military equipment and are trained in its use.

Our great power of preparedness to defend ourselves comes from outstanding scientists, our great industrial plants, and our military leaders, working closely together in a closely knit team.

Our great industries stand ready, our Army, Navy, and Air Force are prepared, but we must make sure that our scientists continue to receive all of the aid they need, and if necessary that we expand these research activities to the greatest possible extent.

Secretary Acheson has recently said in substance "The Soviet Union will not keep any agreement and the only power they will recognize is strength."

I submit to you that if our American scientists can be supreme in all phases of military scientific work, greatly superior to any country in the world, this will give us the protection against any attack that our enemies may plan. Indeed if they know of our great superiority, and they are bound to learn it as a fact and fear it in its specific application, we will have raised the greatest possible defense against a war in the future.

At the present time America still leads in many fields of military scientific work, but we must be supreme in all of them and I believe that if our scientists need more money, greater freedom of activity, more cooperation, that we should make sure that they have it.

Let us increase our military scientific work to the greatest possible degree and do it without delay, and enlist every scientist that has the capability of producing something of military value.

The statement has been frequently made that one of these quiet learned men, working and concentrating on some particular development, may at any time come forward with some new device, some new weapon, some new defense that could save the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys in the event that we are again called on to protect our country.

America must not fall behind in this international race for supremacy in military weapons and equipment. Let us all hope and pray that we will never find it necessary to use these weapons against an enemy but let us be prepared. Full preparedness is our best protection, and this includes superiority in the field of military science.

I would like to know what scientists the Soviet Union have today? I wish I knew whether they are ahead of us or we are ahead of them. It may be that as a result of the discoveries of scientists war may or may not be averted.

To an important extent, in the passage of this bill lies the future security and welfare of this and future generations. This bill will accomplish these purposes in two main ways. It will provide a central agency which will assure adequate and continuing support of basic research and it will also provide for the continuing supply of highly trained scientists in greater numbers to meet the needs of basic research.

The last 50 years has witnessed outstanding developments which have al-

most completely changed our way of life, and it is most certain that in the next 25 years we will see even greater accomplishments as mankind releases the forces of nature and applies them for the betterment of everyone.

The basis of this great advance lies in scientific discovery and application. Working with mathematical formulas, and studying through microscopes and test tubes, year in and year out, our basic scientists and technicians work constantly for these new discoveries. The applied scientists take these findings and develop them for our use, but no great advance could be made, unless the basic scientist first discovered a new phenomenon or a new bacteria.

Basic research is in essence that work done usually in universities or nonprofit foundations. Although frequently financed by grants from industry, basic research is seldom carried on in industrial laboratories because, practically speaking, it does not result in a thing or process which can immediately be made and sold or used for profit.

Our scientific world is without national leadership and there are many gaps in our knowledge that should be explored. This organized exploration is one of the promises of the National Science Foundation. Perhaps of even greater importance is the undeniable fact that the number of outstanding scientists in America is very limited and we must do everything possible to increase the number of qualified men and women engaged in this work.

The National Science Foundation will have the power to make scholarship and fellowship grants to promising scientists and students.

Today we are all vitally concerned with the importance of military research. We must be sure that America remains preeminent and supreme in the discovery of new weapons and military equipment. A world-wide race is going on for new and better ways of waging war.

In my opinion, one of the ways of preventing war is to be so far ahead in military scientific research and development that no country or combinations of countries will dare attack us. If we have this outstanding leadership in military research the fact will inevitably become known, even though the particular weapons or discoveries are guarded secrets and not known to those who might attack us.

The National Science Foundation will provide vital basic information which military research and development can take and apply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is making a very splendid statement. Does the gentleman understand that if this bill is enacted into law and becomes operative, the operations end of this research program that he is discussing will be taken out of the hands of the Army and the

Navy and the Air Force, and be transferred to an operating agency under the National Science Foundation.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I am not making that argument.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, does the gentleman understand whether that is or is not the purpose of this bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot say that, but I will give the gentleman a frank answer. I hope that some civilian control of our scientists will take place, because one thing that a scientist will not stand for is to be subject to discipline by an Army officer. I will state that I stood for it as a buck private, but I do not want to stand for it in civilian life. Certainly, in the Army and the Navy there has got to be discipline. But, I am frankly stating that this is a question that has to be looked into as to whether or not there is that freedom, without the attempt of discipline going on, that would permit the maximum development in the field of pure or basic science.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman's train of thought, but I think these questions are basic. Normally I am for this program, but I want to get certain basic things established in my mind so that we will understand what we are voting for when we vote for this legislation. The gentleman or no one will dispute the fact that the gentleman from New York has called attention to the various research programs of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Aeronautics Board, and so on, costing vast sums of money. Now does the gentleman understand, in advocating the passage of this legislation, that if it passes, the operating end of those research programs will be transferred from where they are presently located and established under the authority of the National Science Foundation Commission.

Mr. McCORMACK. Frankly, I have no such understanding as that, and I am making no such argument.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to have that matter cleared up.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. The intent of the bill is perfectly clear. The operating research programs, particularly the Government program to which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], refers, will remain as operating agencies where they are now located; the Army, the Navy, Public Health, or whatever the situation may be.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that the gentleman's questions, I think, have been very pertinent. I hope that there is a complete understanding on the part of the Army officers and the scientists; and that includes the Navy and the Air Force. I hope there is no misunderstanding, and that resignations have not been reluctantly made, like President Compton, and men like that. We need them. God knows we need these scientists. If that is so, I hope the situation will be rectified very quickly, because one thing is certain, that the man who is a

scientist is a very valuable citizen. We did not expect so much of him before; that is, the people generally, but he plays a very important part in the world of today, not only in peacetime, but particularly in time of war, and particularly in developing the ideas that might avert war or, in case of the further visitation of war, result in victory for our side.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Does not the gentleman agree with me that any operating program under this present law must give and afford complete and absolute freedom to the scientist who may be engaged in any part of scientific research? He must have absolute freedom.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, and that means there must be understanding co-operation. I would like to know if the pure scientists in the Army are operating with the knowledge of what is going on in the Navy and the Air Force, or whether they are detached? All those things are important. We are talking about a man with a brain that the American people should realize is of great value, and that is the scientists in all fields, but particularly the scientists in the basic or pure field of science.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. In every field of science, all over America, our scientists are loyally working to develop new discoveries in military equipment, weapons, and materials, in their own individual laboratories, in groups, and in large institutions of learning.

The work is constant, never ceasing, and more than ever I am convinced that from these patriotic men must come the strongest force of our preparation, so that if the day comes that our boys must again defend our country, they will again not alone have the best equipment that brains can devise and our industry produce, but it will be so superior that there will be no question of the result.

We have to be practical. The most critical period in a democracy is when danger is imminent. That is the time we should prepare. That is the time when public opinion operates. When war exists we all have to get behind the Government to win the war. In times of peace we can struggle along, but when danger is imminent public opinion is usually inflamed and responds to emotional influences, and usually public opinion is wrong. I recognize it to be a human trait that the average individual does not want to see danger approaching. I was majority leader before Pearl Harbor. I saw the selective service extension bill pass this House by one vote. I lived 200 years in the 25 minutes on that roll call. It is when danger is imminent that democracy is weakest, because that is when we fail to do the things we ought to do.

I do not say I have the answer, for I am just a human being, a Member of this body trying to do the best I can for my country and for a future decent world,

but I am convinced that the one thing that will stop war is greater power on the part of America and those countries associated with us, but mainly America, because the Communist world, the Communist countries, have only one respect, and that respect is the respect through fear of any country or countries that have greater strength and power than they.

In this particular field, in the field of science in all of its aspects, and particularly in the field of pure or basic science, any money we invest now I contend is one of the best investments we can make at this time.

Mr. Chairman, our basic research scientists strive to discover new phenomena, and improve everything that goes to wage successful war. They are away out in advance in their pioneering and normally it takes about 5 years for their work to come to fruition.

Following them come the development scientists and technicians who must prove the value of these scientific discoveries and it usually means that these men are 3 years in advance of the day when the equipment is distributed to our fighting men.

Then come the engineers and designers who reduce the new discoveries to practical size and try the equipment or materials out in the field. Finally come the procurement agencies, who must then place the orders for the new equipment, figure out the quantities, delivery dates, and shipping points, so that finally our Army, Navy, and Air Force receive the new military equipment and are trained in its use.

Our great power of preparedness to defend ourselves comes from outstanding scientists, our great industrial plants, and our military leaders working closely together in a closely knit team.

Our great industries stand ready, our Army, Navy, and Air Force are prepared, but we must make sure that our scientists continue to receive all of the aid they need, and if necessary that we expand these research activities to the greatest possible extent.

Secretary Acheson has recently said in substance "The Soviet Union will not keep any agreement and the only power they will recognize is strength."

I submit to you that if our American scientists can be supreme in all phases of military scientific work, greatly superior to any country in the world, this will give us the protection against any attack that our enemies may plan. Indeed, if they know of our great superiority, and they are bound to learn it as a fact and fear it in its specific application, we will have raised the greatest possible defense against a war in the future.

At the present time America still leads in many fields of military scientific work, but we must be supreme in all of them and I believe that if our scientists need more money, greater freedom of activity, more cooperation, that we should make sure that they have it.

Let us increase our military scientific work to the greatest possible degree and do it without delay, and enlist every

scientist that has the capability of producing something of military value.

The statement has been frequently made that one of these quiet learned men, working and concentrating on some particular development, may at any time come forward with some new device, some new weapon, some new defense that could save the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys in the event that we are again called on to protect our country.

America must not fall behind in this international race for supremacy in military weapons and equipment. Let us all hope and pray that we will never find it necessary to use these weapons against an enemy, but let us be prepared. Full preparedness is our best protection, and this includes superiority in the field of military science.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly approach this subject with a good deal of hesitation in view of the remarks that have been made by the able gentleman from New York. I recognize his sincerity and his conviction that this is bad legislation. I hope I will be able to indicate to you why I have been forced to the conclusion that this is not only good legislation but that there is no other alternative open to us this afternoon other than to support this legislation in the interest, first, of our national security, and in the interest, second, of the conditions that face us as far as the economic welfare of this country and the health of the American people is concerned.

The gentleman is entirely right in calling attention to the gigantic expenditures of the Federal Government now in the field of research, both basic and applied. But there are some distinctions which I think it might be well for us to consider. On page 1118 of the budget, there is a listing of the expenditures for 1949, 1950, and 1951 for research and development in the Federal Government. It is as follows:

Expenditures for other developmental purposes
(In millions of dollars)

Research and development	1949, actual	1950, estimate	1951, estimate
Civil:			
Direct Federal programs:			
Atomic Energy Commission	114	155	176
Other agencies	85	118	119
Total, direct Federal programs	199	273	295
Grants-in-aid	11	12	12
Total, civil research and development	210	285	307
National defense:			
Department of Defense	688	630	606
Other agencies	42	49	50
Total, national-defense research and development	730	679	656
Total, research and development	940	964	963

So the total of the Federal Government's expenditures, according to the

budget, is \$940,000,000 actually in 1949; \$964,000,000 recommended in 1950 and \$963,000,000 estimated in 1951.

That gave me a great deal of concern as to where we were heading and as to whether we were actually accomplishing the purposes most of us had in mind. I am frank to say when we first considered this question in committee I was in serious doubt as to the wisdom of the legislation. The more I listened to and studied the evidence presented to us by over 150 qualified witnesses from all over the country, practically all of them earnestly in favor of some kind of legislation such as this, the more I became convinced we simply had to face the picture realistically and accept our responsibility in this field.

In that connection I urge careful consideration of the list of eminent Americans who are in support of this bill, which list is contained at the completion of the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Let me turn to another development which is, in my opinion, of extreme interest. You will recall that the Department of Defense actually spent \$688,000,000 for research and development in 1949, that its estimate for 1950 in this field dropped \$58,000,000 to \$630,000,000 and that its estimate for 1951 dropped another \$24,000,000 to \$606,000,000 in 1951. That is a total reduction in a period of only 2 years of \$82,000,000. Certainly such a development is not being made at the expense of our national security. Surely a substantial savings in the field of national security should point the way to other agencies which, without exception, increased their estimate in 1950 over 1949 and increased them again in 1951 over 1950. In short, while the National Defense has succeeded in reducing its program by \$82,000,000 in this 2-year period, the other agencies have increased their estimates by \$105,000,000.

Why is this?

I think the answer is to be found in the second report of the Secretary of Defense. Let me quote briefly from that report. In the Secretary's report you will find these two paragraphs at page 16:

In the field of science, unification is working well. The Research and Development Board, with the aid and advice of the Nation's top civilian and military technical specialists, is coordinating some 13,000 specific research and development projects of the armed forces, involving an expenditure of about a half billion dollars a year. By eliminating undesirable duplication, by requiring full use of existing facilities, and by sponsoring the exchange of information on pertinent research and development, both inside and outside the Government, the Board has been able to bring about savings in some areas and to shift funds made available thereby to neglected or to more important fields. Satisfactory progress is being made in the formulation of a complete and integrated program of military research and development to provide instruments of warfare essential to our security within a budget that can be supported by the economy of this country.

Recognizing the need for technical and operational evaluation of weapons on an interservice basis, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Research and Development Board, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, established the Weapons Systems

Evaluation Group early this year to provide rigorous, unprejudiced, and independent analyses of present and future weapons systems under probable future combat conditions. These analyses are being made by the ablest professional minds, military and civilian, employing the most advanced analytical methods that can be brought to bear.

The entire chapter IV, entitled "Scientific Research and Development," is worthy of careful reading and again I recommend it highly as valuable evidence for all of us to consider.

For my purposes, I would like to quote brief excerpts answering the question, Why military research and development is necessary:

If there is any one military policy on which the Congress and the public seem to be unanimous, over and beyond the determination to be strong in this period of international uncertainty, it is determination to have superior military equipment and to base war strategy on its use.

The phrases "Maginot Line complex" and "preparing to fight the next war with weapons of the last war" are familiar expressions of our concern lest we take the easy but dangerous course of reliance on the status quo in a world of accelerating progress in technology.

It was a determination to take full advantage of every possible technological superiority that led the Congress to establish the Research and Development Board as part of the national defense structure; it is the job of this Board to insure that the desired superiority is achieved.

Aircraft that can travel faster than sound, guided missiles with increasing ranges and greater accuracy, and submarines that can "breathe" under water for indefinite periods of time are a few of the potential weapons on which material progress has been made since the close of World War II.

It is essential to the security of the United States that its defense be planned in terms of significant new technological advances. Already many of the remarkable weapons of World War II are obsolete or obsolescent, and planning must be done not only in terms of what exists today but in terms of those developments, the early realization of which may profoundly influence the nature of future conflicts.

Another element which plays a substantial part in research and development planning is the possibility of unconventional warfare. This term is applied to such things as biological warfare, radiological warfare, and chemical warfare in new and insidious forms. It also includes psychological warfare which affords a potential enemy many techniques for the destruction of morale and for undermining the capacity of self-defense. Except for the psychological aspects, unconventional warfare did not figure in World War II. Because it exists as a potential threat, however, full consideration must be given to adequate defenses and countermeasures.

The Army and the Navy have vigorous research and development programs which have grown up over a period of years. When the Air Force was constituted as a separate branch of the armed services, its research and development efforts represented a third important program. The size, diversity, and complexity of the fields covered by these programs make sound planning increasingly important.

It is the function of the Research and Development Board to provide a complete and integrated plan of military research and development and to assign responsibility for carrying out its various parts to the respective military departments. The Board must decide such questions as what portion of the

research and development dollar should go into studies in the defensive aspects of biological warfare, into basic research in the physical sciences, into the development of guided missiles, and so on through the whole list of weapons, equipment, techniques, and devices.

The coordinating activities of the Research and Development Board enable each department to become aware of what the other departments are doing in research and development. Unnecessary duplication is thereby located and eliminated or prevented. More difficult, but probably of greater significance, is the Board's continuing responsibility to shift emphasis and funds away from programs of lesser military promise and into those of greater value. The existence of such a coordinating agency makes it possible to stretch the research and development dollar and to cut costs.

Since the close of World War II military expenditures for research and development have averaged over a half billion dollars per year. Although this is but a small percentage of the average total military budget, it is a large figure in comparison to the much smaller sums spent on military research and development before the war—in comparison, say, to the \$13,000,000 obligated for military research and development in 1939, the year World War II began. The amount of money currently being spent for research and development is only slightly less than the entire military appropriation for 1924, and is almost 50 percent as much as the total military appropriation as late as 1937.

Every citizen is naturally interested in three questions: (1) Why has it become necessary to spend large sums for research and development, (2) what are these funds buying, and (3) does the United States have the best military research and development program in the world today?

Basic research represents the broad base of theoretical knowledge and new ideas from which all applications, military and otherwise, must be drawn. If basic research already flourished independently in our universities and industrial organizations, the need for Government sponsorship in this area would not exist, or at least it would not be required on the present scale. In the past the United States has drawn heavily upon the basic research of Europe for ideas, while it excelled in practical applications and engineering.

Although there is a growing body of fundamental science in the United States today, the reservoir is not yet great enough to compensate for the drains made upon it and for the destruction of European science by the war. The military departments are therefore sponsoring limited programs in fundamental science until such time as the United States has caught up in this area. They are also supporting the proposed legislation for a National Science Foundation.

Let me repeat that: "They are also supporting the proposed legislation for a National Science Foundation." This bill was reported June 14, 1949. The report of Secretary of Defense was filed December 30, 1949.

Now to return to that report:

The country is also interested in the early rehabilitation of European science as part of the storehouse of general knowledge.

Then there is this significant section entitled "Savings Through Coordination," which continues:

By eliminating undesirable duplication, by requiring full use of existing facilities, and by sponsoring the active cross-exchange of

information on pertinent research and development both in and outside the Government, the Research and Development Board has been able to bring about savings in some areas and to shift funds made available thereby to neglected or to more important areas of research and development.

Not all savings are reflected in the ledgers, however, because much coordination takes place in the Research and Development Board, when members of the military departments get together around committee or panel tables. For example, in the field of electron tubes a proposal for military work on a metal envelope cathode ray tube was not activated, since such a tube was found to be already under development by another agency.

Formally effected coordination is illustrated by recent Board action on the recommendation of the Committee on Guided Missiles, requesting that three existing projects be terminated and two others combined into one. Through this action an estimated \$6,000,000 in planned obligations for the fiscal year 1950 was made available for allocation to other guided missiles projects of high priority.

The Research and Development Board also sponsors standardization wherever possible to make for greater economy and efficiency. An example in the research and development field proper was the introduction of standards for a uniform system of telemetering for the flight testing of guided missiles at the several test ranges. This has reduced the vast number of different parts of equipments formerly in use by the services. Old telemetering equipment is being replaced by the new standard equipment on a maintenance basis.

To render assistance to the Munitions Board, the Research and Development Board has established a policy which urges the departments to give attention throughout the development of each project to the creation of simple, easily produced designs. Ease of fabrication, assembly, inspection, and maintenance and promotion of interchangeability wherever possible are important considerations. The departments must assure the minimum use of strategic and critical materials, the minimum number and diversity of parts, and the maximum use of standard components and accessories.

In its own operations, the Research and Development Board saves funds and avoids duplication of effort by utilizing wherever possible the established groups of other agencies to make necessary studies and investigations. The Committee on Medical Sciences, for example, is utilizing several of the medical committees and panels of the National Research Council as panels of its own committee.

The problem, therefore, becomes one of obtaining the maximum benefit from every research and development dollar.

Public opinion demands that American defenses be modern and adequate to render the country secure against attack. When the United States citizen faces his responsibilities as a taxpayer he must bear in mind that the development cost of a modern large bomber through the prototype stage, to cite but one example, may well exceed \$50,000,000, including the necessary special equipment that must go with it. Similarly, the development cost of a jet fighter through the prototype stage is likely to be from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000.

The construction of prototypes is the stage in the research and development process where costs run highest. Research must, therefore, be well planned and results meticulously checked through all the earlier stages in order that costly errors may be avoided in the prototype phase.

Let me turn to still another phase of this which I think is important.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HESELTON. Gladly. Just as soon as I complete this one point.

On page 173 of this report of the President's Board entitled "Science and Public Policy," there is the only breakdown I know of which is available for our consideration of this problem of the division between basic research and applied research or development; and if you go through the budget you find practically no agency, down to the smallest, that does not have some kind of research undertaken. It is easy and apparently popular to label some appropriation item "research." Then the door is wide open. It may be important and necessary. It may be relatively unimportant. And it may be a senseless, extravagant waste of time and money. And remember all the evidence is to the effect that no one knows how much is good, indifferent, or bad. I personally suspect that a very great deal of it would not be countenanced by any reputable scientist. I think it entirely possible that the National Science Foundation would find in the rest of Government much more than the \$2 millions the national defense is eliminating which would be discarded without injuring anything but actually improving the Federal program by unchaining talented scientists and placing them in sound programs.

I have made reference to the report of the President's Scientific Research Board. This Board was created by Executive Order 9791, dated October 17, 1946. As it was first constituted, it consisted of John R. Steelman, Chairman; Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War; James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy; Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior; Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture; W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce; John D. Goodloe, Administrator, Federal Loan Agency; Watson B. Miller, Administrator, Federal Security Agency; Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator, Federal Works Agency; Charles R. Denny, Jr., Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, Chairman, National Advisory Committee of Aeronautics; Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director, Office of Scientific Research and Development; David Lillenthal, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission; Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority; Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator, Veterans' Administration; J. Donald Kingsley, executive secretary.

Board of Alternates: Maj. Gen. H. S. Aurand, Director, Research and Development Division, General Staff, War Department; John Nicholas Brown, Assistant Secretary for Air; Rear Adm. Paul F. Lee, Chief, Office of Naval Research, Department of the Navy; Dr. Thomas B. Nolan, Assistant Director, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior; Dr. W. V. Lambert, Director, Agricultural Research Administration, Department of Agriculture; Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director, National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce; Miss Mary E.

Switzer, Special Assistant to the Administrator, Federal Security Agency; Herbert S. Fairbank, Deputy Director, Federal Works Agency; Carroll L. Wilson, General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission; E. K. Jett, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission; John P. Ferris, Director of the Commerce Department, Tennessee Valley Authority; John W. Crowley, Jr., Acting Director of Aeronautical Research, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; Dr. Paul R. Hawley, Chief, Medical Division, Veterans' Administration; Dr. Edward Cushing, Medical Division, Veterans' Administration; John T. Cox, Jr., Administrative Officer, Office of Rubber Reserve, Reconstruction Finance Corporation; Dr. Eugene W. Scott, Deputy Director, Programs Division, Joint Research and Development Board.

Its reports to the President were in five volumes, three dealing with the Federal Government's special role in the Nation's total science effort, a fourth with the problem of science and technical manpower and final report discussing research and allied science both in the Government and in the Nation at large. These reports contain a wealth of statistics and other material from which Members can obtain concrete and convincing evidence of the preeminent necessity of action in this field.

Let me read just a few sentences from the opening part of the first report:

The security and prosperity of the United States depend today, as never before, upon the rapid extension of scientific knowledge. So important, in fact, has this extension become to our country that it may reasonably be said to be a major factor in national survival.

A generation which has witnessed the awful destructiveness of the atom bomb—

And I might insert here, has now learned of the hydrogen bomb—

or which has read newspaper accounts of developments in biological warfare needs no special demonstration of the relation of science to military preparedness. In the war the laboratory became the first line of defense and the scientist, the indispensable warrior. There is no likelihood that this would be changed in the event of another conflict.

It is unfortunate that any part of the case for Federal support of science should rest upon its military importance. But no responsible person can fail to recognize the uneasy character of the present peace. The scientific isolationism which inevitably results increases the urgency of Federal support for science and influences the balance in any recommended program.

Scientific discovery is equally the basis for our progress against poverty and disease. This alone would provide adequate justification for public interest and support.

If we are to remain a bulwark of democracy in the world, we must continually strengthen and expand our domestic economy and our foreign trade. A principal means to this end is through the constant advancement of scientific knowledge and the consequent steady improvement of our technology.

Throughout most of our history, the living standards of our people were raised by expanding our land area and bringing more and more acres under cultivation. That route has now been substantially closed for more than a generation, and we have in-

creased our productivity through an advancing technology. The processes and machines we use in our factories, the ways in which we raise and preserve our food, all derive from theoretical discoveries in the various sciences. The technology in which we excel and which has transformed us in some 80 years from a backward agricultural nation to a world power rests upon progress in the basic sciences. Only through research and more research can we provide the basis for an expanding economy, and continued high levels of employment.

Our technology is sufficiently advanced and our resources sufficiently adequate so that there is no immediate prospect that we shall fall technologically behind. We shall in the future, however, have to rely largely upon our own efforts in the basic sciences to provide the basis for that improvement. The danger lies in the future.

As a people, our strength has lain in practical application of scientific principles, rather than in original discoveries. In the past, our country has made less than its proportionate contribution to the progress of basic science. Instead, we have imported our theory from abroad and concentrated on its application to concrete and immediate problems. This was true even in the case of the atomic bomb. The basic discovery of nuclear fission was made by Otto Hahn and F. Strassman in Germany, founded on preliminary research in Italy, and published in a German periodical in January, 1939, just before the laboratories of Europe went dark.

That free exchange of ideas which formerly permitted us to import to meet our needs no longer prevails. Europe's laboratories are still blacked out and are likely to remain so as long as the unsettled state of the world continues. In many parts of Europe, scientists have been dispersed or slaughtered, laboratories wrecked, intricate and unique equipment destroyed. In others an iron curtain has been drawn around the work of the scientists. The strong nationalism, characteristic of these times, and the isolationism of science that results is a further barrier. The unity of western civilization has been shattered, and for the first time in our history, we are on our own so far as the extension of knowledge is concerned.

Let me quote just one more piece of evidence from these reports. It is pointed out in that most major nations of the world recognize the essential importance of science to them and are expanding their research and development budgets and then it is stated:

The Soviet Union's 1947 budget is reported to provide \$1,200,000,000 as compared with outlays of \$900,000,000 in 1946.

Compare that to our actual 1949 expenditures of \$940,000,000.

The report goes on to say:

In addition, the Russians have embarked—

And this was in 1947—

upon a 5-year program of stepped-up scientific training, under which they are reported to be producing 140,000 engineers and scientists each year.

Compare that with the fact that in 1930 we had 49,000 scientists and technicians, 92,000 in 1940, and then in June 1947 our universities and colleges graduated only 35,000 bachelors and 1,300 to 1,400 doctors of science.

This bill deals specifically and constructively with a means of encouraging the education of more of our young men and women in this vital field. While I

certainly respect the integrity, sincerity, intelligence, and ability of my colleagues who are inclined to oppose this legislation, I earnestly suggest that some of these facts in the light of the almost unanimous opinion of our responsible leaders in national defense, in the educational field, and in the business world should carry great weight with us in reaching our final decision.

Now, let me turn to the Hoover Commission Report, filed with Congress on March 25, 1949. As you all know there were certain differences of opinion among the Commissioners as to a number of the reports, but this was the unanimous report and recommendation of the 12 Commissioners. The full report on Federal research is not long and I commend it to you as additional and extremely important evidence.

For my part, I wish now to quote only certain excerpts which I believe to be of vital importance in our consideration of this legislation:

INTRADEPARTMENTAL RESEARCH

The report of the Scientific Research Board makes it plain that a satisfactorily coordinated research program for the National Government has not yet been realized.

A number of such staff groups is now in operation. These groups include the Agricultural Research Administration, the Office of Naval Research, the Office of Research Planning of the Public Health Service, and the Research and Development Division of the Department of the Army's General Staff.

Effort along these lines within individual agencies is not enough. There is need for an organization to facilitate the development of research policy for the Federal Government as a whole. This was recognized in the report of the President's Scientific Research Board. That Board recommended, as a first step, the establishment of an interdepartmental Committee on Scientific Research and Development. Such a committee was created by Executive order in December 1947. It was directed to further the most effective administration of scientific research and development activities in the Federal Government, and was authorized to submit recommendations on research policy and administration directly to the President.

The full potentialities of this committee have not been realized since its members have not as yet attacked major problems of research policy for the Federal Government as a whole. This may be due in part to lack of staff and funds.

CREATION OF A NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

This points to the need for a National Science Foundation. The major functions of such a foundation should be (a) to examine the total scientific research effort of the Nation, (b) to assess the proper role of the Federal Government in this effort, (c) to evaluate the division of research effort among the scientific disciplines and among fields of applied research, and (d) to evaluate the key factors that impede the development of an effective national research effort. Based upon its investigations, it should advise the President as to the measures necessary to establish a sound scientific research program for the Nation.

The National Science Foundation should consider most carefully the manner in which national policies with respect to scientific research are related to broader questions of educational policy. At present grants for

research purposes are being made on a hit-and-miss basis, making the award of research grants, in effect, a new form of patronage. The awarding of research grants must be put upon a more systematic basis, with due recognition given to their impact on the educational programs of our higher institutions of learning.

Finally, the Commission made two recommendations. The second is the important one for our consideration at this time. It was:

The Commission recommends that—
b. A National Science Foundation be established.

We have this bill before us this afternoon. The fact that this bill in quite similar form had passed in the other body in May 1948 was known to the members of the Commission when it made that recommendation. We can take judicial notice of that fact. I think it is compelling evidence to those of us who can see in that Commission's recommendations perhaps the only solution to the fiscal mess we are in. It is the bill I sincerely believe will accomplish the purposes recommended both by the President's Board and the Hoover Commission.

I shall put in the RECORD—and I regret I do not have it completed yet—some material I think will convince you that we are duplicating now; that we are making unnecessary and unwise expenditures, and that the only way we can control it is the same way that the Department of Defense is controlling it in that important field, and that our hope lies in the National Foundation, not with many of these other Departments with their constantly increasing demands for more funds for their pet research programs, many of which they cannot explain today. These are three analyses developed from the budget as to what has been done and what is recommended, from reports as to pending legislation in this field, and as to research activities in the health field under the Public Health Service. The latter is not intended as criticism. It is entirely possible that every activity is useful and should receive even stronger support. It is only to place before you the evidence as to the breadth of the activity in the Federal Government and to urge that there is an imperative necessity for a National Science Foundation to evaluate the entire activity and to advise us upon the proper course of action we should take in the future.

These analyses follow:

SELECTED ITEMS FROM 1950 BUDGET TO ILLUSTRATE BREADTH OF ACTIVITIES UNDER RESEARCH

<i>Department of the Interior</i>	
Bureau of Reclamation: Engineering and economic investigation, 1950.....	\$461,500
Bureau of Mines: Scientific and technical research, 1950.....	18,135,807
National Park Service—Historical and archeological research without break-down—Fish and Wildlife Service:	
Research on fish and fisheries.....	1,736,000
Research on birds and mammals.....	476,700
Total.....	20,810,007

<i>Department of Labor</i>	
Child Labor and Youth Employment Research, 1950.....	\$108,634
Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1950: The Bureau, a research and statistical organization.....	5,493,700
Bureau of Consumers Price Index, 1950.....	1,126,000
Wage and Hour Division, 1950.....	142,000
Total.....	6,870,334

<i>Post Office Department</i>	
Research and development program, 1950, under act of Aug. 16, 1949, Public Law 231.....	\$74,000
(Estimate of \$151,900 previously carried on under this title transferred to "General administration.")	
Total.....	74,000

<i>State Department</i>	
Scientific and technical programs, 1950.....	\$301,926
Some part of Philippine Rehabilitation, over-all, 1950.....	14,061,350
Some part of Institute of Inter-American Affairs, 1950.....	5,992,600
Total.....	20,355,876

<i>Treasury Department</i>	
Division of Tax Research, 1950.....	\$137,600

<i>Other departments</i>	
Atomic Energy Commission, Physical Research, 1950.....	\$31,377,238
Federal Communications Commission: Applied technical research and frequency allocation, 1950.....	383,023
General Accounting Office: Development installation and evaluation of accounting systems, 1950.....	1,017,944
Interstate Commerce Commission: Collection and analysis of accounting and statistical data, 1950.....	873,840
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, 1950.....	43,000,000
Smithsonian Institution Research, 1950.....	178,250
Tariff Commission: Assembly and analysis of basic tariff, production and trade data, 1950.....	358,764
Department of Commerce: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; same general fields and objectives as Tariff Commission, 1950.....	5,017,058
Maritime Commission: Design and construction of prototype vessels, 1950, estimated cost (design and construction of naval auxiliary prototype vessels, estimated cost, 1951, \$10,000,000).....	4,744,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:	
Expense for research and maintenance of synthetic rubber stand-by plants.....	8,300,000
Synthetic rubber program, research and development.....	3,000,000
TVA: Fertilizer and munitions research, R. & D.....	4,879,000
Food and Drug Administration, some part of research and development, 1950.....	708,725
Howard University: Resident instruction and departmental research; some part of research and development, 1950.....	2,478,125
Federal Security, Office of Education: Collection and analysis of statistics and grants-in-aid, 1950.....	100,915

<i>Other departments—Continued</i>	
Public Health Service:	
Clinical and laboratory research and grants-in-aid, 1950.....	\$596,476
Control of tuberculosis—cooperative applied research, 1950.....	721,996
General health studies, etc., 1950.....	16,720,292
Control of communicable diseases studies, etc., 1950.....	3,070,030
Disease and sanitation investigation and control, Alaska, 1950.....	1,317,000
Hospital construction, grants for research, experiments, and demonstration, 1950 (1951, \$1,000,000).....	-----
National Institutes of Health, Basic Research, 1950.....	11,844,137
National Cancer Institute, 1950.....	20,916,000
Mental Health, 1950.....	9,620,794
National Heart Institute, 1950.....	16,161,500
Dental Health, 1950.....	1,934,000
Arctic Health Institute, 1951, estimate \$975,000.....	-----
Total.....	189,319,107

<i>Federal Security Administration</i>	
Children's Bureau, Research in Child Life:	
1949.....	-----
1950.....	\$86,826
1951.....	88,721
General Services Administration, Geophysical Institute, Alaska:	
1949.....	979,000
1950.....	875,000
1951.....	-----
(Plus \$6,625,000 contract authority.)	
Expansion Public Health Service, Bethesda:	
1949.....	6,723,729
1950.....	30,320,000
1951.....	10,700,000
Research Facilities, National Institute of Dental Research:	
Building 1950.....	85,000
Limit.....	2,000,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency, Housing Research Program:	
1949.....	332,000
1950.....	2,318,000
1951.....	3,318,000
<i>Department of Agriculture, Solicitor's Office</i>	
Lands, forestry research, and general legal services:	
1949.....	\$528,466
1950.....	535,300
1951.....	560,900
Agricultural Research Administration:	
1949.....	2,536,044
1950.....	2,503,900
1951.....	913,500
(Working capital fund to be established in 1951, \$1,500,000.)	
Special research fund:	
1949.....	1,278,856
1950.....	1,262,600
1951.....	1,272,800
Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials:	
1949.....	353,408
1950.....	354,800
1951.....	517,500
Research on agricultural problems of Alaska:	
1949.....	434,943
1950.....	678,800
1951.....	316,200

Department of Agriculture, Solicitor's Office—Continued	
Experiment stations:	
1949.....	\$239,517
1950.....	236,250
1951.....	238,450
Federal Experiment Station, Puerto Rico:	
1949.....	139,719
1950.....	147,800
1951.....	160,950
Bureau of Animal Industry:	
1949.....	1,491,109
1950.....	1,336,400
1951.....	1,567,100
Research of Diseases of Animals:	
1949.....	1,128,298
1950.....	1,098,700
1951.....	1,271,700
For eradicating tuberculosis and Bangs disease:	
1949.....	6,144,478
1950.....	6,316,700
1951.....	0
Research under foot-and-mouth disease control:	
1949.....	258,000
1950.....	0
1951.....	0
Bureau of Dairy Industry:	
1949.....	1,145,038
1950.....	1,116,000
1951.....	1,371,000
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering:	
1949.....	2,958,464
1950.....	2,846,800
1951.....	2,971,000
Research of field crops:	
1949.....	2,614,688
1950.....	2,413,580
1951.....	2,649,950
Fruit, vegetable, and specialty crops:	
1949.....	2,606,211
1950.....	2,406,600
1951.....	2,644,000
Forest diseases:	
1949.....	421,359
1950.....	442,440
1951.....	473,700
Soils, fertilizers, and irrigation:	
1949.....	2,152,671
1950.....	2,424,500
1951.....	2,709,570
Agricultural engineering:	
1949.....	793,280
1950.....	870,670
1951.....	1,047,610
Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering: Rubber investigations:	
1949.....	1,420,396
1950.....	1,843,600
1951.....	1,885,800
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:	
1949.....	3,340,184
1950.....	3,648,100
1951.....	4,021,000
Insects and plant disease control:	
1949.....	4,180,849
1950.....	4,700,500
1951.....	4,752,000
Foreign plant quarantines:	
1949.....	2,294,248
1950.....	2,364,000
1951.....	2,618,000
Citrus blackfly:	
1949.....	1,212,227
1950.....	1,175,600
1951.....	1,837,500
Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry:	
1949.....	5,845,124
1950.....	5,728,525

Department of Agriculture, Solicitor's Office—Continued	
Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry—Continued	
1951.....	\$5,807,000
Agricultural chemical and naval stores investigation:	
1949.....	628,657
1950.....	655,925
1951.....	-----
Regional research laboratories:	
1949.....	5,197,372
1950.....	5,072,600
1951.....	-----
Synthetic liquid fuels project:	
1949.....	73,742
1950.....	81,860
1951.....	115,000
Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics:	
1949.....	900,170
1950.....	919,200
1951.....	1,370,500
Forest Service:	
Forest and range research:	
1949.....	2,858,657
1950.....	2,719,919
1951.....	2,761,735
Forest products:	
1949.....	1,212,931
1950.....	1,205,500
1951.....	1,216,100
Soil Conservation Service: Soil conservation research:	
1949.....	1,650,188
1950.....	1,452,800
1951.....	1,467,850
Production and Marketing Administration: Marketing research:	
1949.....	1,138,274
1950.....	1,168,477
1951.....	1,197,468
Farm Credit Administration: Research and technical assistance:	
1949.....	493,962
1950.....	491,200
1951.....	547,000

Department of Commerce	
Bureau of Census:	
1949.....	\$5,581,717
1950.....	5,865,000
1951.....	6,585,000
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Research and development of airway facilities:	
1949.....	91,243
1950.....	7,000,000
1951.....	9,948,000
Coast and Geodetic Survey: Earthquake investigation:	
1949.....	110,943
1950.....	111,300
1951.....	112,300
Bureau of Public Roads: Testing and research laboratories:	
1949.....	552,083
1950.....	447,917
1951.....	-----
(Funds for continuing of construction at Langley, Va., contained in appropriation of Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1949, provided by an appropriation of \$1,000,000 in above act.)	
National Bureau of Standards:	
Research and testing:	
1949.....	\$4,891,657
1950.....	5,019,388
1951.....	4,729,000
Radio propagation and standards:	
1949.....	3,042,370
1950.....	3,100,000
1951.....	3,153,000

Department of Commerce—Continued	
National Bureau of Standards—Continued	
Construction and equipment, Radio Laboratory and Guided Missiles Laboratory:	
1949.....	-----
1950.....	-----
1951.....	\$6,375,000
Weather Bureau Research:	
1949.....	681,756
1950.....	626,366
1951.....	780,726
Department of the Army	
Research and development:	
Quartermaster Corps, 1950, estimate.....	\$8,194,209
Transportation Corps, 1950, estimate.....	691,348
Signal Corps, 1950, estimate.....	25,208,072
Medical Corps, 1950, estimate.....	3,551,396
Corps of Engineers, 1950, estimate (1950 program: 235 projects, 35 scheduled for completion).....	5,877,351
Ordnance Department, 1950, estimate.....	49,017,897
Chemical Corps, 1950, estimate.....	102,032
Total.....	92,642,305

Department of the Navy	
(Navy personnel—applied research program to develop more effective methods for utilizing human resources to military requirements)	
Research and development:	
Aircraft facilities, 1950, estimate.....	\$77,853,434
Ships and facilities, 1950, estimate.....	23,138,000
Ordnance and facilities, 1950, estimate.....	59,672,904
Medical care, 1950, estimate.....	2,767,770
Civil engineering, 1950, estimate.....	902,000
Engineering research facilities—operating and maintaining facilities engaged in civilian engineering research and development programs such as advance base proving ground, Fort Huemene and Arctic test station, Point Barrow, Alaska, 1950.....	1,872,420
Research, 1950.....	46,497,500
Service-wide supply and finance, 1950, estimate.....	958,093
Service-wide operations—refers to research and development without break-down at naval observatory.....	-----
Total.....	213,662,121

Department of the Air Force	
Research and development, 1950.....	\$213,641,584
National Defense	
Department of the Army.....	\$92,642,305
Department of the Navy.....	213,662,121
Department of the Air Force.....	213,641,584
Total.....	519,946,010

SOME PENDING LEGISLATION DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY DEALING WITH RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTES (S. 2591, H. R. 3943)

Numerous bills were introduced to establish separate research institutes for arthritis,

multiple sclerosis, blindness, etc. The Public Health Service opposed such continued proliferation of separate research institutes within the Public Health Service. This bill was devised as a compromise solution. It established two new institutes, one on arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases and another on blindness and neurological diseases including multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, and cerebral palsy. Also, the Surgeon General is given additional authority to expand or contract research programs. This bill passed the Senate and is pending in the health subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The House health subcommittee completed its public hearings on June 23, 1949, but did not take action on the bill.

STUDY OF CHRONIC AND DISABLING DISEASES (S. 2584)

This bill authorizes the appropriation of \$200,000 to enable the Public Health Service to study and report to Congress on the best methods of obtaining periodic estimates of the amount and distribution of chronic diseases, injuries, and handicapping conditions. This bill passed the Senate and was referred to the health subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

FAMILY ASPECTS OF CHRONIC ILLNESS (S. CON. RES. 17)

This bill declares it to be the sense of Congress that research on the familial aspects of chronic illness and investigation of practical methods of furnishing family health services should be expanded and intensified. Accordingly, the bill directs the United States Public Health Service to extend its activities toward this end. It passed the Senate and is now pending before the health subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

UNITED MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION (S. 2008, H. R. 5182)

This bill carries out the Hoover Commission proposal for a new United Medical Administration to provide for medical care, public health, and medical research. In it would be consolidated most of the large-scale activities of the Federal Government in the fields of medical care, medical research, and public health, including Federal hospital facilities. The Public Health Service would be transferred from the Federal Security Agency. Also, responsibility for furnishing medical and hospital care for veterans would be transferred from the Veterans' Administration. No hearings were held on these bills.

CHILD LIFE RESEARCH (S. 904, H. R. 4465)

This bill would broaden the mandate of the United States Children's Bureau to investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and extend its powers and duties to implement this responsibility. For this phase of its work the Children's Bureau received an appropriation of \$571,000 this year. This bill calls for the appropriation of \$7,500,000 for the first year to be used for research and demonstrations in child life and development, research fellowships, training and instruction in pediatrics and in child life and development, and the development of a national clearing house for information on current and proposed researches and studies. Hearings were held by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, but no further action was taken on the bill. In the House the bill was referred to the health subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which took no action on the measure.

SURVEY OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED PERSONS (S. 458, H. R. 3937)

This bill authorizes \$5,000,000 to enable the Bureau of the Census to make a survey of the number and characteristics of physi-

cally handicapped persons. It was reported favorably in the Senate but was not called up for action. In the House the Post Office Committee took no action on the bill after receiving unfavorable reports from the Federal Security Agency and the Bureau of the Budget.

LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH UNITS (S. 522, H. R. 5865)

This bill authorizes increased Federal aid to encourage and assist each State in establishing and maintaining a network of local public health units organized to provide basic full-time public health services in all areas of the State. Public health services are defined to include services dealing with the diagnosis and prevention of disease, the control of communicable diseases, health education, demonstrations, sanitation, vital statistics, the training of personnel for State and local public health work and other aspects of preventive medicine. The bill was passed by the Senate without a dissenting vote. In the House, hearings were held on this subject by the health subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which reported the bill for consideration by the full committee.

SCHOOL HEALTH SERVICES (S. 1411, H. R. 3942)

This bill authorizes \$35,000,000 a year for Federal grants to aid the States in developing health services for children of elementary and secondary school age. The bill calls for periodic medical and dental examinations for all school children, with treatment of conditions whenever the parents are unable to provide such treatment. Treatment for all children, regardless of the economic status of parents, is left to the option of each State. Services would be available to children attending public and parochial schools. In a State whose constitution or laws prohibit the use of public funds by private schools, the Federal Security Administrator would make grants directly to the private schools instead of through the State agency. This bill passed the Senate without a dissenting vote. In the House hearings were held by the health subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which reported the bill for reconsideration by the full committee.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

The United States Children's Bureau administers grants to the States (\$11,000,000 annually) for maternal and child health services such as prenatal clinics, public health services, well-child clinics, immunizations, and examinations of children of school age by physicians and dentists. In addition, the Bureau makes grants to the States for services to crippled children which includes locating them, diagnosing their crippled condition, and providing or locating skilled care for them. Legislation was introduced to increase the amounts of each of these appropriations to \$25,000,000 for the first year with no ceiling on appropriations thereafter. This proposal is included in part B, title VI, of article 1679, as well as in S. 2352, H. R. 5835. In the course of the extended public hearings in both branches of Congress on the major health bills, consideration was given to this proposal, but no action was taken.

MEDICAL AND HEALTH PERSONNEL TRAINING (S. 1453; H. R. 5940)

These bills would establish an emergency 5-year program to increase the number of trained personnel in medicine, nursing, dentistry, dental hygiene, hospital administration, and public health. Eligible schools would receive Federal grants to help meet costs of instruction, with incentives for increasing enrollments. Grants would also be made for establishing new schools and expanding existing ones. Over the 5-year period, Federal grants would average over \$55,000,000 a year. The Senate passed the bill (S. 1453) without a dissenting vote. A

similar bill (H. R. 5940) was reported favorably to the House, except that it includes assistance to schools of optometry. When Congress adjourned, the bill was still before the House Rules Committee.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

The appropriation for this item finances the direct expenses of the Public Health Service under the hospital construction program.

Technical services: The Service assists the States and their communities in making inventories of their hospitals and health centers, determining the additional facilities required, and developing a coordinated program to meet the indicated need. Proposed hospital and medical center projects for which Federal financial help is requested are reviewed to determine eligibility for assistance, and the project plans and specifications are reviewed for compliance with construction standards. To assure adequate facilities and adherence to cost limits, technical assistance is provided on architectural and engineering aspects. The Service is also authorized by recent legislation to conduct research, experiments, and demonstrations toward the effective development and utilization of hospital services, facilities, and resources. Funds are included for initiating this program. The budget includes \$1,605,862 for these activities—\$601,702 more than the current year's appropriation.

Cooperative applied research: In cooperation with States, medical schools, and private investigators, the Service conducts studies of the effectiveness of BCG vaccine for the prevention of tuberculosis and of problems in epidemiology, diagnosis, prognosis, immunology, and therapy of tuberculosis. In addition, the Service makes related studies of chest X-ray interpretation and the development and application of radiological equipment. The 1951 estimate provides for an expansion of BCG vaccine studies in Puerto Rico to include preschool children. The estimated cost of this expanded program is \$356,000—an increase of \$134,004.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The purpose of the activities financed from this appropriation is to foster and conduct research in fundamental problems in microbiology, communicable diseases, community health, pathology and pharmacology, physiology, biochemistry and nutrition, chemistry and chemotherapy, physical biology, and other fields.

Grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training: The current year's appropriation of \$5,995,000 is supporting approximately 565 research projects, averaging \$9,700 a project, and 170 research fellowships, averaging \$2,940 each. The 1951 program calls for an increased appropriation of \$7,165,000 and contemplates a sizable expansion in research grants, particularly for support of extensive investigations in a new field of medical research recently opened up by discovery of the therapeutic activity of certain steroid compounds, including cortisone and adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH), which promises beneficial effect in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and other diseases. Of the proposed appropriation, \$6,650,000 is for research projects, and \$515,000 (same as current year) is for research fellowships.

Headquarter research program: An appropriation of \$5,107,000 is proposed to support basic research in fundamental physiological and biochemical processes, in infectious and tropical diseases, and in biologics. The 1951 estimate contemplates expansion of studies of the causes and possible cures for the crippling diseases of the bones and joints,

with particular emphasis on rheumatoid arthritis, including research in cortisone, ACTH, and related compounds. Proposed increases are partially offset by the discontinuation of yellow-fever vaccine production by 1951.

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

Approximately 200,000 people died from cancer in 1948. It is estimated that 600,000 people are presently under treatment for cancer and that 375,000 new cases are diagnosed each year. The activities financed from this appropriation have three major purposes:

1. To foster and conduct research in the causes of the various types of cancer and in the development of improved methods of detection, diagnosis, and treatment.
2. To improve teaching in cancer problems and increase the supply of personnel trained for cancer work.
3. To assist in development and maintaining detection, diagnostic, and home-care services at the local level.

The proposed appropriation will permit continuation of this program at about the present level.

Grants for research and training: The budget includes appropriations as follows for grants to medical and dental schools and other institutions and to individuals for cancer research and training:

260 research projects.....	\$2,600,000
155 research fellowships.....	500,000
105 training stipends.....	375,000
Teaching of medical subjects...	2,250,000

All of these amounts are the same as for the current fiscal year. They provide teaching grants of \$25,000 to each of 72 recognized 4-year medical schools and of \$5,000 to each of 47 recognized dental schools and 2-year medical schools. No new cash or contract authority is provided to assist institutions in the construction of cancer-research facilities; \$5,000,000 is included to liquidate prior-year commitments.

Grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other control services: The sum of \$3,500,000 is proposed for grants to all States to strengthen State and local clinical and educational services.

Grants for special control projects: Seventy-one special control projects receive financial assistance through special grants of Federal funds (\$1,000,000) to State and local health agencies, universities, hospitals, and nonprofit professional organizations to develop, initiate, or establish improved types of cancer-control techniques and devices.

Federal research and services: The budget calls for an appropriation of \$3,756,000 (compared with \$3,663,893 this year) for Federal cancer-research activities. Other direct operations, including consultative services to States in the development of their programs would continue at their present levels.

MENTAL-HEALTH PROGRAM

Approximately half of the beds in the Nation's hospitals are occupied by the mentally ill. A relatively large percentage of those seeking medical attention have conditions which are influenced by some form of emotional disorder. The activities financed from this appropriation have three major purposes:

1. To foster and conduct research in the causes of the various mental and neurological diseases and in the development of improved methods for their prevention, detection, diagnosis, and treatment.
2. To improve teaching in mental health and increase the supply of personnel trained for mental-health work.
3. To assist in the development and maintenance of preventive, diagnostic, and outpatient clinical services at the local level.

Grants to States for control services: The budget calls for the appropriation of \$3,550,000 (same as current year) for grants

to the States for detection, diagnosis, and other preventive and control activities. Federal grants have resulted in the initiation of mental-health programs in 27 States, and the expansion of such programs in 24 others. Programs include preventive and educational activities, professional services, clinical services, and training of State and local mental-health personnel.

Grants for research and training: The budget calls for increased grants to medical schools and other institutions, and to individuals for research and training as follows:

	Current year	Next year
Research projects.....	\$794,000	\$1,100,000
Research fellowships.....	100,000	200,000
Expansion of graduate teaching grants for teaching of subjects relating to mental illness.....	1,950,500	2,299,000
Training stipends.....	900,000	1,050,000

While the current year's appropriation includes grants of \$10,000 each to 42 medical schools for undergraduate teaching in psychiatry, the 1951 estimate provides no funds for expanding this activity on the assumption that Congress will pass general legislation providing aid to medical schools.

Federal research: The proposed appropriation includes funds (\$599,300 compared with \$329,200 for the current year) for Federal research activities including:

1. Research in narcotic and barbiturate addiction.
2. Epidemiological field research in multiple sclerosis.
3. A field study in Phoenix, Ariz., to determine the mental health needs of an urban community with a heterogeneous population.
4. Initiation and expansion of neurological research, a new program of research in schizophrenia, and preliminary studies of the effects of cortisone and acth in nervous and mental disorders.

NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

Heart diseases constitute one of the leading causes of death. The activities financed from this appropriation have three major purposes:

1. To foster and conduct research in the causes of the various diseases of the heart and circulation and in the development of improved methods for their detection, diagnosis, and treatment.
2. To improve teaching in cardiac problems and increase the supply of personnel trained for research and treatment of heart diseases.
3. To assist in the development and maintenance of detection, diagnostic, and home care services at the local level.

Grants for research and training: The proposed appropriations for grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training are the same as the current year's, with one exception. While the 1951 estimate provides \$5,350,000 to liquidate last year's commitments for the construction of research facilities, no new contract authority for this purpose is given. Grants would be made as follows:

Research projects.....	\$3,820,000
Research fellowships.....	300,000
Expansion of teaching of medical subjects relating to heart diseases.....	741,000
Training stipends.....	150,000

Grants for control activities: The sum of \$2,000,000 (same as current year) is proposed for grants to States for detection, diagnosis, and other control activities. Under this program, the States find and refer cardiac patients for diagnosis and treatment, provide services to heart-disease patients in their

homes, furnish training opportunities to physicians and public-health workers in cardiac problems, and supply public information.

Federal research: An appropriation of \$1,830,354 is proposed, compared with \$1,407,939 for the current year, for Federal research in the development of diagnostic and case-finding instruments, the peripheral vascular system, kidney and electrolyte metabolism, high blood pressure, gerontology, rheumatic heart disease, therapeutics, and epidemiology.

DENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

The activities financed from this appropriation have three major purposes:

1. To foster and conduct research in the causes and prevention of dental diseases and in the development of improved methods for their diagnosis and treatment.
2. To increase the supply of personnel trained for dental health work and improve the utilization of dental health personnel now available.
3. To assist in the development and maintenance of preventive and clinical programs at the local level.

Grants for research and training: The fund for grants to dental schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training would be increased to \$325,000, compared with \$235,000 for the current year.

Federal research: The proposed appropriation of \$329,225 (\$237,320 this year) provides for expansion of research into the cause and possible cure of transient bacteremia, studies relating to the reattachment of supporting dental tissues destroyed in periodontal disease, and expansion of other studies in dental disease. Last year, Congress had appropriated \$100,000 for developing plans for the erection of a dental research building on the grounds of the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. It is proposed to postpone this project until it is found that this additional space is needed.

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

The Public Health Service is currently engaged in a major expansion of its medical research facilities at the National Institute of Health in Bethesda, Md. The principal building, now in its second year of construction, is the clinical center, a research laboratory equipped with 500 research beds for clinical research in cancer, heart, mental, metabolic, and infectious diseases. Its purpose will be to provide a medical center where the best quality of hospital care can be given all types of patients under scientific observation and where laboratory facilities for adjunct studies with animals are immediately accessible. The project also includes auxiliary structures to provide power, incineration, storage, laundry, animal breeding, and shops services for the entire National Institutes of Health. It is expected that the clinical center will be finished and equipped for operation by the close of 1952. The budget calls for the appropriation of \$15,125,000 which is in addition to the \$18,100,000 appropriated to date for this activity.

CONTROL OF VENEREAL DISEASES

The number of reported syphilis cases has declined from a peak of 592,941 in 1943 to 353,393 in 1948 and 300,975 in 1949. The activities financed from this appropriation have two major purposes:

1. To assist States and localities in case finding and treatment.
2. To develop an immunizing agent and more effective treatment and diagnostic agents and methods.

The budget calls for an appropriation of \$14,000,000 for the next fiscal year commencing July 1, 1950 (fiscal year 1951), compared with \$16,000,000 for the current fiscal year. Federal grants to the States for case finding and treatment would be \$1,670,000 less.

Grants for case finding, treatment, and other control activities: The proposed appro-

priation for such grants for the next fiscal year is \$6,835,000, compared with \$7,757,000. This estimate assumes that despite the reduction in Federal grants, the total of all Federal, State, and local expenditures in 1951 for these purposes will equal or exceed that of 1950:

1. Increases in State and local contributions are anticipated.

2. Significant increases in local services are expected to result from increased Federal grants for general public-health work.

3. Estimated decreases in State and local contributions for in-patient treatment is expected to release more State and local funds for case finding and out-patient treatment.

Grants for special in-patient treatment centers: Admissions have declined from a peak of 181,754 in 1947 to 160,066 in 1949, and average patient days per admission from 9.8 days in 1947 to 8.8 days in 1949. The forecasts of patient-day loads and estimates of the Federal share of costs in fiscal years 1950 and 1951 are as follows:

	1950	1951
Patient-days -----	1,280,000	1,100,000
Federal share of costs, \$3.90 per day-----	\$4,992,000	\$4,290,000

Grants for special case-finding projects: The budget calls for an appropriation of \$300,000, compared with \$346,000 for the current year. Continuing progress by States in achieving improved case-finding methods is expected to decrease the need for making Federal grants on a special project basis.

Technical assistance to States: The Public Health Service furnished assistance to the States in medical, nursing, and laboratory activities through field studies and demonstrations in improved case-finding methods and treatment, and through preparation and dissemination of scientific information affecting venereal diseases. The proposed appropriation for these purposes is approximately 10 percent less than for the current fiscal year.

CONTROL OF TUBERCULOSIS

The reported incidence of tuberculosis in this country remains high; 138,331 cases were reported in 1948. The activities financed from this appropriation have two major purposes:

1. To assist States and localities in case finding, diagnosis, and in placing cases under local medical supervision.

2. To determine the cause of the disease and the mode of its transmission and to develop improved methods of detection, diagnosis, and treatment as well as an effective immunizing agent.

The budget calls for an appropriation of \$9,600,000 which is slightly less than the current year's appropriation.

Grants to States for tuberculosis control activities: Federal grants to the States would be \$6,350,000—\$440,000 less than the amount available for the current year. This estimate assumes that despite the reduction in Federal grants, the total of all Federal, State, and local expenditures in 1951 for this purpose will equal or exceed that of 1950. Increased State and local contributions, and increased local health services which are expected to result from increased Federal grants for general public health work, are expected to offset the cut in Federal grants for this program.

Mass X-ray surveys in large cities: It is estimated that over two-thirds of the Nation's tuberculosis problem is concentrated in cities. In the last 4 years, the Public Health Service has taken chest X-ray films for 2,435,835 adults. Of that number, approximately 24,571 with a tentative diagnosis of tuberculosis have been referred to physicians for diagnosis and treatment. During 1950, the service is for the first time operating with two complete teams on a full-year

basis. Forecasts of work load and unit costs are as follows:

	1950	1951
Chest X-ray films--	2,479,362	2,900,000
Cost per film-----	46¢	43¢
Amount-----	\$1,140,508	\$1,247,000

Significantly lower-unit costs in 1950 and 1951 are expected to result from an increased volume of films and the introduction of improved methods and procedures.

Follow-up work after mass X-ray surveys: Mass X-ray surveys cause an increase in cases requiring follow-up, which is frequently five or six times the normal load. The facilities and personnel of local health departments usually cannot effectively take care of such a rapid increase. It is proposed, as a new program, to assign trained professional workers to local health departments in the two metropolitan-survey areas to be covered in 1951 for a specified period of time after the mass case-finding surveys to assist in final diagnosis and other follow-up work. The estimated cost is \$105,000.

CONTROL OF COMMUNICABLE DISEASES

Despite notable progress in recent years, many communicable diseases are not yet under control. This appropriation finances laboratory and field investigations and control operations designed to supplement and support the activities of the States and localities in the control of communicable diseases.

General communicable-disease control: This includes epidemiology, laboratory technological services, general veterinary public health activities, engineering, entomological and technical development activities, and training and production of training materials. The 1951 estimate provides increases for:

1. Improving the diagnostic methods and performance of State, local, and other non-profit laboratories.

2. Expanding epidemiological studies of the mode of transmission of virus diseases, streptococcal infections, and enteric diseases.

3. Expanding studies of the health hazards involved in the use of new insecticides, rodenticides, and other commercial poisons in the control of communicable diseases.

The budget includes \$2,600,000 for these purposes—an increase of \$150,000.

Investigation and control of specific communicable diseases: These diseases are malaria, typhus, plague, and other rat-borne diseases, rabies, leprosy, infant diarrheal diseases, poliomyelitis, encephalitis, and other virus diseases, and "Q" fever and other rickettsial diseases. The 1951 estimate reflects reductions in control operations for malaria and typhus of 42 and 56 percent, respectively, in accordance with morbidity rates which have sharply declined from their wartime and postwar peaks. Only partially offsetting increases are estimated for investigations of infant diarrheal diseases and encephalitis. The proposed appropriation of \$2,650,000 is \$1,055,000 less than the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

General epidemic and disaster aid: Emergency aid is furnished in disease epidemics and disasters which create problems beyond the capacity of State health departments. Seventeen States in which epidemics or disasters occurred in 1949 received aid from the communicable-disease center of the Service. The appropriation for this work is \$40,000.

SANITATION AND INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE

The purpose of the activities financed from this appropriation is to supplement and support the activities of States and localities in promoting and preserving the public health through control of the basic essentials of individual and community life—air, water, food, and shelter. The proposed appropriation is \$4,000,000—almost \$1,000,000 more than the amount available for the current fiscal year.

Water pollution control: The present program consists of the initial development and organization of activities authorized in the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, including: technical and consultative services on prevention and abatement of water pollution; preparation of comprehensive river basin programs for pollution control; and field and laboratory investigations in devising and perfecting methods of testing for and treating certain industrial wastes. The 1951 estimate provides increases in funds for the further development of these activities to meet the objectives set forth in the act. The budget includes \$1,766,826 for this program—\$645,226 over the current year's appropriation. In addition, \$1,000,000 (same as last year) is proposed for grants to State and interstate water pollution agencies in order to assist them in the conduct of surveys, studies, investigations, and research related to the prevention and control of water pollution caused by industrial wastes.

Milk, food, and other sanitation activities: These include consultative and technical assistance to State and local authorities and laboratory and field investigations in sanitation of water, milk, shellfish, and other foods. The 1951 estimate provides increases for a new program of certifying interstate shipments of milk and for intensification of activities in shellfish sanitation. The budget includes \$715,000 for these activities—\$103,880 over the current year's appropriation.

Industrial hygiene: Technical and consultative services are furnished to States, local authorities, and industry, including assistance in establishing, conducting, and improving industrial hygiene services and in making atmospheric pollution studies. Research and investigations are undertaken in the evaluation of injurious and objectionable chemical, physical, and biological agents used or produced in industrial processes, and in the development of control measures. The budget estimate of \$655,000 will permit operation of this program at approximately the current year's level.

Radiological health services: These include the collection, analysis, and dissemination of information relative to the hazards of handling, using, and disposing of radioactive substances and the training of personnel competent to render advisory services to Federal, State, and local authorities in radiological health problems. An increase in funds from \$60,000 for the current year to \$110,000 for the next fiscal year would permit the establishment of a radiological health training unit.

GENERAL PUBLIC HEALTH WORK

Latest available information indicated that little more than one-half of all counties are serviced by full-time local health units, and many of these are inadequately staffed. This means that most counties lack adequate services in one or more of such fundamental phases of public health as public health nursing, public health dentistry, control of communicable diseases, and sanitation. The basic purpose of this appropriation is to assist States in meeting the need for local health services as well as to provide financial support for State health services of a general character. The budget calls for the appropriation of \$26,425,000—an increase of more than \$9,000,000 over this year's appropriation.

Grants to States for general health: The proposed increase is primarily for assisting States to expand and strengthen local health services. The 1951 estimate of \$23,450,000 for grants under this appropriation, together with the 1951 estimate of \$3,550,000 for grants to States under "Mental health activities," equals the limit of \$27,000,000 imposed by existing law.

Technical assistance to States: The present program includes: (a) consultative services to States for local and general health services, and review and analysis of State

plans, programs, and budgets; (b) sanitation and other general training of State and local public health personnel, assistance to States in establishing training programs, and in-service training for Public Health Service officers in local health units; and (c) demonstrations in nutrition and diabetes. The 1951 estimate provides for the addition of a screening team for finding diabetes cases and demonstrating the case-finding technique to local health departments. Other increases are for strengthening the training program. The increased funds included in this budget for these purposes are as follows:

	1950	1951
Consultative services.....	\$510,000	\$540,000
Training.....	305,163	337,000
Demonstrations.....	1,301,163	1,432,000

The studies in chronic-disease problems: This budget includes a new appropriation of \$105,000 for studies in: The development of techniques for screening individuals in one visit for various chronic diseases, mass screening for glaucoma, and home care and restorative services for the chronically ill.

SPECIAL HEALTH PROGRAM IN ALASKA

The activities financed from this appropriation have two basic purposes. The first is to supplement and strengthen the services of the Territorial Department of Health to meet the needs of an expanding military and civilian population in Alaska. The second is to enable the Public Health Service to conduct field and laboratory investigations of the disease problems of the Territory, many of which are different from those in the continental United States. An appropriation of \$1,259,000 is proposed, which includes a special grant of \$708,000 to Alaska for general health purposes.

Grants for research, experiments, and demonstrations: New legislation enacted last year authorizes the Public Health Service to make grants-in-aid to States, local governments, and nonprofit organizations for projects for the conduct of research, experiments, or demonstrations toward development, utilization, and coordination of hospital services, facilities, and resources. The sum of \$1,000,000 is recommended for this purpose.

HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH

The Veterans' Administration conducts a continuous program of research on various phases of the administration of its hospitals. Following are some examples of recent research projects:

Veterans' Administration has estimated that during the past 3 years research in connection with the design of hospital equipment alone covered some 900 major studies and resulted in an annual saving of \$750,000.

In cooperation with manufacturers, a floor material was developed that meets requirements in all parts of the country and under all kinds of weather conditions.

Four items of waiting room furniture were standardized, having common replacement parts.

Test results have indicated the superiority and economy of zone-controlled heating systems.

A study is currently under way to disclose a practical method of flameproofing mattress ticking and filling.

In 1947 the total research activities were given as \$1,160,000,000. This includes industries and universities. Of that in the Federal Government there was \$625,000,000 appropriated and only \$55,000,000 went to basic research, while \$570,000,000 went to applied research development.

In the War Department there was \$500,000,000, but only \$35,000,000 was expended on basic research, which this bill

deals with, and yet \$465,000,000 was expended on applied research.

Industry, \$450,000,000, only \$10,000,000 on basic and \$440,000,000 on applied.

Universities, \$35,000,000 on basic and only \$10,000,000 on applied.

So I hope you will see what this committee is trying to do and why it is trying to focus attention on basic research, and why, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] and others have so ably stated, we felt it was our duty, irrespective of party, by a very heavy majority, not only to recommend this legislation to the House, but it was our duty and obligation to support it and try to convince you of its soundness as well.

Mr. TABER. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if the gentleman could point out to us any language in the bill which would authorize the so-called Foundation to do the things that you indicated was being done in the armed services in connection with the coordination activity. In the armed services they have authority to do it.

Mr. HESELTON. Yes. I think you will find that in paragraph 6, section 3 (a), on page 3. You will find in the committee bill that there is a new committee amendment recommended. I am happy to say that the members of the committee were willing to consider a suggestion that I made because of the Hoover Commission report, but unfortunately that language does not do what we intended it to do. Therefore, I propose to offer an amendment, and I hope it will be supported by members of the committee. It is as follows:

To evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government and correlate the Foundation scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups.

That, in my judgment, will properly place this new Foundation, if we create it, in a position to evaluate the whole Federal picture. It will not place it in a position where it can say to private research groups, "You must do this or else we will not give you something" or "You cannot do that or we will withdraw funds."

It leaves them to do their job by correlating this Federal activity in the overall industrial research and university picture of this country, but it definitely gives the Foundation no authority to evaluate the work of non-Federal groups or to interfere with their programs. I want to add that our colleague from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] has discussed it with me, as well as our colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] and others. I am confident that the substitute amendment meets their very proper objection to the form of the committee amendment. I want to absolve other members of the committee from any responsibility for that language. I had too little time to consider it carefully. It would not do what I intended—carry out the recommendation of the Hoover Commission. This substitute will do that. I hope it will be accepted by the Interstate and

Foreign Commerce Committee and by you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Since I had prepared an amendment substantially similar, although, I admit, inferior in quality to that offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I shall support his amendment and think it is most important that it be adopted.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman—
Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman who is now addressing the House has spent a lot of time on this bill. There are a few questions I would like to try to get answered. I asked one a short time ago, and the gentleman attempted to answer it. He said that it was not the intent of this bill to transfer operating functions in the fields of scientific research, whether basic or otherwise, to the Foundation. Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. BIEMILLER. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Then if the gentleman has time, I would like for him to explain why on page 19, section 8 was stricken out and a new section was inserted which proposes to make the funds that have heretofore been made available to operating agencies in the field of research transferable to the Science Foundation.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin is one that I do intend to discuss in my remarks. If he will be patient for just a few moments, I will be coming back to the question he raises. I wish to spend most of the time available to me in dealing with the general basic problem which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has raised.

But first I think the urgency of the situation should be made clear.

The very suddenness with which we were catapulted into the atomic era is dramatic proof of the urgency of a Nation Science Foundation in relation to our national security. The general theories from which the practical workings of atomic energy were developed were common knowledge among the explorers of the scientific frontier long before the rest of us awakened to their shattering realities. These theories came not from the researchers who work toward a known goal within the frontier, but from the pure researchers who

explore beyond the outer limits of man's knowledge of himself and his universe.

What has that to do with this bill? Just this. This Nation is sponsoring or assisting in many research projects, public and private. The most prominent are being carried on by the Atomic Energy Commission. Almost every one of them is aimed at the accomplishment of given ends, of goals believed reachable inside the present limits of man's knowledge of the way the world works.

Meanwhile scientists from all over the United States have appeared before congressional committees to tell us that almost no pure research of the kind that first provided the atomic theories is being done. Skilled minds are applying that which the restless probes of the universe discovered years ago to the construction of a hydrogen bomb. But virtually no one is back out in that limitless scientific area where the potentialities of the H-bomb were discovered.

Pure research is enormously expensive without having any foreseeable benefits. Years of effort might result in scientific explanation of the principles of man's behavior—or in nothing. It might result in some principle of the universe that would bury the hydrogen bomb with the caveman's club—or in nothing. But pure research must be done because it is our chance that in the end science may balance the awful gift of power with the precious counterweight of control.

There are endless other potentialities in pure research, many of them almost as important. As Franklin D. Roosevelt said in November 1944:

New frontiers of the mind are before us and if they are pioneered with the same vision, boldness, and drive with which we have waged the war we can create a fuller and more fruitful employment and a fuller and more fruitful life.

Mr. Chairman, we must see the urgency in all this. The urgency in bringing to bear on our common problems not only the vast store of man's present knowledge, but that which has so far escaped him. There lies our hope.

The National Science Foundation Act was written with these great needs in mind. It deals with smaller problems as well as the large, but all within the context of the urgent importance of expanding this Nation's scientific research program.

According to Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director of the wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development:

The responsibility for the creation of new scientific knowledge—and for most of its application—rests on that small body of men and women who understand the fundamental laws of nature and are skilled in the techniques of scientific research. We shall have rapid or slow advance on any scientific frontier depending on the number of highly qualified and trained scientists exploring it.

The testimony is ample, indeed overwhelming, that the advance is not yet rapid, particularly in the pure research which is basic to applied research. It is estimated that our stock pile of as yet unapplied basic knowledge is down about 40 percent below prewar levels.

Dr. Karl Compton, well known to most of you as former Chairman of the Research and Development Board of the National Military Establishment, has written that the Board more and more frequently meets problems the solution of which is at least temporarily halted by lack of basic knowledge.

Why have existing private and public agencies failed to take up the slack? There is the problem of personnel stated by Bush, the problem of far greater expense in terms of equipment and man hours because of the huge scale of activities needed and the problem of over-all direction.

What, first, is the personnel situation? If the prewar trend in this country had continued we would have had about 205,000 scientists in this country. We now have about 165,000. There are greater demands for them than ever. As a result there are unfilled research positions in almost every public or private research agency as well as on university teaching staffs.

What about equipment and laboratory space? A committee of the National Research Council indicates that the capital outlay needed by universities and colleges alone is about \$130,000,000. To show the present lack of cohesive knowledge about our scientific personnel and facilities as a whole, there is no comparable figure on private needs.

And, third, what about coordination? The Hoover Commission is worried about the lack of it among Federal agencies alone, without mentioning the much worse situation of private research groups. There is a right to be suspicious of a system which produced sulfanilamide before the First World War, but got its first real use from the discovery more than 20 years later.

I think the need is pretty well established. There is, in fact, only scattered opposition to the measure. If the bill's intent were better understood, it seems likely even this opposition, mostly concerned about its effects on patents, would vanish.

The bill says only that each contract for research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the other parties to the contract—that no such provision will be inconsistent with any patent law. Only those who believe the Government of the United States can do no right would mistrust such a clause. It is a course of action that would be followed by any public agency with or without such a clause. Any agency which did not protect the rights of the taxpayer to such a limited extent would deserve and get a sound thrashing from Congress.

As one of the authors of National Science Foundation legislation, I want to discuss in some detail other advantages of H. R. 4846, the bill before you.

It is a solution to one of the crucial problems of this type of legislation. The administrative structure provides direct responsibility to the executive branch. It provides equally for participation in

policy decisions by impartial, but vitally interested scientists.

Not only is the proposed foundation administratively sound, but it has properly flexible authority. It can move from subject to subject, placing its emphasis on research in the area where the national need is greatest at the time.

The bill also takes into consideration a situation created by the 4 years which it has taken to bring the foundation this close to reality. Many Federal agencies are already conducting research programs which could not and did not wait for the creation of an over-all agency. These programs are producing splendidly and are, in fact, good advertisements of what the nationally integrated program of the foundation can do on a much greater scale.

Among the agencies with the largest programs are the Atomic Energy Commission, the Military Establishment and the Public Health Service. They are performing their particular functions with distinction.

Under this legislation, it is not proposed that their programs will be taken over. The foundation would, of course, immediately assume its role as the coordinating agency, but it is expected that operating responsibility of present programs will remain in the hands of individual agencies. There are three principal reasons for this expectation. First, provision of research funds to a number of Federal sources is healthy, particularly since Federal funds are such a high percentage of the total allotted for research in this country. Second, there is an extensive network of non-Federal advisory groups now cooperating with the Federal agencies and their knowledge and uninterrupted assistance is vital. Finally, the foundation must not divert attention from the major problems of national scientific strategy to the details of individual programs already in operation.

The Public Health Service is a particular case in point. Grants for basic research in medicine and related sciences in this field are made to support investigations selected by scientists in the Nation's medical schools, universities and hospitals. The scientists and not the Public Health Service select the areas in which they wish to work. Applications for grants are reviewed by nongovernmental specialists who are leaders in their field. Their recommendations are reviewed by national advisory councils. These councils must not only approve all specific grants, but advise on policies of the total program.

Almost all this activity is directed toward the chronic diseases which are the major causes of death in this country. As now handled, this activity has been a marvelously successful case study in democratic debate and decision. There is no need to alter its operation in any major respect; indeed, there is a need to preserve its present general form and content.

The programs of the Public Health Service would require changing only as the national scientific strategy requires changing as determined by the National

Science Foundation. There, I think, is the ideal relationship between the foundation and such agencies as the Public Health Service.

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

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Does this bill contemplate that the National Science Foundation, if established, will make requests for one over-all appropriation to cover the research indulged in by all Government agencies authorized to conduct research?

Mr. BIEMILLER. That is definitely not my understanding. I understand that the amounts requested would be (a) for the obvious operating expenses of the agency, and (b) for such operations as are not covered by any other grant made by the Congress for research by any existing Federal agency.

Mr. KEEFE. So that those present operations, such as the Public Health Service's categorical programs for public health, and the National Institute of Health, would not under this, in the judgment of the gentleman, be compelled to bid for the favor of one over-all piece of money in order to get a slice for the operation of their particular agency?

Mr. BIEMILLER. That is precisely my understanding and may I add in connection with the question which the gentleman raised earlier on page 19, subsection (h) of section 14. My understanding for the need of that section, and I ask my subcommittee chairman to check me if I am not correct, is that in the event a project had already been initiated—and let us use the Public Health Service inasmuch as that is the illustration in front of us—if there had been some project initiated by one of the Public Health Service institutes, either for their work in public health or under the grants it makes to various universities or other agencies which needed supplementing by some further grant for which the National Science Foundation might have funds, this subsection (h) gives the authority for pooling those funds and pooling the results and pooling the work that is to be done under such situation.

Mr. PRIEST. That is my understanding of the purpose of that provision. Let us say that the National Cancer Institute had some research going on at Johns Hopkins; let us say there was need for an additional amount for which the division of medical education in this bill had some funds, that the two might be pooled to further the project. That, I think, would be an example of what the language is intended to do.

Mr. KEEFE. I doubt if that is an answer to the question which the gentleman from Wisconsin now speaking has raised, because subsection (h) on page 19 of this bill definitely provides that—

Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or

in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided.

Mr. PRIEST. That is my understanding. If the funds were provided for cancer research on that agreement between the two agencies concerned a transfer could be made. There is authority therefor.

Mr. KEEFE. They could take the funds that the Congress has granted for research for cancer, for example, if the Foundation requested transfer of those funds with the consent of the Surgeon General or the head of the Federal Security Agency who would be the person involved, I suppose, they could transfer funds from that appropriation over to the National Science Foundation?

Mr. BIEMILLER. The section goes on to say: "to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided."

In other words, you have to have the approval of the Surgeon General in the instant case and the fact that the funds must still be utilized for the purposes for which the Congress appropriated them. This is a matter of bookkeeping. It is intended for such projects as it may be more desirable to coordinate than to have go on independently; but does not affect the basic work that would be done by the Public Health Service.

Mr. KEEFE. It makes the Foundation an operating agency in that respect.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Only insofar as the Surgeon General is willing to agree.

In addition to these major advantages of a national science foundation as proposed in H. R. 4846, there are a number which are almost as important.

First. The foundation could contribute to a solution of the problem of exchange of scientific information in which the need for secrecy is matched by the need to have the information available under the safeguards written into the bill to as many scientists as possible.

Second. The foundation could give us a total picture of how many scientists are needed, the rate of production and the fields in which the most acute shortages exist.

Third. The foundation could give us our first sound understanding of what private and public scientific resources we have, how they are distributed now and how they are likely to be distributed and used in the future.

When all this has been said about the National Science Foundation; when you add to it the 4 years of discussion, public and private; when you sum it up—what more can be said?

Only this. There are those who fear any activity on the part of government. They are the government haters. They think anything the Government does is bound to be wrong. Well, we are relatively reasonable men. Every single one of us saw and helped this Government successfully prosecute a war in which the life of the Nation was at stake. Every single one of us knows of other good and important things this Government has done, in peace as in war.

There is no more important thing Congress can do at this time than pledge

this democratic government to underwrite its scientific future.

The benefits of science are for all of the people of this country—and eventually of the world. It is fitting that the representatives of the people of this country once more man the outer frontiers of science with the pioneers who are our hope of a new and better world.

It is as important that those outer frontiers be manned as it is that we strengthen the bastions of our national defense. For, in the end they are the same—at once protection against our fears and hope for our future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, may I say that this is a bill upon which we have had hearings in the Seventy-ninth Congress. In the Eightieth Congress we had hearings upon the same subject, and in the Eighty-first Congress we had hearings on the same subject, and that I started out as a member of the committee in the Seventy-ninth Congress being opposed to such type of legislation. But I have been overcome by the overwhelming weight of the arguments made by the witnesses in behalf of this bill, and I listened with equal care to those opposed to it.

I think one of the most able and powerful witnesses who appeared before our committee was Dr. Karl T. Compton, and I should like to read, if I may, some portions of his testimony which are directly in answer to some of the questions which have been raised, particularly by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. Dr. Compton said, in part:

I am here in three capacities—as representative of the National Military Establishment by designation of the Secretary of Defense, as Chairman of the Research and Development Board, which is generally responsible for planning and coordinating military research, and as a citizen with some experience in scientific research as president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology until last November. I hasten to say that in all three capacities I strongly support the establishment of a National Science Foundation. I should also add that the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force support the basic legislation and concur in this statement. In addition, the Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to presentation of this statement to you.

Despite the extensive discussion during the past 4 years of legislation for this purpose, I feel that it might be useful briefly to review the essential elements of the agency with which we are concerned, for I have the feeling that there is danger of diversion of attention to extraneous issues. In so doing, it may be less confusing if I refer only to H. R. 2308 and H. R. 12, intending, of course, to include the bills identical with each. However, I should like to exclude H. R. 359 for the time being and discuss it separately.

The need for a scientific foundation rests upon the major requirement in this country with respect to science. This is the dual necessity of supplementing the private resources available for the support of basic research and for the training of scientists and engineers. All other issues which have arisen in the course of consideration of National Science Foundation legislation, al-

though many are important in themselves, are subordinate to the basic need for a foundation, and within the limit of reasonableness, they should be kept subordinate.

We have in the last 10 years devoted an enormous effort to applied research, and this, although considerably reduced since the war, is still roughly three times the annual effort made before 1939. This effort, together with previous modern advances in the utilization for practical purposes of natural phenomena, is bringing us near the point of diminishing returns. We have literally exhausted the stock pile of fundamental knowledge in many fields.

Further improvements are, of course, possible, but significant progress is becoming more and more difficult. I speak now from the point of view of the National Military Establishment concerned with providing for our armed forces equipment and weapons superior to those of any potential enemy, but the same thing applies to other governmental agencies and to industry as well. It is basic research which provides the data and general knowledge for use by those engaged in applied research for particular ends, and neither Government nor industry can maintain substantial technological progress without a steady increase in the quality and scope of this basic knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that that statement by Dr. Compton alone is the overwhelming argument which makes this legislation important and imperatively necessary.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

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

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. May I say that I grew up in the same town with Dr. Karl Compton, attended the same college, and have had definite correspondence with him relative to this legislation. I asked him one question which maybe the gentleman believe it would stifle private industry in its efforts and research?

Mr. HALE. I quite definitely do, and I am going to develop that thought.

Nothing would please me more than to join in the chorus of praise for this legislation. It is never very pleasant to serve as a dissenter on a congressional committee, particularly on a committee as strong and able as I think the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is. It is only because I feel rather strongly that this particular piece of legislation is not really wise and salutary that I voted against it in the committee this year. I voted against it in the Eightieth Congress, and at that time made a more elaborate and extensive speech than I expect to make today.

The truth of the matter as I see it is that the effect of this bill is to inject science into politics and politics into science; and I think it is a miscegenation devoutly to be avoided.

I do not believe that you can possibly draw a bill which gives Government control over scientific-research programs and still leaves scientists the freedom I think they must have. Nobody has said any more eloquently than it was said this morning by the gentleman from Massachusetts, our majority leader, that the scientist must have his freedom. I do

not care how well-meaning political bureaus or commissions or foundations may be, I do not think they can leave scientists altogether free, and free scientists must be.

The way to accomplish the result which this bill seeks to accomplish is, in my opinion, to amend our tax laws and make more readily possible private donations and corporate donations to scientific pursuits and research. I believe that amendments of this kind to our tax laws could very readily be devised. I think they would be completely effective, and would cost the Government very much less money than it will find itself spending for the support of this Foundation.

The trouble with this bill, in my opinion, is that it is one more straw in the gradual socialization of our whole national structure. I read the other night with great interest the President's \$100-dinner speech in which he poked fun at the Republican Party for opposing this, that and the other measure as being socialistic. Of course, Mr. Chairman, one straw does not make a haystack. Two straws do not make a haystack. Three or 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 100, or 200 straws do not make a haystack. Finally you get enough straws—I just do not know how many it does take—but you get enough straws and you get something that everybody recognizes to be a haystack. It seems to me if you place more and more activities, whether of a business or a scientific nature, under Government regimentation, then you have—finally—a structure, the character of which no one can mistake. I have great respect for Dr. Compton and Dr. Bush and all the other distinguished scientific gentlemen who favor this legislation.

I will call attention to the fact, however, that there are many distinguished scientists who are heartily opposed to this legislation. During the Eightieth Congress I inserted in the Record a very large number of communications which I received from distinguished scientists in opposition to a measure similar to this. But the sad truth is that too many scientists find themselves like so many farmers, manufacturers, and others unable to resist the lure of Government subsidies. I wish that this legislation might be rejected. Science will not suffer if it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the Office of Scientific Research and Development, as directed by Dr. Vannevar Bush, was an organization during the war of 5,000 scientists and 10,000 technicians. They advanced our scientific and technical knowledge 20 years in the space of 5 war years. If the Office of Scientific Development and Research was efficacious during the war, we should have a continuation of similar work during peacetime. The National Science Foundation would accomplish that—a continuation of the splendid work performed by these technicians and scientists under the able direction of Dr. Vannevar Bush.

I hope a man of the caliber and stamp of Dr. Vannevar Bush will become Chief of the National Science Foundation. We could never find a better man than he to head up this outfit.

There are no longer any physical frontiers but frontiers of science are still vague intellectual regions unconquered. Indeed, they seem to recede ever further away as physicists, biochemists, biologists, medical savants make new revelations and discoveries.

To help control these ever-changing frontiers will be the function of the National Science Foundation. That problem is too gigantic for private industry or groups to cope with. Our Government must step in.

I want to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that Charles Kettering, a very noted scientist and automotive industrialist, tells us that 6,000,000 men and women are marked for death from cancer and 200,000 will die every year from that dread scourge, cancer. If a cure could be found for cancer at a cost of \$25,000,000, which is the estimated ultimate cost for the National Science Foundation, I say the cost would be minuscule in comparison to the dread disease called cancer. Dr. Kettering stated:

Cancer presents a number of curious paradoxes, such as the fact that biologically it is at the positive extreme of life and growth and is at the same time a widespread cause of death; that the more complete our medical services and the higher our standards of living, the more cancer we seem to develop; that scientists have a relatively great knowledge of the world around us, but have failed to penetrate with equal mastery the unit of man himself, the cell.

Then he goes on to ask: Why is it that 200,000 people amid us must die every year from cancer?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman understands that vast sums of money are now being spent upon research to discover the cause and cure of cancer.

Mr. CELLER. I say that the National Science Foundation, regardless of all other scientific endeavor, will specifically direct its attention to the finding of a cure for cancer.

Take the case of the common cold. The medical profession has advanced remarkably in latter years, but it is no disparagement of the medical profession to say that the doctors have not even succeeded in finding a cure for the common cold. The story is told of a man who comes to a doctor. The doctor says, "Why, you are suffering from a cold." "Well, can you help me?" asked the patient. The doctor says, "I'll tell you what you do. It is raining cats and dogs outside, take off your coat and your hat and walk about 3 miles in that teeming rain. Then come back to me."

The patient said, "But I will get pneumonia."

The doctor said, "That is exactly what I want you to get. I can cure pneumonia but I cannot cure a common cold."

If we could cure a common cold, it would be worth more than the \$25,000,000 a year, the cost of estimated operation under the National Science Foundation.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not want the gentleman to be under a misapprehension, of course. The \$25,000,000 that is proposed here as the cost of this bill is in no way related to the direct research in the field of cancer. If the gentleman had been here he would understand that the National Science Foundation itself is not to be an operating agency. We are going to spend \$100,000,000, if necessary. Do not talk \$25,000,000 in cancer. We want a hundred million dollars.

Mr. CELLER. Please do not use all my time. I will say to the gentleman that we in this House still have control of the purse strings of the Nation. All you need to do is to vote down anything above and beyond \$25,000,000. I want to be economical when it comes to expenditures. Economy, yes; but not parsimony. I do not want to react toward this proposition in a pinch-penny manner. I fear that some of those who are opposing this bill are acting in a niggardly manner. The National Science Foundation will have justified itself if it finds, say, the cause and cure of heart disease. Where human life is at stake, the cost cannot be weighed as some do in the Chamber who oppose the bill. The argument of bureaucracy as advanced against the bill is the usual argument of die-hard conservatism. If another bureau will help save human lives or advance our national health and welfare, I am for another bureau.

There are scores of nonfatal maladies of which medical science knows very little. Those maladies are serious and laden with intense pain. They are not lethal. You do not die from them, but their cost in misery and suffering and the loss of man-hours is incalculable. Maybe the National Science Foundation can find a cause and give us a remedy for shingles, for gout, for arthritis, for rheumatism. Medical science has not been able to effectuate a cure for any of those diseases that I have mentioned. They do not know the causes and, therefore, know no permanent cure. Take the malady commonly called gout. It involves the one having gout in most excruciating pain. There is the idea that gout is caused from an improper accumulation of uric acid that has an affinity for the great big toe. I was afflicted with gout not so long ago. The doctor told me I had the gout. I was in terrible pain. I said, "Are you sure? I do not lead that kind of a life." "Oh," he said, "you have been reading Dickens or Benjamin Franklin's Ode to Gout." "Gout," he said, "could attack anyone; man or woman, tall or short, lean or fat; those who live richly and those who live on an austere diet." "But," he said, "we really do not know much about it." He gave a specific remedy which tended to relieve the pain, but gout can recur any time.

Shingles is a dreadful affliction. I hope nobody ever gets shingles, but I can tell you that shingles is like a thousand toothaches under your skin. It is due to some nerve condition, but the doctors know practically nothing about it except to recognize the symptoms. Maybe the National Science Foundation will yield a remedy for shingles or gout or arthritis.

Medical science and biochemistry have lengthened somewhat life's span, but there seems to be no valid reason why it should not be lengthened further. The National Science Foundation might well be the fulcrum by which our life's span might be heightened and lifted.

Too many of our own members leave us for their final reward at a time when they reach the height of their intellectual powers; when they could do their best work and create greater benefits for the Nation; when they could draw upon rich experience to help solve the problems of this hectic age. But illness besets them and the grim reaper demands his toll.

Perhaps through the National Science Foundation we can help to strengthen these men in body and mind by postponing the coming of infirmities and thus give them a longer lease on life.

I recall the lines in the second act of Shakespeare's *As You Like It*:

Last scene of all
That ends this strange eventful history,
Is second childishness and mere oblivion,
Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything.

Perhaps the research and medical and technological advances that would be made by the National Science Foundation can prevent the second childishness and mere oblivion that comes with the seventh age of man, so that men at seventy could be strong and vigorous and still have their faculties and not be "sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything."

I also recall the lines in *All's Well That Ends Well*:

Let me not live
After my flame lacks oil, to be the snuff of
younger spirits.

Perhaps the results of the research of the National Science Foundation can supply that oil now lacking and make the flame of life glow after seventy.

A proposed amendment would add a loyalty oath requirement for scholarship and fellowship holders. The amendment would add a part (b) to section 10 reading as follows:

No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure by the Foundation under authority of this act shall be used to make payments under any scholarship or fellowship to any individual unless there is on file with the Foundation an affidavit executed by such individual that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable in respect of such affidavits.

As to this amendment, I quote from an article by Dael Wolfe, of the Ameri-

can Psychological Association, as same appears in the magazine *Science*, published by American Association on the Advancement of Science, January 27, 1950:

This amendment was proposed to the very great regret of scientists. It was proposed last spring when Atomic Energy Commission fellowship holders were under fire from other congressional committees. It is a concession to the current temper of Congress and many citizens. But it is unnecessary; overt treason or acts of disloyalty are adequately handled by existing law, which is not strengthened by the affidavit requirement. It is also an invasion of freedom, and it is disturbing to have undergraduate and graduate students majoring in any of the sciences and supported by Foundation funds required to sign such an affidavit regardless of whether the work upon which they are engaged requires security classification or not. The affidavit is, however, a milder requirement than the FBI investigation which must now be made of all Atomic Energy Commission fellows, and accepting it may be necessary. At its meeting in New York City on December 27 the Inter-Society Committee for a National Science Foundation formally voted its disapproval of the inclusion of this proposed amendment. At the same time, if the amendment is added despite the opposition which it will arouse, the bill as a whole will have the support of the intersociety committee.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I hope there is no misapprehension among the membership of this committee and the House concerning the basic reasons why this bill is brought here. There is a very vast difference between what is called basic or fundamental research and the applied research, which is that type of research which most of us seem somewhat familiar with. Basic research is something that delves into the absolutely unknown; it delves into the very deepest unknown aspects of science. We talk a lot about virus diseases, for example; but no one yet knows what a virus is; it is a name for something they describe, but they have yet to find out what a virus is, what it looks like and how viruses differ from one another. It is said that a virus causes shingles; it is said that a virus causes the common cold, but no one yet has been able to identify either or do anything to destroy them except to know that they are there. This is one example in the field of medicine.

In the field of pure science such as that dealing generally with electronics or radiation, it was research into the very unknown, the blue, so to speak, that brought out those principles which developed in the application of that science into, among other applications, what now is known as radar. In the field of mathematics it is not the kind of mathematics that figures out some particular problem, but it is the finding of new kinds of mathematics with which to learn the answers to heretofore unsolved questions. This is basic; it is fundamental; it has nothing to do with the applications of the things that are discovered.

My good friend, the gentleman from Maine, has said that this problem might

well be solved; that is, the problem of the financial support of basic or fundamental research, if we would permit a greater exemption in the income tax for gifts to scientific institutions, and I have no quarrel with that. I believe that if instead of having a 10 percent allowable deduction from income for contributions to eleemosynary institutions, churches, and so forth and so on, it were 20 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent, or 50 percent, we might indeed get those moneys. But that is not in the offing as far as I can see into the future; I cannot see any immediate time in the future when deductions would be permitted to be made from income for these purposes so long as we have the very great national debt we now have to meet. It is important if we are going to find those basic and fundamental answers that are needed from science before we can make application of those answers to the solution of the many, many problems in our country that the Government help in establishing this foundation.

Let me point out that during the recent war when we had the Selective Service Act before us we made no exemption of scientific personnel until we found our universities stripped of some of the really great minds that were needed to train further in basic science. I offer that statement here because if we ever should consider another such bill let us not take these minds that can be developed into the very highest type and send them out to dig trenches, to bake bread, to carry arms, or whatever else the man might be called upon to do in the field of military effort. We must realize that we had a whole generation of these fellows taken out of our colleges. Today we are short of men who can think into the blue, into the unknown, and we must reestablish that broader basis of men who are interested in these technologies and scientific pursuits in order that we can keep abreast and keep ahead of our applied science which are searching for new knowledge on which to base further applications.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I had a little experience in the Eightieth Congress that impressed me with the need for an organization such as the one set up in this bill. When the Armed Services Committee was organized the chairman of that committee, the late Mr. Andrews, of New York, appointed a scientific research and development subcommittee and he named me as chairman of that committee. I learned there that the last war was won in a large measure in the laboratories of the country.

The thing that the military men and the scientific men with whom we came in contact dwelt on most was the need for basic research; that is, to expand the frontiers of science and thus learn something new. Part of the object in pursuing basic research was to block out theories they had which were not tenable, it was found, after extensive basic research.

I am not impressed with the argument that this might mean the regimentation of scientists. In our great State universities which our various States own and operate, and I have gone to two of them, that has not occurred. At the University of Wisconsin, where I was a student at one time, there was a charge that the scientists were being regimented and there was such a violent reaction to this charge that no one ever tried to regiment the scientists any more.

Also I learned as a member of this committee that the cost of basic research is so stupendous and also so essential that we must find money other than private money to finance it. The only place I can see to find that money is in the National Treasury. Even the States such as California and Wisconsin, whose activities in science are nationally recognized cannot, without private aid finance such programs. As everyone has pointed out, the private foundations are gradually dying out due to our fiscal system, which levies very high taxes on large incomes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill affords a vehicle which can do the basic research that is necessary in our national defense as well as in our national life and for the reasons stated I am going to support the bill.

We have not been as preeminent in pure research as many people believe. The following statement from Dr. Vannevar Bush from his book, *Science: The Endless Frontier*, which I accept as my statement, states the situation as follows:

Our national preeminence in the fields of applied research and technology should not blind us to the truth that, with respect to pure research—the discovery of fundamental new knowledge and basic scientific principles—America has occupied a secondary place. Our spectacular development of the automobile, the airplane, and radio obscures the fact that they were all based on fundamental discoveries made in nineteenth-century Europe. From Europe also came formulation of most of the laws governing the transformation of energy, the physical and chemical structure of matter, the behavior of electricity, light, and magnetism. In recent years the United States has made progress in the field of pure science, but an examination of the relevant statistics suggests that our efforts in the field of applied science have increased much faster so that the proportion of pure to applied research continues to decrease.

Several reasons make it imperative to increase pure research at this stage in our history. First, the intellectual banks of continental Europe, from which we formerly borrowed, have become bankrupt through the ravages of war. No longer can we count upon those sources for fundamental science. Second, in this modern age, more than ever before, pure research is the pacemaker of technological progress. In the nineteenth century, Yankee mechanical ingenuity, building upon the basic discoveries of European science, could greatly advance the technical arts. Today the situation is different. Future progress will be most striking in those highly complex fields—electronics, aerodynamics, chemistry—which are based directly upon the foundation of modern science. In the next generation, technological advance and basic scientific discovery will be inseparable; a nation which borrows its basic knowledge will be hopelessly handicapped in the race for innovation. The other world powers, we know, intend to foster scientific research in the future.

A matter that came to my attention while I was subcommittee chairman of the Scientific Research and Development Subcommittee was that there was a great shortage of scientists, especially young scientists. This was due in part to our failure to grant deferment to scientists who were inducted into the armed services. Britain deferred these men, but we did not. The Westinghouse Corp. is doing a marvelous work in conducting an annual contest to uncover scientific talent in our high schools. Each year they hold a dinner at which they announce the winners of their contest. This year is the ninth annual dinner which climaxes their science talent search and at this dinner 40 winners will be announced and given scholarships. This event is one of the most inspiring that I go to. I have not missed one since I was first invited. The winners who are brought to Washington receive scholarships ranging from \$2,800 to \$100. In addition the search reveals many more promising young scientists and 260 more are given honorable mention. The director of this great project is Mr. Watson Davis and the project is known as Science Service. The Westinghouse Corp. deserves great credit for sponsoring and financing this very important activity.

There is a great shortage of young scientists and this cannot be filled by private enterprise. Consequently I feel that a bill such as the one before us is worth passing so we may help private enterprise get the scientists that this modern world needs so badly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, until the Federal budget is balanced and payment on the national debt is at least begun, I must be convinced that H. R. 4846 or any bill, that would set up another bureau, is absolutely necessary or would be of immeasurable value to the country before I could vote for it.

Therefore, I should like to ask proponents of this so-called National Science Foundation Act of 1949 some questions.

I find in the bill absolutely no estimate as to how much the Foundation would cost the taxpayers per year. Under section 3, the Foundation would be allowed to make "grants, loans, and other forms of assistance" using, according to section 15, "such sums as may be necessary." It has been estimated on the floor that the cost would be at least \$25,000,000 a year.

To me, this looks too much like another blank check at the disposal, according to section 2, of the executive branch—in other words, the President. And, although section 3 provides for the Foundation to render an annual report to the President for submission to Congress, would not section 11 amount to censorship powers of information vital to the public through allowance of funds without regard to the limitations of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor?

Except under parts of section 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, establishing the Board, director, executive committee, divisional committees, and special commission, I can find no limitations as to the number of people who could be employed. And section 14 appears to give the director power to sidestep the Civil Service Commission. Is this true? If so, would not the patronage handed over to the President be practically unlimited?

What provision is there that any individual or group of individuals could make any crucial decision or recommendation when each member of the Foundation is appointed directly or indirectly by the President? In this connection, I call your attention to the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission was not permitted to decide whether to attempt the manufacture of the hydrogen bomb. The President asserted that he and he alone would make that decision.

And nowhere in the bill can I ascertain any guaranty against duplication of the Foundation's activities with such bureaus as the Atomic Energy Commission, the United States Employment Service, the Department of Education, and the Department of Defense. The bill, under section 14, for example, calls only for consultation or concurrence with certain bureaus.

Section 11 would give the Foundation authority to receive funds donated by others. Could this lead to coercion of individuals and businesses or favoritism to those able to afford contributions? Could further impropriety result through allowance of the director or deputy director to hold office in organizations making contracts with the Foundation simply by obtaining approval of the Executive Committee, as outlined in section 14?

And, under section 12, what would happen to the entire patent set-up with officers or employees of the Foundation being allowed to apply for patents under any rules and regulations that the Director might establish, even though such persons would be called nominees of the Government?

Would the bill allow the Foundation to confiscate personal property of all kinds including research facilities and patents? If not, where in the bill is such an interpretation precluded?

Under section 13, could not the Foundation grant up to a hundred percent of its funds to foreign governments and individuals? Is there any assurance that the Foundation would work primarily for the benefit of the people of the United States instead of foreign governments?

And could not scholarships, authorized by section 10, be used as subsidies for foreign universities?

If we approve this bill, will we create another bureaucracy that will grow and grow, eat up unlimited funds, roam and rule the entire arena of science and all people, businesses, associations, and educational institutions pertaining to science?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. To most of the gentleman's questions he can find answers in the report. But, the answer to the question concerning the hydrogen bomb and the Atomic Energy Commission, I will say to the gentleman that the Atomic Energy Act provides that the President, and the President alone, can make the decision as to whether or not to build it. That is the act.

Mr. GROSS. That may be true, and I think that act should be revised. I am likewise opposed to this legislation because it gives the President too much power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it is my firm conviction that this House should pass the National Science Foundation bill. My able and distinguished fellow committee member from Tennessee has ably and lucidly explained the working provisions of H. R. 4846, how the National Science Foundation would function and how it would fill the research needs of the United States. I cannot emphasize too greatly the need for this organization. Our Yankee ingenuity has always been turned to the mass production of goods rather than to the research of a fundamental sort that makes possible these new developments. American industry deals primarily and essentially with applied science and has preconceived goals which prevents its engineers, chemists and other skilled and trained employees from delving too far into the field of basic or speculative science. As a matter of fact some of our most sensational new processes and drugs have been the result of basic research on matters previously thought to have little bearing or relation to the end discovery. Such discoveries frequently come from remote and unexpected sources.

The desire of American industry for practical short term results as opposed to speculative research, which is essentially a long term proposition and non-commercial in nature, has led to a critical imbalance between basic and pure scientific research and applied scientific research. Probably less than 8 percent of the total expenditures on research activities in this country are channeled to basic research. The recent war channeled virtually all of our scientists away from basic research and the shortage of teachers, science graduates, and science Ph. D.'s has been estimated as high as 15,000, 100,000, and 3,000, respectively, for the three categories.

Further, if we look at our past spectacular development of the automobile, radio, airplane, radar, and the atomic bomb as well as other less publicized inventions it can readily be seen that a tremendous part of our basic knowledge in these fields has been borrowed from Europe. Take a look at the 149 Nobel Prize winners in physics, chemistry, and medicine from 1901 through 1948; 123 were born and received all their early training in Europe; only 22 were born in

the United States and trained here. With a war-devastated Europe, devastated intellectually as well and without the financial resources to conduct expensive basic research, the time has come when we can no longer depend on other nations for our basic discoveries. As we push on to new frontiers in science basic research is going to require more and more expensive equipment and better trained personnel. Our colleges and universities, long the primary source of pure scientific work in the United States, are finding that funds for anything but the applied sciences are dwindling yearly year. Endowment funds are inadequate and produce but an inadequate income from which to finance the basic research that provides the stream of new ideas and discoveries to turn the wheels of private and public enterprise.

Not only can we no longer borrow our basic scientific discoveries from Europe but we have but to peer beyond the iron curtain to see Russia midway in a 5-year program to produce 700,000 scientists and engineers and spending well over a billion dollars a year in scientific training. Further than that we have but to look at war-impooverished England to see an example of a country now learning in the hard school of experience what it means to drop behind in research and development and permit her factories and laboratories to become obsolete. I cannot overemphasize the importance of the National Science Foundation. It may well prove the slim margin of victory in a shooting or cold war. That is what radar proved to be in our war of attrition with the German submarine in the last war and German rockets were stilled only by capturing the launching sites.

The importance of a backlog of scientific data and research information is apparent from the development of penicillin and other wonder drugs. While war tended to accelerate the application of basic medical discoveries it was the fact of these discoveries that cut deaths from disease in the military from 14.1 per thousand in World War I to 0.6 per thousand in World War II. There remains yet a tremendous challenge in the medical research field. Heart disease, cancer and yearly scourges of infantile paralysis or polio are constant reminders of this fact.

H. R. 4846 is admirably suited to perform the functions demanded of it. The Hoover Commission in reporting on the Government's research program heartily endorsed the creation of the National Science Foundation and stated that it should have the following major functions:

- (a) To examine the total scientific research effort of the Nation;
- (b) To assess the proper role of the Federal Government in this effort;
- (c) To evaluate the division of research effort among the scientific disciplines and among fields of applied research; and
- (d) To evaluate the key factors that impede the development of an effective national research effort. Based upon its investigations, it should advise the President as to the measures necessary to establish a sound scientific research program for the Nation.

Compare that, if you will, with the functions stated in section 3 (a) of H. R. 4846; the Foundation is authorized and directed—

(1) To develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences;

(2) To initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biographical, engineering, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such basic scientific research and to appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and upon the general welfare;

(3) After consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;

(4) To award, as provided in section 10, scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

(5) To foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

(6) To evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups, including scientific research programs of agencies of the Federal Government, and to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with such programs;

(7) To establish such special commissions as the Board may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this act; and

(8) To maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways to provide a central clearinghouse for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States, including Territories and possessions.

Section 3 (b) goes on to state:

In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, it shall be one of the objectives of the Foundation to strengthen basic research and education in the sciences, including independent research by individuals, throughout the United States, including its Territories and possessions, and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education.

This bill further provides that until otherwise decided by the Foundation there will be certain divisions created within it as follows:

(1) A Division of Medical Research;

(2) A Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences;

(3) A Division of Biological Sciences; and

(4) A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall be concerned with programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

(b) There shall also be within the Foundation such other divisions as the Board may, from time to time, deem necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the creation of this Foundation with the purposes and organization provided in this bill will greatly stimulate and will coordinate and lend direction to the scientific endeavor of this Nation. May I state at this juncture that one of the most important features of this bill is that for scholarships and research fel-

lowships. The most important single factor in science and technology is the quality of the personnel engaged therein. Where there are always those rare individuals who will rise to the top without formal education and training they are the exception rather than the rule. Often the most talented of our youth are without means to pursue the extended education necessary to qualify them for pure science or basic research. The National Science Foundation will not only provide us with the means to educate the most talented of our youth but it will retain a register of the scientific personnel of the Nation for use in times of war or national emergency and as a clearinghouse for the full utilization of the creative potential of this group.

I want to stress, too, the fact that freedom of inquiry will be maintained and the Foundation will neither build nor operate scientific laboratories of its own. By utilizing the colleges and universities and private research facilities the Foundation will employ the most productive units of original and creative scientific thinking. This system will promote a strong sense of personal and intellectual freedom which we in America believe to be the most conducive to advancement and constructive work. Further, this agency is designed and is instructed by the terms of the bill to work to supplement and encourage private research facilities and efforts of manufacturers and others. With such a provision this bill has the support of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Another benefit that will be derived from the Foundation is the general dissemination of scientific information to all the country except that which must be retained for security reasons. Presently only large, well-established and highly integrated corporations are able to maintain a research staff with sufficient qualifications and proper equipment to carry on the long-range work necessary in basic research. As a result these units place small independent businesses at a competitive disadvantage and tends to foster monopoly of patents on new discoveries in corporations of that category. Published results of research under the National Science Foundation would be equally accessible to small businesses as large, and with equal speed.

I do not hold out the National Science Foundation to be a panacea for progress but I do conceive of it as furnishing the necessary impetus to basic research which is an essential ingredient in our search for better health, prosperity, and national security. It will enable us to raise our standards of living and to release the full creative and productive energies of the American people. It is vital to our goal of full employment and a fruitful life.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, former Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, in September 1945 dramatically pointed out that our new frontiers lie in scientific research, and I quote his words:

It has been basic United States policy that Government should foster the opening of

new frontiers. It opened the seas to clipper ships and furnished land for pioneers. Although these frontiers have more or less disappeared, the frontier of science remains. It is in keeping with the American tradition—one which has made the United States great—that new frontiers shall be made accessible for the development by all American citizens.

Mr. Chairman, it is my firm conviction that the National Science Foundation will open new frontiers for all American people and help maintain this country in its present preeminent position. I urge the Members of the House of Representatives to approve it. I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Act of 1949."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions which I would appreciate having cleared up either by the gentleman from Tennessee or the gentleman from New Jersey, or both, or by some other member of the committee.

On page 13, section 11 subsection (e) gives to the Foundation the authority to acquire property by purchase, lease, loan, or otherwise. I am somewhat worried about the power of eminent domain, not so much in the field of real estate, although offhand I fail to see why it should be necessary for this Foundation to have any power to condemn property since it is not to be an operating agency, but I am particularly interested in, and the point to which I would appreciate some member of the committee directing his remarks has to do with the possible power of eminent domain over patents and patent rights.

I have received a number of communications from individuals connected with several industries in my community employing large numbers of men and women who are very much afraid that this particular language might permit the Foundation to acquire and force a concern to give up valuable patent rights through the power of condemnation.

I notice, however, on page 159 of the hearings, that when there was some colloquy on the point both the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Minnesota indicated that they did not think this power did exist. It seems to me important to have this point clarified on the record.

I have prepared an amendment to this section to exclude the power of eminent domain over patents and patent rights. If it is not necessary, I do not want to offer it, but if it is, I should like to offer it, when we reach the consideration of section 11.

I want to be sure that the Foundation cannot claim, by virtue of the provisions of this bill, that it has the right to walk into any plant, large or small, and say to the management that it must turn

over valuable patent rights to the Government without any choice in the matter or any voice except to be heard on the question of the amount of compensation.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate very much the gentleman's position in the matter. I can say without reservation that the Foundation would not have any authority under this bill or under any law on the statute books today to exercise the right of eminent domain and to condemn patents. The only general authority for eminent domain is contained in an act passed in 1888. That act restricts the right of Government agencies which have the authority under the act to real property for the purpose of public buildings, highways, bridges, and other public structures of that kind. So the question of having any right to exercise eminent domain over patents is not contained in this law nor any other law. I believe we have studied that question pretty thoroughly to determine that point.

Mr. KEATING. That has been canvassed by the committee, and that is the considered judgment of those who have studied it?

Mr. PRIEST. That is the considered judgment of those who have studied it over quite a long period of time.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. As a matter of fact there was language which would have permitted that in the original bill, as I remember it, as it was submitted to the committee. It was specifically stricken from the bill by the committee and has not been reinserted in either the Eightieth or Eighty-first Congress. There is no power whatsoever to exercise eminent domain in this bill as we understand it.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to refer to another section. At page 3, section 3, subsection (6) has to do with the evaluation and correlation of scientific research programs. As now worded, it gives authority and direction to evaluate all such programs, both those undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government and by individuals and private research groups. This seems to me to give rise to the possibility of an unwarranted intrusion into the affairs of individuals and such private research groups as are represented by the research laboratories of private industry.

Under no circumstances should this Foundation be able to claim that it is given authority under the provisions of this law to require, at least in time of peace, that private individuals or companies disclose the results of their own independent research. To permit otherwise would certainly open the door to the possibility of abuse through requiring an individual or company to make disclosure to the public, including that

individual's or that company's competitors of all the results of research which had entailed immense expenditures of time and money.

I had prepared an amendment to meet this problem, which would read as follows:

(6) To evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by public research groups, and by individuals and private research groups when mutually agreeable, including scientific research programs of agencies of the Federal Government, and to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with such programs.

Since I am now informed that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON] a member of the committee, will offer an amendment to limit the evaluation of the scientific research programs solely to agencies of the Federal Government, eliminate any authority for evaluation of such programs by individuals or private research groups and provide that it shall only be in the proper field of correlation that the Foundation shall have anything to do with such individual and private research groups, I shall, of course, not offer my amendment and will support the one offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Indeed, I think his language is superior to mine in making the legislative intent entirely clear that the Foundation shall under no circumstances, except by mutual agreement, be able to inject itself into the private field.

I sincerely hope that the important amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts will be adopted and I would emphatically urge its acceptance by the committee.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman, so far as I know on this side we are perfectly willing to accept it, and I feel that is true on the other side.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, enactment of H. R. 4846, the National Science Foundation bill, is vital to the welfare and security of the United States.

The National Science Foundation bill has been long in the making. It has received the most careful study by the Congress and by executive agencies of the Government over a period of years. Since July 1945, when Dr. Vannevar Bush submitted his memorable report, *Science: the Endless Frontier*, three separate Congresses have considered legislation and taken testimony from hundreds of witnesses prominent in our national life.

The objectives to be sought by a National Science Foundation have received virtually unanimous support and approval by these many witnesses and by other individuals and organizations throughout the country. The urgent need to foster and promote basic research in the sciences rises above any party consideration; it goes to the heart of our national welfare and safety.

True, there have been sharp differences of opinion and judgment on particular

provisions of the National Science Foundation bill. The appropriate administrative structure, the disposition of patents involved in Government-financed research, the place of the social sciences in the proposed program—these and other vexing problems have been debated.

President Truman's veto of a science foundation bill passed by the Eightieth Congress indicated that the problem of administrative organization had not been satisfactorily resolved. The bill that came from the Eightieth Congress would have vested the responsibility for major policy decisions in the hands of private persons. The President has been a firm and consistent supporter of National Science Foundation legislation, but he has rightly used his veto power to insist that the public interest be safeguarded.

The bill which we consider today has attempted to work out reasonable solutions to the controversial elements in earlier bills. Although these provisions may not meet with all of our individual views, I feel strongly that the unanimity of agreement on general objectives and the urgency of the need for this legislation should persuade us to vote the bill favorably.

It is important to note that the Hoover Commission in its report of Federal research specifically and unanimously recommended that a National Science Foundation be established.

In emphasizing the need for the development and integration of a research policy for the Federal Government as a whole, the Commission noted that an interdepartmental committee on scientific research and development had been created by executive order on December 1947. However, the Commission pointed out that the full potentialities of this interdepartmental committee had not been realized, partly due to lack of staff and funds, and then stated:

An interdepartmental committee working alone and without staff is seriously limited in achieving adequate coordination and in developing over-all plans to completion. This points to the need for a National Science Foundation. The major functions of such a foundation should be (a) to examine the total scientific research effort of the Nation, (b) to assess the proper role of the Federal Government in this effort, (c) to evaluate the division of research effort among the scientific disciplines and among fields of applied research, and (d) to evaluate the key factors that impede the development of an effective national research effort. Based upon its investigations, it should advise the President as to the measures necessary to establish a sound scientific research program for the Nation.

In addition, the foundation should be given appropriations for the support of basic research and for research fellowships in fields not adequately covered by the research grants and fellowships of other Federal Government agencies. The foundation might administer the grant and fellowship programs for which it has received funds, or delegate administration to other Federal agencies. In addition, it should advise the President as to the proper balance among research grant and fellowship programs supported by appropriations given to other Federal agencies, and as to major policies that

should govern the administration of these programs.

The National Science Foundation should consider most carefully the manner in which national policies with respect to scientific research are related to broader questions of educational policy. At present grants for research purposes are being made on a hit-and-miss basis, making the award of research grants, in effect, a new form of patronage. The awarding of research grants must be put upon a more systematic basis, with due recognition given to their impact on the educational programs of our higher institutions of learning.

Also the Hoover Commission task force report on Federal medical services, emphasizing the vital relationship of basic research to the future of scientific medicine, stated as follows:

We recommend the creation of a National Science Foundation, not as a specific organizational reform in the Federal medical service, but as an obvious means of insuring the strength in basic sciences upon which our national security rests and upon which the future progress of scientific medicine depends. Some members of our committee feel that the foundation should cover the social sciences as well; others stress that it should include lay members. Our concept of a foundation, it should be pointed out, calls for very great powers and resources to sustain and, where necessary, to increase the output of basic scientists, to develop new fields of knowledge, and to support educational and training institutions.

As a people interested in the practical results of scientific research, it is difficult for us to realize how dangerously we have exhausted the scientific resources which make these benefits possible. As Dr. Bush pointed out in his famous report, more than 4 years ago, the bank of scientific brains in Europe, from which we borrowed so lavishly in years past, was shattered by the war. In our own company, we have been living on our scientific capital, so to speak, without making adequate provision for the future.

In my studies as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have been impressed with the fact that the development of atomic energy rests on a complex pattern of theoretical investigations and discoveries by scientists throughout the world for the past hundred or more years. Basic research is by no means an American monopoly, but we have new and great responsibilities to our own people and to those of other nations, facilities for conducting basic research must be greatly expanded.

Many more of our young people must be trained for scientific pursuits—for basic scientific research from which flow the practical results that increase the comforts and conveniences of daily life, that make for greater health and happiness, and that guarantee our national security in an age of unprecedented technical developments.

In this connection, I note that social sciences are not specifically excluded from the national science foundation bill as reported by the committee. I hope that the social sciences will receive their full share of attention in the work of the new foundation. We must learn how to live in this new age of science, with its enormous possibilities for human welfare or human destruction. The

social sciences have a legitimate place in the work of the proposed National Science Foundation.

As the members know, a number of Government agencies, including the Atomic Energy Commission, already are conducting scientific research programs along certain lines. Section 14 (j) of the bill very clearly provides that the work of the National Science Foundation will not duplicate that of the Atomic Energy Commission. At the same time, section 14, paragraphs (g) and (h) provide a means of integrating Government activities in scientific and technical research.

Establishment of the National Science Foundation will make possible a national policy in these fields, and become an instrument for maintaining the continuity of that policy. Under the impetus of the foundation, private universities and institutions will carry on a large share of the basic scientific research. Presently these institutions cannot conduct unaided the costly programs that modern science requires. And many of our most talented youth cannot, without some financial aid, put those talents to use through education in the universities.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important bills to be considered by this session of Congress. Its enactment will have lasting benefits. It will meet a need recognized by all persons who have concerned themselves with the general welfare of our country in this scientific age.

I believe the hearings show that we had arrived at the point of graduating about 2,000 basic research scientists in 1941. This number declined during the war to about a thousand a year, and we have gradually increased it to about 1,700 a year. So we are still behind in our annual graduation of scientists before we went into World War II.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, the gentleman will agree that the reason why the number of young scientists dropped off during the war was the foolish policy that the United States had of drafting young scientists into the armed services, regardless of their ability or the need for them in the field in which they were occupied?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I agree completely with the gentleman's observation. I say that any drafting in anticipation of a future war should be done on a scientific basis, and I mean scientific by not taking those people that are most valuable to our economy in time of a crisis.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is a member the great Committee on Armed Services, is he not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, I am not, at this time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman was at one time?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was at one time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hope that when we have this new so-called selective-service extension bill before the House that we will provide for proper exemption of those men who are necessary to science in time of war.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly trust that if a selective service draft is inaugurated, that it shall be done in the proper manner.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think the gentleman also remembers that England followed a different policy. They exempted those scientists from military service?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is exactly right, and we had to lean on England for some of our most important scientists in the field of basic science as well as applied science in the atomic field.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The figures which the gentleman gave with respect to the number of graduates show that the number had been reduced to 1,000 during the war and immediately thereafter. Those figures have increased to 1,700.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And that figure of 1,700 is already 1 year old.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are still gaining.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is not nearly as desperate as that figure would indicate.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I did not mean to say that it was desperate, but I believe the gentleman will agree with me that we are facing an age now where scientific advancement is much more important than it was 10 years ago.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And more and more people are going into it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has again expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer a technical amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRIEST: On page 1, line 4, strike out "1949" and insert in lieu thereof "1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I feel that this is the last word, and that the last word is a question: Shall we be able to survive the things that we ourselves do? The burdens you place upon the taxpayers of America. This question becomes especially pertinent when it is brought out, as was done here this afternoon by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], that for scientific research in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and other branches of Government we are spending close to a billion dollars annually. A tremendous sum for research, yet you go at it again. Spend, spend, spend. Notwithstanding this huge expenditure, a bill is brought

in today to set up another organization of 24 Board members to be appointed by the President, a bill to establish a bigger and bigger government by setting up this National Science Foundation. On what foundation? A bankrupt Treasury? Apparently no consideration is given to what we may be able to do to save our country from disaster and distress by lightening the load of burdensome expensive government on the people of this country. No thought of the cost of this bill. No thought on your part of where will you get the money.

I do not know where in the world we are going; I do not know where you are headed, except for bankruptcy. Sometimes I think some of you do not care a hoot where we go.

In your own household when your funds are exhausted but somebody in the household gets the idea that a new dishwasher would be nice, a new garbage disposal unit, or a new set of cupboards, a new car or radio; you would not go ahead and obligate yourself, put yourself in debt until you had figured how you were going to be able to finance the improvements; you would try to keep your household on a good sound basis by getting along with what you had. But that is not the way this Congress does things. Just as in the country at large, so in this very House of Representatives, there are many who are always trying to establish something new, who are urging these departments all the time to go ahead and set up these great organizations without regard as to how they can be financed. Will you ever get sensible? The first thing you know our house is going to tumble down on us and we are going to be in the very position Joe Stalin predicted for us, wrecked financially. And whose fault will it be? Why it will be the fault of those men who have been advocating all these things and who have been squandering the taxpayers' money and the resources of the country, foisting the load off onto our children, and our children's children. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Honest to goodness, you ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Sometimes I wonder if we have any sense at all. I do not say that we are fools, but certainly we do the things that fools would do. This is about as close as I can come to expressing myself adequately without being thrown out of the Chamber, but I mean every word I have said.

We are in the position right now of setting up this new organization. Two months ago the President said the state of the Nation was good, yet at the time he made that statement he knew that a lot of coal miners were not mining coal; he knew that things were getting tighter and tighter; but because he promised a lot of labor leaders that he would do away with the Taft-Hartley Act he let things go on and on in the coal fields until now there are many communities of the country without sufficient coal to keep warm in this winter weather.

He should have put the Taft-Hartley Act in operation in January and we wouldn't be where we are today, no coal, people freezing, men out of work, a mess by a messer Truman. Whose fault is that? It is due to the dilatory tactics of

the Chief Executive in letting this thing go on. He is liable to bring in a bill, and many of you will support it, to nationalize the coal industry of this country. Right there we start in with his socialistic program. You are getting into it up to your neck. Who said it was the President's duty to take over these mines? Why, Bill Green. The labor leaders want it and they are going to try to force you to do it. Shame on you if you take over the coal mines. Next it will be railroads, telephones, and what not. Socialism, New Dealism—everything but Americanism. This bill is not necessary, it is not economical, it is not for the good of the country, and I am opposed to it today. Because Great Britain went socialistic last week is no reason for us doing so. Because Britain wants Attlee instead of Churchill for Prime Minister is their business, but it is our business when they want us to give them a billion and a half to keep the Socialist Government alive. It's your constituent's business and I hope they will take care of you for giving us away, I hope they will take care of our Government by watching how you vote to put us into bankruptcy. I say "be nifty and thrifty in Fifty." Vote this bill down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a few questions of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee who was in charge of the writing of this bill, as I understand it, in order that we may get definitely in this RECORD a very clear legislative intent whenever the question of interpretation of this bill might arise. Some of these questions I have asked during general debate, but I want to ask them again and pin-point them at this time in order that there may be one place in the RECORD where we can point to and say to whoever may be called upon to interpret the provisions of this bill hereafter: Here is what the Congress had in mind when it passed this particular legislation.

Most Members of Congress are thoroughly familiar with the grant and aid program of the Public Health Service and the programs of research conducted at the National Institutes of Health and the programs of research in the field of medicine and related activities that are being given gratis to the National Institutes of Health programs. If this legislation is passed, is it proposed that those programs will be taken over by the National Science Foundation and administered by it as an operating agency?

Mr. PRIEST. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I, too, think it is important that at one particular place in the RECORD, to use the gentleman's words, "we pin-point" this question in order to establish definitely legislative intent.

The answer to the gentleman's question is "No." I have a great interest in these particular grant and aid programs conducted under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service, as does the gentleman. I appreciate his interest. We

have worked together in the past in connection with the Heart Institute, the mental-health program, the Cancer Institute, and other programs. I would not consent to see anything come that would in any way interfere with that categorical work being done by these institutes in the Public Health Service. I reiterate that the answer to his question is "No."

Mr. KEEFE. The answer to the question is "No." May I say to the gentleman that he well knows I have devoted the major part of my legislative work in the Congress during the past 12 years in the field of public health, and I do not want to see any interference or any obstruction of the programs that the Congress has unanimously put into action in the fields that the gentleman has just referred to.

A serious question has arisen in my mind as to whether or not if the National Science Foundation is appointed under the general provisions found in this bill some individual who might be appointed or who may head it might be of strong enough character to say: We are going to take these programs over and run them ourselves as an operating agency. He could do it under this bill?

Mr. PRIEST. I do not think so, and if the gentleman would point out any language which he believes would give the Foundation that authority, I should be happy to examine it, and I know that the committee will.

Mr. KEEFE. All I have in mind, may I say to the gentleman, is the function of the Foundation, specifically section 3, subparagraph (2), page 2, of the bill where it says that the Foundation is authorized and directed to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, and other sciences.

My question with reference to that is this: You do not mean by that language that they are to disturb the existing programs that the Congress has already established in those fields?

Mr. PRIEST. Certainly we do not mean that they should disturb them, and they could not disturb them without having authority, in effect, to nullify an act of Congress, because all of these programs are established by law and are operating under law, and I do not believe that this language relating to initiating and supporting scientific research could quite be interpreted to mean that they could nullify an act of Congress, and we do not intend that that be the purpose.

Mr. KEEFE. A further question. There are pending now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a number of bills relating to categorical programs that affect a number of the great menaces to mankind, arthritis, rheumatism, and so forth. I believe there are two.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to my colleagues that the subject of this colloquy that is taking place between the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and myself we have previously discussed, and we believe that it is in the interest of proper legislative action to have answers to these questions which I have given a good deal of study to in connection with this bill.

Now I want to ask this question: If the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce decided to pass a bill providing for a new Institute of Health to deal with the problem of rheumatism and arthritis, or multiple sclerosis, or poliomyelitis, or some of the other diseases not covered in the categorical program, you would have no idea but what, when Congress so legislated, those programs would be conducted as the categorical programs are being conducted today, and that the Science Foundation would not disturb or take those programs over.

Mr. PRIEST. I certainly would have no other idea than that any new research institute that might be set up would operate just as those already established are operating insofar as any taking over by the Science Foundation is concerned; provided they are set up on the same basis, they would operate the same, and generally we have the pattern there on which all of those research programs do operate. May I say this to the gentleman—and I want to make this clear—I do not want anything that I might say here to be interpreted as meaning that there could not be a voluntary cooperation between the Foundation and the Public Health Service, if they so desired, but there is nothing in the bill, and it is not the intention of the author of the bill or the committee that reported it to give it any authority to take over any research work.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to my distinguished friend, if the present bill did not have provision in it that would permit such correlation, I would not think it would be worth while at all. I am heartily in accord with that particular phase of it.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Every once in a while the gentleman asks the question whether or not the existing programs could be taken over and operated. May I point out to the gentleman the language on page 17 of the bill in section 14, subsection (c) as relates to operation:

The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

That may refer to the physical plants and the operation of them and the pointing out that they cannot take them over and operate along that line.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, that does not answer the question that I had in mind. While I thank the gentleman for interjecting that, that is not a contribution to the issue that is before us, may I say in my humble opinion, with respect to the question that I asked.

The next question is this, may I say to the Chairman: It has been indicated by many who are interested as I am in the passage of this bill ultimately that they may contemplate that the National Science Foundation itself will come before the Congress and ask for one integrated over-all appropriation dealing with the question of basic research outside of the appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission, which is exempt from the provisions of this bill. I would ask the gentleman whether or not it is his intent or the intent of the committee that the present system of having the agencies of Government that are charged with the responsibility for conducting the research come before the Congress and present their needs shall be changed in favor of one over-all appropriation request.

Mr. PRIEST. The answer to that question is that there is no intention to have any one agency come before the Congress to ask for an over-all appropriation for scientific research, and there is not contemplated any change in the present policies and practices in that respect.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for his statement in that regard.

I notice that section 3 (a) 6 of the bill has been amended on page 3 at line 6 to provide that the Foundation shall "evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups." The bill contained previous to the amendment the following language:

To correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups.

There is a vast difference between correlation and evaluation. I should like to get it clear in the RECORD as to just what the committee had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. I notice the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON] is on his feet. He has an amendment which he proposes to offer, and which I propose to accept as chairman of the subcommittee—and I find no objection to it on the part of any member of the committee—which will read as follows, in lieu of the language in paragraph 6 on page 3:

To evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government and to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups.

The gentleman will notice that the emphasis here is shifted. There is no effort to correlate the other programs with the Foundation but, after evaluating and saying what others are doing, then it is to map its own program and correlate it with the others. I think there is quite a difference there, and

that that would answer some of the objections raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] earlier in the day.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman. May I ask this further question:

Is it the intent under this bill that in making the evaluation of these programs the Foundation itself shall be compelled to scrutinize and go into each individual budget and approve or disapprove the budget request made by the operating agencies?

Mr. PRIEST. That is not the intention.

Mr. KEEFE. Now this final question:

On page 19, line 76, these words are stricken from the bill:

(h) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies authorized to engage in scientific research or development.

Why did the committee strike out that language if it is the purpose of this bill to maintain the existing research activities of the Public Health Service, for example?

Mr. PRIEST. It is my understanding that this language was stricken from the bill for one or two reasons, largely because it was believed that other sections of the bill, particularly the so-called Heslton amendment and one or two other sections, made this language unnecessary.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman in conjunction with what he has already said with the apparent consent of other members of the committee as to the purpose of the committee in striking this out as to there not being an operating agency so far as the public health is concerned in the National Science Foundation that perhaps it was thought this was not necessary because it is the legislative intent of the committee now that so far as the operating programs of the public health are concerned, they shall not be transferred to the Foundation and it shall not become an operating agency with respect to the health program. Is that correct?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct, and that generally was the reason for striking this language—it was considered entirely unnecessary at that point.

Mr. KEEFE. I might say to the gentleman having satisfactorily cleared up these questions which I have had in my mind with respect to this bill, I shall vote for the bill because I think there is no field in the world in which we need activity more than we need it in the field of basic research.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Where in this bill is this safeguard contained?

Mr. KEEFE. It is contained in the colloquy which has just taken place between the gentleman and myself, which writes the legislative history of this bill and the construction which should be placed upon it. I realize full well that a bureau which may be set up may pay

no attention, and the Supreme Court may pay no attention to what has taken place here today, but if they follow the usual practice of legislative construction they will go into these debates and the legislative history of the bill which, in my opinion, will be helpful in determining what the Congress had in mind when it passed the bill.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman who is now addressing the committee and the gentleman from Tennessee have any objection to putting that language back into the bill in addition to the colloquy that you have had here? Why should it not be put back in?

Mr. KEEFE. I personally would like to see that done.

Mr. JUDD. So would I.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like to see that language on page 19 retained in the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman from Tennessee object to that?

Mr. KEEFE. I think it is good language and shows the intent clearly. It shows that is the intent of the Congress.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. Would the gentleman from Tennessee object?

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman, so far as I am concerned, it was not taken out at my request. It was done at the request of some Member, as I recall it, on the minority side of the committee. So far as I am personally concerned, I would not object to it. I do not think it is necessary. But I do not want to take the responsibility on behalf of the subcommittee by saying that I do not object when, as I recall it, it was taken out on motion of some minority Member. Perhaps I am mistaken about that, but I believe I am correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, for the past 5 years a proposal for the establishment of a national science foundation has been debated and discussed by people in and out of Congress. I have followed those discussions and debates with consuming interest. I am convinced that a national science foundation properly conceived and properly managed can serve a number of useful purposes. I would like to vote for the pending bill, H. R. 4846. However, I want to understand exactly what I am voting for. My primary interest is in the relationship between the proposed foundation's activities and the existing medical research activities of the Federal Government. I have as a major reward of my public career the satisfaction of having helped to form and enact the laws that have played a major part in redirecting the medical research of the entire Nation toward diseases that afflict mankind, and of expanding the support for basic medical research in the United States. Permit me to briefly explain first how medical research is being advanced through action taken by the Congress during the last few years.

The communicable diseases that once were the major causes of death are gradually becoming relatively less important. We still have not licked polio, nor do we have tuberculosis completely under control. We have yet to bring other infectious diseases under control. But,

in taking death rates and illness rates as a measure, diseases which formerly took a terrific toll in human life and suffering are now under complete control or have been eliminated completely as major causes of death: Venereal disease, pneumonia, yellow fever, typhus, malaria, and many other contagious and infectious diseases have been put under control as a result of the magnificent efforts of the researchers, scientists, and practitioners who now are armed with the implements to keep them under control.

Today, however, heart disease and diseases of the circulatory system, arthritis and rheumatism, cancer and mental disorders are the major causes of suffering incapacity and death. Recognizing the obligation of the Federal Government to lead in the field of basic research in an attempt to put these killers and cripples of mankind under control, the National Cancer Institute was established in 1937. The National Mental Health Institute was established in 1946. The National Heart Institute and the National Dental Research Institute were established in 1948. There is pending today in the House a bill which has already passed the Senate to establish an institute for neurology and blindness and an institute for rheumatism, arthritis, and metabolic diseases. Each of these institutes has or will have the authority to make grants for research and to award fellowships. In addition, they have as a result of the unanimous action of the Congress provided urgently needed funds for construction of research facilities, particularly for heart and cancer investigations. Each of these institutes has a national advisory council composed of outstanding people in each field, together with brilliant laymen who are dedicating themselves to the effort to find the cause and cure of these terrible scourges of mankind. All of the research grants made by the existing institutes are reviewed by nongovernmental specialists of the highest competence. It should be pointed out that under the laws applicable to each of these institutes, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service can approve no research grant that has not been approved by the appropriate advisory council. This system of supporting medical research is a going concern. I am proud to say that I have had a hand in devising this system and have a degree of pride in the fact that it is one system of Federal aid that has not resulted in Federal control. The present system protects the freedom of investigators in medical schools, research centers, and in universities. It is helping newer and smaller research centers throughout the country as well as the larger, well-established centers of research. It has received continuous support from people interested in public health matters, and the Congress has reflected that attitude of the general public by overwhelmingly supporting the program now in operation.

I am of the opinion that solely on the basis of dollars-and-cents return and on cold consideration of the Nation's requirements for national defense, we should be appropriating more for medi-

cal research. Time will not permit a demonstration of the cold economic facts aside from the humanitarian aspects that are involved. I can state without fear of contradiction, however, that the results already obtained and clearly indicated in the medical research field conducted under the direction of the National Institutes of Health have paid huge dividends to the American people. While the current funds available in the field of medical research are wholly insufficient, in my opinion, at the present time, I think it is only fair to say that the current levels of public expenditure are more nearly adequate than they were before the drive to conquer the chronic and degenerative diseases began in earnest. I am convinced that as a matter of public policy this expanded scale of research is sound and that any contraction would be a disservice to the Nation and the people of the world. Complete candor compels me to state that I shall continue to resist any effort to cut back and limit the efforts of the Federal Government and other public and private agencies throughout the Nation that are conducting such a magnificent fight in the public interest in these fields. This position compels me to try to understand the relationship between the proposed National Science Foundation and the existing medical research program. What will be the effect upon the National Institutes of Health and the vast research programs now being conducted in the health and medical fields?

I have studied the pending bill, and I confess that it is so general in its provisions that I presently do not have a complete answer to the problem. I doubt if there is a member of the Congress that can make a complete and satisfactory explanation. Is the National Science Foundation under the pending bill going to take over the medical research grant and fellowship activities that are now operating smoothly and in a manner that draws the highest praise from the universities of the Nation and the medical schools throughout the country? If that is the intent of this bill, then I shall be compelled to vote against it. I am raising this question during debate so that Members of Congress who feel as I do may have a definite understanding as to what interpretation of the language in the pending bill will be adopted. I suggest, therefore, that those in charge of this legislation make it abundantly clear that it is not the purpose of this legislation to take over and destroy, perchance, the efficient, smoothly operating program now being conducted by the Institutes of Health under existing law. If I were to vote for this legislation, it would be on the assumption and understanding that this will not happen.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am interested in another question; namely, will all research activities of the Federal Government be submitted to the Congress as a single appropriation requests? I vigorously oppose such a proposal. For more than 10 years I have been a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that has dealt with the appropriations for medical research. I have tried to make it my business to know the needs of

medical research and the strength and weaknesses of the Federal Government's activities in this field. I would not like to see medical research relegated to a subitem under a single research appropriation which under general ceilings imposed by the Executive in making his budget would compel those interested in the field of medical research to fight for a reasonable share of the over-all appropriation granted to the Foundation. To do so might well mean that the field of medical research so vital to the welfare of the people of this country might be subordinated to powerful pressure groups demanding funds for research in other fields.

Another question arises; namely, what is the role of the Foundation's Division of Medical Research in relation to the existing medical research grants and fellowship activities of the Federal Government? If the task of the National Foundation proposed in the pending legislation is to be assumption of responsibility for securing appropriations for and administering existing medical-research grant and fellowship programs of the various National Institutes of Health, I would oppose the bill. I would like the committee in the course of the arguments on this bill to make it abundantly clear as to just what the role of the Foundation is to be in the medical-research grant and fellowship programs presently administered by the National Institutes of Health. If ultimately vote for this legislation, it will be upon the common-sense assumption that the Division of Medical Research created under the provisions of the pending bill would not destroy the present programs of the National Institutes of Health.

I can well see why medical research must be weighed as part of a total national program, and I can see why the full effect of these programs—particularly their effect upon educational institutions—should be carefully considered. These seem to me to be the kind of activities that should be the primary concern of the Division of Medical Research. If the Foundation is to become an operating unit rather than a coordinating and advisory unit operating in the field of medical research, then I seriously question the advisability of adopting that portion of the Foundation bill.

In concluding, may I say that I would like to have clarified the meaning of the two amendments proposed to H. R. 4846 by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Section 3 (a) (6) of the bill—page 3, line 6—has been amended to provide that the Foundation shall "evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups, including scientific research programs of the Federal Government." Does this mean that the Foundation will look at general trends in medical research for the purpose of making recommendations, or does it mean that the Foundation will review the budgets of the medical research agencies in detail? The answer to this question is necessarily involved in the answer to the question as to whether or not this program contemplates the submission to the Congress of one over-all research budget.

If it is the intent of this amendment to authorize the Foundation to present to the Congress the detailed budgets of funds necessary in connection with the Federal program of research and grants, then I should be compelled to oppose the amendment. The bill as originally drafted defined the Foundation's interest in this matter in the following language:

To correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups.

There is a vast difference between the provision as originally written in the bill and the amendment proposed. The substitution of the word "evaluate" for the word "correlate" completely changes the meaning and intent of this section. I would ask that the committee in proper time explain in detail just what this amendment means in order that the Foundation if and when created will understand what the legislative intent was.

I also note that the committee which considered the bill proposes that section 14 (h)—page 19, line 6—be stricken. If you will turn to the printed bill you will observe that the original language provided "the activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any other functions or activities of other Government agencies authorized to engage in scientific research or development." Why has this provision been stricken from the bill? I can see that it might be advisable to reshuffle many of the research activities of the Federal Government and that this clause might possibly forestall some highly desirable changes. At the same time I do not believe that the elimination of this provision should be construed as blanket authority for the Foundation to disturb research activities that are logically located and that are operating satisfactorily. I have heretofore made my position on this matter clear so far as the medical-research grant and fellowship activities of the National Institutes of Health operated by the Public Health Service are concerned. I now ask the sponsors of the bill to explain what they had in mind when they proposed deleting this clause, and whether my interpretation of their action is a correct one.

I also note on page 19 of the bill that provision is made for the transfer to the Foundation of funds to be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made, and the paragraph ends with this language: "and until such time as an appropriation is made available directly to the Foundation for general administrative expenses of the Foundation without regard to limitations otherwise applicable to such funds." This is a very broad, sweeping grant of authority and power to expend transferred funds. I would ask the committee to make it clear just why limitations on the expenditures of funds for administration written into appropriation bills by the Congress should be eliminated when funds are transferred to the Foundation. It will be noted that the appropriation author-

ized under this bill is without limitation, and in my humble judgment it should clearly be shown to the Congress what savings, if any, can be anticipated in the event this legislation becomes law.

I shall carefully listen to the arguments, and I trust that someone from the committee will be able to answer the questions which I have raised. My vote for or against the pending bill will be determined by the character of the answers which are received during debate to the questions which I have raised.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, merely to state to the gentleman that if the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON] is to be placed in the bill, for the purpose of evaluating scientific research programs undertaken by the Federal Government, then if this language in subsection (h) remains in the bill it might possibly prevent the Foundation from making a proper evaluation of whether or not there was overlapping and duplication in the Federal Government as among its various agencies in conducting basic scientific research programs. There is every reason, I believe, why the gentleman being a member of the Committee on Appropriations would want the Board to report on any such overlapping or duplication in order that due economy might be had in the expenditure of the public funds.

As a matter of fact, it is my opinion that the enactment of this bill and the establishment of the Foundation and its activities in evaluating scientific research and correlating scientific research will provide a considerable saving over the amounts now being expended. That does not mean that the Foundation would have the power to strike any budgetary item from any budget, but they certainly should take a good long look at the multitude of different research projects that are being conducted now under the aegis of the Federal Government.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is addressing himself now, as I understand it, to the proposed Heslton amendment, which has been referred to.

Mr. HINSHAW. No. I am talking about the remarks of the gentleman opposing striking out the language contained in subsection (h) on page 19, which I think it would be well to strike.

Mr. KEEFE. Why should we not leave it in?

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the committee will accept the amendment as it stands, which strikes out the language, because if you leave this language in the bill and say, "shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies authorized to engage in scientific research or development," then you may rob this agency of any right to criticize or to point out that there is duplication going on in the various Government agencies. It seems to me that it is a matter of protection for the Federal budget to take that language out.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman's statement is very appropriate in response to the suggestion that was made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. The real answer is in the next section, is it not, whereby authority is given and there may be cooperation between agencies of the Government in carrying out the functions and purposes of scientific research.

Mr. HINSHAW. That I think is very important.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point and be open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Science Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation"). The Foundation shall consist of a National Science Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") and a Director.

FUNCTIONS OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation is authorized and directed—

(1) to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences;

(2) to initiate and support basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences, by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such basic scientific research and to appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and upon the general welfare;

(3) after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to initiate and support scientific research in connection with matters relating to the national defense by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific research;

(4) to award, as provided in section 10, scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences;

(5) to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

(6) to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups;

(7) to establish such special commissions as the Board may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this act; and

(8) to maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and in other ways provide a central clearinghouse for information covering all scientific and technical personnel in the United States, including its Territories and possessions.

(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, it shall be one of the objectives of the Foundation to strengthen basic research and education in the sciences, including independent research

by individuals, throughout the United States, including its Territories and possessions, and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education.

(c) The Foundation shall render an annual report to the President for submission on or before the 15th day of January of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. Such report shall include in full the report of the Executive Committee to the Board, provided for in section 6 (e), and information as to the acquisition and disposition by the Foundation of any patents and patent rights.

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) The Board shall consist of twenty-four members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and of the Director ex officio, and shall, except as otherwise provided in this act, exercise the authority granted to the Foundation by this act. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be eminent in the fields of the basic sciences, medical science, engineering, agriculture, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, the Association of American Colleges, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

(b) The term of office of each voting member of the Board shall be 6 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, eight at the end of 2 years, eight at the end of 4 years, and eight at the end of 6 years, after the date of enactment of this act. Any person who has been a member of the Board for twelve consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for appointment during the 2-year period following the expiration of such twelfth year.

(c) The President shall call the first meeting of the Board, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman.

(d) The Board shall meet annually on the first Monday in December and at such other times as the Chairman may determine, but he shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the members so request in writing. A majority of the voting members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. Each member shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last-known address of record not less than 15 days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

(e) The first Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board shall be elected by the Board to serve until the first Monday in December next succeeding the date of election at which time a Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected for a term of 2 years. Thereafter such election shall take place at the annual meeting occurring at the end of each such term. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Board shall elect a member to fill such vacancy.

DIRECTOR OF THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 5. (a) There shall be a Director of the Foundation who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after receiving recommendations from the Board. He shall serve as a nonvoting ex officio member of the Board and also as the nonvoting Chairman of the Executive Committee. In addition thereto he shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of \$15,000 per annum and shall serve for a term of 6 years unless sooner removed by the President.

(b) In addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in him by this act, the Director shall, in accordance with the policies established by the Board, exercise the powers granted by sections 10 and 11 of this act, together with such other powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Board; but the powers granted by sections 10 and 11 (c) shall be exercised only with the approval of the Board.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established an Executive Committee of the Board which shall consist of the Director ex officio and nine other members elected by the members of the Board from among their number. The term of office of each member of the Executive Committee shall be 2 years except that (1) any member elected to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected shall be elected for the remainder of such term; and (2) the term of office of four of the members first elected after the date of enactment of this act shall be 1 year. Any person who has been a member of the Executive Committee for six consecutive years shall thereafter be ineligible for election during the 2-year period following the expiration of such sixth year. The membership of the Executive Committee shall, so far as practicable, be representative of diverse interests and shall be so chosen as to provide representation, so far as practicable, for all areas of the Nation.

(b) In addition to the powers and duties specifically vested in it by this act, the Executive Committee shall exercise such powers and duties as may be delegated to it by the Board.

(c) The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of its Chairman or at such times as may be fixed by itself, but not less than six times each year.

(d) A majority of the voting members of the Executive Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(e) The Executive Committee shall render an annual report to the Board, and such other reports as it may deem necessary, summarizing the activities of the Executive Committee, making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate, and setting forth the recommendations of the divisional committees and special commissions. Minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Executive Committee, the divisional committees, and special commissions shall be included in such reports.

DIVISIONS WITHIN THE FOUNDATION

SEC. 7. (a) Until otherwise provided by the Board there shall be within the Foundation the following divisions:

- (1) A Division of Medical Research;
- (2) A Division of Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences;
- (3) A Division of Biological Sciences; and
- (4) A Division of Scientific Personnel and Education, which shall be concerned with programs of the Foundation relating to the granting of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences.

(b) There shall also be within the Foundation such other divisions as the Board may, from time to time, deem necessary.

DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

SEC. 8. (a) There shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation.

(b) Each divisional committee shall be appointed by the Executive Committee and shall consist of not less than five persons who may be members or nonmembers of the Board.

(c) The terms of members of each divisional committee shall be 2 years. Each divisional committee shall annually elect its own chairman from among its own members and shall prescribe its own rules of procedure subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the Executive Committee.

(d) Each divisional committee shall make recommendations to, and advise and consult with, the Executive Committee and the Director with respect to matters relating to the program of its division.

SPECIAL COMMISSIONS

SEC. 9. (a) Each special commission established pursuant to section 3 (a) (7) shall consist of 11 members appointed by the executive committee, six of whom shall be eminent scientists and five of whom shall be persons other than scientists. Each special commission shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman.

(b) It shall be the duty of each such special commission to make a comprehensive survey of research, both public and private, being carried on in its field, and to formulate and recommend to the Foundation at the earliest practicable date an over-all research program in its field.

SCHOLARSHIPS AND GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 10. The Foundation is authorized to award, within the limits of funds made available specifically for such purpose pursuant to section 15, scholarships and graduate fellowships for scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, and other sciences at accredited nonprofit American or nonprofit foreign institutions of higher education, selected by the recipient of such aid, for stated periods of time. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens of the United States, and such selections shall be made solely on the basis of ability; but in any case in which two or more applicants for scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, are deemed by the Foundation to be possessed of substantially equal ability, and there are not sufficient scholarships or fellowships, as the case may be, available to grant one to each of such applicants, the available scholarship or scholarships or fellowship or fellowships shall be awarded to the applicants in such manner as will tend to result in a wide distribution of scholarships and fellowships among the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 11. The Foundation shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including, but without being limited thereto, the authority—

(a) to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary governing the manner of its operations and its organization and personnel;

(b) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this act;

(c) to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on, by organizations or individuals in the United States and foreign countries, including other government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, of such basic scientific research activities and such scientific research activities in connection

with matters relating to the national defense as the Foundation deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and, when deemed appropriate by the Foundation, such contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, may be entered into without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

(d) to make advance, progress, and other payments which relate to scientific research without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 529);

(e) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this act;

(f) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated, without restriction, other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

(g) to publish or arrange for the publication of scientific and technical information so as to further the full dissemination of information of scientific value consistent with the national interest, without regard to the provisions of section 87 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1270; 44 U. S. C., sec. 111);

(h) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b-2) for persons serving without compensation; and

(i) to prescribe, with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, the extent to which vouchers for funds expended under contracts for scientific research shall be subject to itemization or substantiation prior to payment, without regard to the limitations of other laws relating to the expenditure of public funds and accounting therefor.

PATENT RIGHTS

SEC. 12. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed pursuant to this act which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Foundation to enter into any contractual or other arrangement inconsistent with any provision of law affecting the issuance or use of patents.

(b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however,* That this subsection shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Director may establish.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND COORDINATION WITH FOREIGN POLICY

SEC. 13. (a) The Foundation is hereby authorized to cooperate in any international scientific research activities consistent with the purposes of this act and to expend for such international scientific research activities such sums within the limit of appropriated funds as the Foundation may deem desirable. The Director, with the approval of the Executive Committee, may defray the expenses of representatives of Government agencies and other organizations and of in-

dividual scientists to accredited international scientific congresses and meetings whenever he deems it necessary in the promotion of the objectives of this act.

(b) (1) The authority to enter into contracts or other arrangements with organizations or individuals in foreign countries and with agencies of foreign countries, as provided in section 11 (c), and the authority to cooperate in international scientific research activities as provided in subsection (a) of this section, shall be exercised only after consultation with the Secretary of State, to the end that such authority shall be exercised in such manner as is consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

(2) If, in the exercise of the authority referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, negotiation with foreign countries or agencies thereof becomes necessary, such negotiation shall be carried on by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 14. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Executive Committee shall from time to time prescribe, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided,* That the Director may, in accordance with such policies as the Executive Committee shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel and fix their compensation, without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this act. The Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of the divisional committees and special commissions, shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations. Neither the Director nor the Deputy Director shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as such Director or Deputy Director, as the case may be; nor shall the Director or Deputy Director, except with the approval of the Executive Committee, hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this act.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the Executive Committee, a Deputy Director who shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the Executive Committee, may prescribe and shall be Acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the Office of the Director.

(c) The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

(d) The members of the Board, and the members of each divisional committee, or special commission, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$25 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation, and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b-2).

(e) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees and special commissions, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Board, of a divisional committee, or of a special commission shall not be considered as service bringing him within the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 99), unless the act of such individual, which by

such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves the Foundation or in which the Foundation is directly interested.

(g) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals in the United States or foreign countries, including Government agencies of the United States and of foreign countries, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which, if aided, will advance basic research, and (4) encouraging independent basic research by individuals.

(h) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies authorized to engage in scientific research or development.

(i) Funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Foundation for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Foundation for the purposes for which the transfer was made, and, until such time as an appropriation is made available directly to the Foundation, for general administrative expenses of the Foundation without regard to limitations otherwise applicable to such funds.

(j) The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel shall be transferred from the United States Employment Service to the Foundation, together with such records and property as have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such roster as may be determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The transfer provided for in this subsection shall take effect at such time or times as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall direct.

(k) The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy, nor shall it exercise any authority pursuant to section 11 (e) in respect to that field, without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. Nothing in this act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

(l) The executive committee, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property (having military significance) in connection with scientific research under this act, and for the proper safeguarding of any information or property so classified.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 15. (a) To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Foundation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Appropriations made pursuant to the authority provided in subsection (a) of this section shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and ex-

penditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in the acts making such appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 3, line 3, strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive, and insert the following language:

"(6) to evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups, including scientific research programs of agencies of the Federal Government, and to correlate the Foundation's scientific research programs with such programs."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON to the committee amendment: Strike out paragraph 6 of section 3 (a) on page 3, line 6 through line 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(6) to evaluate scientific research programs undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government and to correlate Foundation scientific research programs with those undertaken by individuals and by public and private research groups."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall speak briefly on this, with apologies to those who were here when I stated that I would offer this amendment at the proper time. In the interest of saving time, I would like to read briefly from the last page of the Hoover report:

This points to the need for a National Science Foundation. The major functions of such a Foundation should be (a) to examine the total scientific research effort of the Nation, (b) to assess the proper role of the Federal Government in this effort, (c) to evaluate the division of research effort among the scientific disciplines and among fields of applied research, and (d) to evaluate the key factors that impede the development of an effective national research effort.

The second recommendation of the Hoover Commission is:

(b) The Commission recommends that a National Science Foundation be established.

I called attention previously to the report of the President's Special Board appointed in 1946, which is contained at the beginning of page 49 of the second annual report of the Secretary of Defense. There are two paragraphs I would like to emphasize.

The Army and Navy have vigorous research development programs which had grown up over a period of years. When the Air Force was constituted as a separate branch of the armed services its research development efforts represented a third important program. The size, diversity, and complexity of the fields covered by these programs make sound planning increasingly important.

The coordinating activities of the Research and Development Board enable each department to become aware of what the other departments are doing in research and development. Unnecessary duplication is thereby located and eliminated or prevented. More difficult, but probably of greater significance, is the Board's continuing responsibility to shift emphasis and funds away from programs of lesser military promise and into

those of greater value. The existence of such a coordinating agency makes it possible to stretch the research and development dollar and to cut costs.

The President's board in one of its reports has pointed out that what is needed is that each of these hundreds of agencies in our Government that are engaged in extensive research programs should review those programs, should evaluate them, should set up a long-range plan which should then be submitted to this Foundation so that we could integrate them into a national program.

Since the Second World War the military expenditures on research have averaged over half a billion dollars a year. Although this is but a small portion of the average total military budget, it is a large figure in comparison to the much smaller sums spent on military research and development before the war—in comparison, say, to the \$13,000,000 obligated for military research and development in 1939, the year World War II began. The amount of money currently being spent for research and development is only slightly less than the entire military appropriation for 1924, and is almost 50 percent as much as the total military appropriation as late as 1937.

In the National Defense Establishment this committee has been able to report that it has actually brought about substantial savings through this coordination. It makes the statement on page 61:

Formally effected coordination is illustrated by recent Board action on the recommendation of the Committee on Guided Missiles request that three existing projects be terminated and two others combined into one. Through this action an estimated \$6,000,000 in plant obligations for the fiscal year 1950 was made available for allocation to other guided missiles projects of high priority.

Carrying that over into the other fields of major research we can confidently anticipate, I believe, a much better and well-rounded program.

I call your attention finally to this: The proposed amendment places the emphasis upon evaluation of scientific research programs undertaken by the Federal Government, not by the universities, not by the industries, not by private research. We have no business going into that and telling them: "You shall do this; you shall not do that." That is their business and they should be permitted to plan and conduct their own business. But this Foundation, if we adopt this amendment, would be under the obligation of correlating the Foundation's program with those of individuals and of public and private research groups. I am hopeful that my colleagues in the House will see it as do my colleagues on the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman agree that the Hoover recommendation refers to Government enterprise?

Mr. HESELTON. Absolutely and exclusively.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. What assurance does private industry have that

the Government will not take it over? What is meant by the word "correlate"?

Mr. HESELTON. The language has been submitted to draftsmen and to industry, and it has been approved by industry specifically. It is to correlate the Foundation's scientific research program, nothing else; correlate our Federal program with what is being done in the country by universities, industries, and in other public-research programs. I can assure the gentleman that it has met with the approval of substantial business interests which are engaged in this field with very heavy investments.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I have my doubts about that.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word merely to say that the committee accepts the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] to the committee amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I favor this amendment and the bill.

This amendment providing for correlation in the whole field of scientific research is extremely valuable for there is nothing exclusionist about such research, nor are any particular areas of research to be included or excluded because other agencies, public or private, are working on them. It is therefore most desirable that correlation be teamed with evaluation as is done by the pending amendment. This in the best interests of the most effective and complete scientific research.

With respect to the general purposes of the bill itself it is indeed gratifying that it is now being considered and that the objections which caused the President to veto a similar bill passed by the Eightieth Congress have apparently been overcome. In a day of A-bombs and H-bomb, an effort to restore the balance between applied and pure science is entitled to our convinced support.

It is gratifying to know too that, on the whole, although there is opposition to some features of this bill on the part of scientists and others who have studied the subject because of certain inadequacies, notably those relating to the broadest distribution of research grants, and questions of patent rights and cooperation with international agencies, there appears to be strong support for the bill from scientists and educators everywhere.

My own wartime experience and that of many other Members of the House taught us the critical place in our social and economic development and in the development of our national security of fundamental research in the sciences. We have made spectacular achievements in applied science, pure research, however, is the base for all such achievements, whether done here or elsewhere. The march of the world forward demands no less of the nation on earth with the best technical equipment, and which has done the most with it for the human well-being as well as for international peace and security, than that we undertake this additional measure to make more effective our great resources for scientific research.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]

has very well stated that most obvious objections to this bill as I see them. There are, however, certain ill-omened implications in the philosophy of science, or rather of many—too many—scientists, which deserve attention from those who are to administer this act so as to remedy the tragic naïveté involved in such cases as those of Drs. May and Fuchs, and of Hiss and others in this country.

It hardly seems that the infiltration of communism in world politics can be checked while we cling to a Socialist concept of political action and, accordingly, play me-too politics with the demagogues of the Kremlin. We can hardly hope to promote world peace while democratic statesmanship consists of trying to assure the material welfare of humanity, not by compelling responsible behavior—not by confining government to the functions which maintain law and order and so assure decent incentives by the reward of economic security through private property—but by falsely guaranteeing that which can be available only through the industry, thrift, and intelligence of a responsible and abstemious citizenry.

Science, or rather scientists, seem to be telling us that we can forget what the desire for welfare, when not impelling anarchy and pillage, has always dictated, namely, abstention. Not merely the intelligent use of nature's bounties, but also prevention of the plundering of the planet under excessive population pressure, is the only possible path to permanent peace and the control of the industrial Frankenstein which scientists, as technicians, are constructing.

A government which is paternalistic, not by restraining, but by promoting, the expansion of population, cannot fail to become either a totalitarian aggressor bent on taking the earth's resources from other races and nations, or else a decadent bureaucracy seeking in vain to guarantee full employment at high wages to everyone and to assure no hardship for anyone. It is not possible to temporize with such policies—to steer a safe political course among the world's races by promoting universal abundance with the hope of thus containing communism by allaying unrest. In this situation scientists are having a disturbing influence because they are divorcing their calling from moral standards, just as are most other people, through the philosophy of materialism.

Even biologists, who should know better, are preaching that life itself is mechanistic. By drawing the red herring of their doctrinal dispute with the Kremlin's Lysenko—as to whether the promised land of milk and honey is to be reached by Mendelian or by Lamarckian theory—over the trail of their own materialism, they are obscuring the very basis of moral restraints provided by the idea of a selective struggle for survival which was instilled into Darwin's concept of evolution by Thomas Malthus. We may cite among those who are so engaged, Prof. Theodosius Dobzhansky of Columbia University who asserts, in a recent issue of *Science*, that competition and the struggle for life are misleading meta-

phors which should be removed from the vocabulary of science.

By no means all scientists are thus deluding themselves and their public. Dr. Warren Thompson, of Ohio, and other careful students of demography, that is, of human population problems, are no utopians nor do they consider that human populations tend to decline as their security advances. That the truth is exactly to the contrary should give pause in developing a foreign policy based on the idea that industrialization of backward areas will restrain population and make for peace on earth and good will among men. Permit a few observations quoted from Professor Thompson's essay in the February *Scientific American*. After citing figures on Swedish experience indicating that lower birth rates and higher death rates were the result of poor harvests, he says: "In the long view, Malthus was fundamentally correct when he said that man's growth in numbers was largely dependent on the supply of subsistence." Improvements in agriculture have "had exactly the effects that Malthus had predicted the provision of more ample subsistence would have on population growth. For a time it appeared that in the Western World we no longer needed to give serious attention to the ideas of Malthus, that we had learned how to produce at a rate in excess of any possible rate of population growth, and that we could look forward to an easier life no matter how high our birth rate or how low our death rate."

Now, however, "experience in Japan gives tangible support to the belief of demographers that the industrially backward areas of the world are likely to grow rapidly in population during the next century as they industrialize." In the "Malthusian countries" of the Orient, like India, "the population seems to grow whenever subsistence increases and to stop or even decline at times of scarcity and great epidemics."

Professor Thompson believes that these problems have a very direct relation to the maintenance of peace. In a world which is filling up as ours is, and which is one world whether we like it or not, the urgent question regarding the livelihood of a growing people soon becomes a matter of concern to all nations. Hence there is a need to begin to plan for such changes in population growth as will contribute best to human welfare.

It seems far less clear to natural scientists that it should be that there never has been any time in which the extent of life on earth has been found to be cumulative. It has always depended upon the amount of solar energy which plant life could, currently, capture in its synthesis of organic compounds for the sake of the plant's own offspring. Other species have intruded into a struggle over this limited supply. The struggle has begotten a myriad of forms, many now extinct in addition to those whose strategies still suffice for survival.

Man's dominance is thus not a matter of being able to control the environment in any sense of mastering the physical limitations of the planet and going on to unprecedented miracles of expansion

unrelated to other living things. The genus homo has developed a cultural, technological method of bypassing the limitations of anatomical form; this use of machinery and other techniques has produced a sudden dominance over other species. These others have become easy prey—so easy, indeed, that many species have succumbed and are extinct, which once afforded large supplies of food. Many a localized civilization has arisen and disappeared by such developments. But it will be a new and terrible experience, indeed, that seems imminent today in the currently world-wide explosion of population to be followed by inevitable disaster, unless population can be controlled by a system of enterprises that is free for all—but not free from competitive restraints which compel those who are unable to make the grade to be eliminated, not by the fury of hydrogen bombs that science seems about to release in a dysgenic holocaust, but by being good losers in a game that not every genetic element on earth can win.

If this sort of peaceful genocide is not impressed upon the human race, so that the unfit in ideological or other groups are forced to quit by failure to reproduce as fast as they die naturally, the kind of genocide which wars produce and which the United Nations Organization is naively proposing to stop by a so-called convention, will surely take up the surplus sooner or later in a state of affairs where the horrors of peace are not exceeded by those of war.

It seems to be, not venality, but rather a naive faith in materialism that is undermining the morale of our scientists and bringing about such cases as those of Dr. May and Dr. Fuchs, and, in our own midst, the academic apologies for such inane betrayals of America as we have seen among American scholars, such as Alger Hiss, who have had, personally, everything to lose and little to gain by their Communist sympathies.

The Foundation for Promoting Basic Science which these same academic interests are urging before this body seems not to be in hands which have a clear understanding of the best interests of science apart from the welfare of scientists. Indeed, the most potent factor in the advance of science seems to me to have been crowded out in the four technical divisions provided for. I see little hope, in this specialization, for escaping the Babylonian confusion which the Rockefeller Foundation has said exists in the ranks of science. The director of that foundation not long ago allotted a fund to the effort at eliminating these difficulties in the state of scientific thought. Basic science can certainly be advanced less by technological developments by specialists than by basic philosophical considerations. This could be accomplished, moreover, without the tremendous expenditures which are indicated as too much for private funds to attain while already unbalanced Federal budgets are producing rising costs which dissipate endowments at an increasing pace.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in support of this suggestion for economy and accomplishment, I present some pointed phrases taken from an essay on the

Scientist—Technician or Moralist? which makes rather plain the relation of the academic scientist to the social ills that we are enduring. The author is Prof. George Simpson of the City College of New York, writing in the current issue of the magazine, *Philosophy of Science*, published under the editorship of Dr. Churchman of Wayne University in Detroit. I quote:

When faced with moral problems, natural scientists have developed the habit of running away from science itself. * * * As scientists they glory in being technicians; this eases their consciences by leaving ethics to moral philosophers or mystics. * * * Although he has handed over moral problems to the philosophers, the average natural scientist frowns upon philosophy as aimless speculation on the unsolvable problems which nobody but an impractical visionary would spend his time on. * * *

It would seem that the retreat from morality by science is now full, for the dominant view in social science today is that social scientists might well learn from natural scientists how to achieve a new social status derivative from what can be subsidized rather than from what requires investigation. * * *

Moral retrogression and material progress are part and parcel of the bifurcation of science and morality. The insolubility of moral problems by science gains ever more credence as material problems become more and more soluble by "applied science"; that is, technology. As industry becomes more and more rationalized, morality becomes less and less rational. * * *

Truth which is arrived at socially is proceduralized so that it loses its valuative aspect and becomes sanctimonious. It becomes a form of social worship, not a form of social understanding. * * * Nobody in this situation is supposed to question the worth of science, for science does not question the worth of so-called moral behavior. By avoidance of moral issues science reigns supreme. * * *

To engage in an attempt to help structure society so as to make possible the subservience of emotion, interest, and desire, to rationality, is to become a pariah, an outcast, a troublemaker, and, most unkindest cut of all, to be damned as uncooperative by a non-cooperative society. It is small wonder, then, that the scientist is led to accept the social position he finds and to join in the mass chorus which sings his praises as a technician who will help anybody discover anything as long as he does not have to tell them what to do about it.

The full cycle is completed when the social scientist joins in the chorus and asks that he, too, be permitted to join this gallant ship's company sailing the seven seas on a social pleasure-pain cruise. * * * Truly, "Come All Ye Faithful" can be sung in praise of Mammon. Out in the cold, like the poor looking in on the banquet board, is a motley crew of philosophers who are paying the price for not devoting their lives to asking only the proper questions. Perhaps it is not too much to expect that soon philosophers too will find their way into the ranks of the technicians. * * *

Scientists have been taken in by the soft words of praise for their devotion to the cause of humanity spoken even by those who may use scientific work to defeat the ends of reason. The severing of science from morality is part of a more general process in modern society whereby means have triumphed over ends.

In the battle of pressure groups in modern society the scientist is considered as one among many, asking no quarter and seeking no quarter. The state becomes an umpire between truths, so-called; the victor need give no hostage to reason. Indeed, reason

itself becomes an attribute of political victory. The final, crowning triumph occurs when truth is what political power proclaims. Aryan races, the new mythos, an elite without natural talents other than administrative, a world made in the image of man's irrationality—these are the ripe fruits of science in the service of politics which has no allegiance to social truth.

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

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended by the substitute.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 10, line 20, insert "(a)" after the figure 10.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 16, insert the following:

"(b) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure by the foundation under authority of this act shall be used to make payments under any scholarship or fellowship to any individual unless there is on file with the foundation an affidavit executed by such individual that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable in respect of such affidavits."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida to the committee amendment: Page 11, line 19, after the word "unless" insert "(1)", and on page 12, in line 1, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(2) the affidavit is accompanied by such supporting evidence as the foundation may by regulations require, and (3) the director and at least five of the voting members of the executive committee are satisfied that the statements made in the affidavit are true."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the committee does not go quite far enough. That is the only objection I have. The amendment states that payments can be made if there is an affidavit executed by the individual to the effect he does not believe in and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

The Foundation under this verbiage, therefore, would be authorized to make payments to a Communist who files such an affidavit.

I add two propositions to this, first, that the affidavit must be accompanied by such supporting evidence as the Foundation may by regulation require.

In other words, the Foundation can pass a regulation as to what it requires in the affidavit to be filed. Everyone will know what that is by looking at the records. They can tell what those regulations are.

My second addition is that the director and at least five of the voting members of the executive committee must be satisfied that the statements made in the affidavit are true. That is a protection to the Foundation.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is simply undertaking to provide an additional precaution against taking into the organization people who are not loyal to the United States Government?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is all it is. I am glad the gentleman from Georgia asked that question. That is my only purpose. It throws some duty on the Foundation and the director to determine whether the affidavit is true or not. In the past few days Alger Hiss has been convicted of perjury. Another fellow down here, Christoffel, was convicted the other day for perjury. Now, what difference does it make to a Communist who wants to secure an advantage, who wants to take our courses over here? He would sign an affidavit and the Foundation would be absolutely justified in admitting him if the affidavit was merely on file. They do not have to go into any details. They do not have to go into the truth or falsity of it. The simple fact it is filed would justify payments of this scholarship or other fund.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman refers to Communists. Let us take a look at other applicants. Whether they are under the cloud of suspicion of being a Communist or not, will they be allowed? Suppose it is a decent citizen and not a Communist, does he have to go through the swearing that he is not a communist or does he have to submit other evidence?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Under the amendment offered by the committee you have to do that. But, this just puts a little more safeguard for them to justify his being made a payment.

Mr. DINGELL. It does not cast any reflection on the character of a man who was not a Communist.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Not at all. It casts no reflection on anybody.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman is a good one. I think the committee ought to have no doubts at all about the sincerity of the gentleman in asking for this amendment. Anybody who is communistically inclined should not be on the commission or be employed by the commission.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. You all know of an instance—I will not call his name—in North Carolina, having to do with the Atomic Energy Commission. Why, he

was there taking advantage of the courts, taking our American money, and he was a Communist. They afterwards found it out and dismissed him. This only throws a safeguard around anybody before they can take our money. As for me, I do not want a cent of American money to go to a Communist for anything; I do not care what it is.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, I understand the gentleman's purpose, and we all have the same purpose in mind. But, when you require an affidavit from a person that he is not a Communist, and he subjects himself to the laws of perjury, how can you double protect such a thing as that?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I want to say that the committee amendment provides that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. How can you strengthen that?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. He must have the supporting evidence. I hope we have enough good Americans here to adopt this amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. What kind of supporting evidence, beyond his affidavit?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. WIER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

Mr. WIER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. WIER. I desire 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that on the committee amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. PRIEST. On the committee amendment and all amendments thereto.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request to make it 15 minutes. I see a number of the subcommittee seeking recognition. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

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

Mr. SHAFER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand, the 10-minute limitation has already been agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. That was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, reluctantly I rise to oppose the amendment offered by my good friend and our esteemed colleague and member of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. I know that deep in his heart he is sincere; he is honest and has every good intention as is utterly possible by proposing the amendment. I respectfully submit to the committee, however, that it is certainly unnecessary to have an amendment such as my good friend proposes; in fact, it can do nothing except confuse the administration of the act as it applies to scholarships and fellowships.

I am as vigorously opposed to any funds proposed by this act for scholarship or fellowship being made to anyone that does not hold sacred allegiance to the United States, as the gentleman from Florida, or any other Member of this Congress. I am just as anxious as he or anyone else that no Communist or fellow traveler be permitted to participate in the program. I do not believe there should be any windfall or any opportunity for such another experience as occurred in a university in connection with the atomic-energy program.

The gentleman is a good lawyer. It is well known under our judicial procedure that there is a severe penalty for perjury. Therefore, we provided that none of these funds to be appropriated can be used by anyone unless there is an affidavit by such party that he does not believe in and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

And further, the committee amendment provides specifically that the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable in respect of such affidavits. In other words, the penalty provisions of the law shall apply without any possible doubt when perjury is committed.

Security, yes; we should have stringent security provisions but they should be workable. It would be wholly impractical for the executive committee of the Foundation to have to go out and make an investigation to determine whether or not a man commits perjury. The gentleman knows that it is not only administrative action but that the executive committee would be required to do the work of the law-enforcement officers and the courts.

There is no doubt in anyone's mind but what this Congress adequately and appropriately dealt with this same question in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission. The committee amendment is identical with the provision the Congress adopted as applies to the Atomic Energy Commission. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the committee

amendment included in the bill providing that before scholarship awards can be made there must be such affidavit on file to the effect that the party involved is not a Communist and has no affiliation at all with any Communist organization or any other organization that would overthrow our form of government is the correct approach.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. What is the affidavit worth when it comes to one who is disloyal to his country?

Mr. HARRIS. It is worth just what perjury was worth in the Alger Hiss case. It is worth what any other affidavit required under the laws of our country is worth, that if a man perjures himself he is subject to the penalty of the law. It is not a question for the Board or the Foundation to determine, it is a question for the institution to determine when these scholarships are awarded.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] a moment ago said that one of the grave fears he has in his mind about this legislation is the inevitable control of the institution. Are you going to set up this Foundation composed of six or more men who will tell any institution in the United States who may have a scholarship award? That is exactly what you are doing here. Talk about the control of your educational institutions. You would certainly authorize the Foundation, without any question, to determine by your amendment who will receive scholarship awards.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that irrespective of what the Foundation does the payments for these scholarships cannot be made until the director and a majority of the executive committee are satisfied that the affidavit is true.

Mr. HARRIS. The scholarship award is made through an institution who has the students. It is not altogether the determination of the Foundation on a particular student. What you would provide is for the Foundation to make any determination it wants to in any institution in the United States on any man or any student that might want a scholarship or fellowship. I believe the gentleman has not sufficiently considered the amendment, he has proposed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Committee defeat the amendment.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the time allotted to him was granted to Mr. WIER.)

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the time has arrived for educational institutions to assert their positions, and I personally believe that it is obvious that acceptance of the principle of

thought control, in any form or manner, will be fatal to American education, scholarship, and to democracy itself. If such regulations as those in force in Executive Order 9835 were made applicable to the student body and faculty of the University of Minnesota, there would be an instant change in the intellectual climate of the institution. Very few persons would dare discuss the merits or demerits of progressive legislation except in private with most trusted friends. The free play of ideas would be a thing of the past because no one could trust others not to be in the secret service of an organization whose duty it was to report on dangerous ideas. The university administration itself would lose authority to determine fitness for enrollment as a student or employment as a staff member. That authority would pass to a Federal board.

I have ascertained that Federal employees here in Washington have adopted the attitudes I outlined above, and I know for a fact that many competent persons have left Federal employment rather than be subject to the intellectual and emotional harassment of the loyalty order and associated investigations.

Perhaps I should make my position clear. I favor every protection of American democracy against any overt act perpetrated to overthrow it by any unconstitutional means. I would prosecute to the full extent of the law any perpetrator of such an act. If membership in any organization can be established by due process of law to constitute such an overt act leading to clear and present danger to our democratic system by unconstitutional means, I would favor construing the act of joining such an organization as a crime, and punishable, not, however, by any ex post facto law or rule. However, I believe with Bernard de Voto, who said in another connection—Harpers, July 1949, page 63—"that the right of free speech cannot be restricted unless a 'clear and present danger' to society exists—and exists with such immediate urgency that there is no time to answer idea with idea."

The road to totalitarianism is paved with bricks, each one of which exposes a face acceptable or even desirable to a majority. Totalitarianism itself is simply a system in which minorities have no rights or protection. The minority is itself a different group on every individual issue. The genius of Anglo-Saxon common law and the virtue of the American Constitution consisted first of all in the protection they afforded to minorities. If those qualities are lost, civilization is set back a thousand years.

It is my opinion that although we should have governmental assistance for the support of scientific research in this country the public interest would be badly served if such support were granted with the inclusion of a loyalty clause governing students and employees in every institution in the country expecting to use such funds.

I believe it will be obvious to you that the inclusion of such a clause would change the intellectual environment of every institution covered by it just as it has already changed the intellectual plan for workers in the Government services.

It is not unsafe to predict that frank and open discussion of political problems will be very largely eliminated in American colleges and universities if Federal aid to education and science is coupled with Federal loyalty clearance. I have no doubt that the great preponderance of persons to whom such rules might apply would be cleared without question. However, the very fact that secret derogatory information might mean the loss of one's job, will encourage most persons to keep all of their ideas to themselves. I feel sure that this is not what you and other Members of our Congress desire to have happen to our academic institutions. It is, of course, incompatible with the principles of freedom for which we all stand. I intend to use my good office to prevent such a calamity from occurring in connection with Federal aid to science and education. We can better afford to go without the aid than to jeopardize our most cherished traditions which distinguish us from the totalitarian states.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to call the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] to the fact that I think he was in error when he made the contention that the awards of scholarship provided for under this bill are made to educational institutions. I have some knowledge of the scholarship awards that are made under authority of the United States Public Health Service, and I find the situation here is exactly the same, and that the scholarships are directed to individuals. The National Science Foundation selects the individuals itself, as provided for in section 10, on pages 10 and 11 of this bill. Therefore, it is of extreme importance to see to it that the individuals who are selected are people that we can trust. The Commission itself is charged with that responsibility. So the arguments that are being made that there is interference with academic freedom, and all that sort of thing, on the campuses of the universities, pales into insignificance in face of the fact that the Commission itself is charged with the responsibility of granting these scholarships and fellowships to individuals.

In my humble opinion, we cannot be too safe. I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has a very decent perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of this bill and particularly anxious to vote for the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Chairman, in the first session of the Eightieth Congress we passed S. 526, the National Science Foundation Act of 1947. This bill was vetoed by the President, but he stated that he was in favor of the Science Foundation and only objected to its administrative organization as unsound. It deprived the President

of the control of an agency which clearly fell in the executive branch of the Government. Such an administrative structure could have developed into an autonomous agency controlled by private research institutes and universities.

There is no doubt a strong popular interest among the public, and with scientists in particular, for Federal support of scientific research. The discovery of spectacular weapons of war such as the atomic bomb, hydrogen bomb, and radar has forced us to recognize that the national security, the general welfare, health, and prosperity of our people are dependent upon our maintaining strong scientific resources. The miracle of production of airplanes, tanks, and other weapons of war was brought about by the cooperation of Government, industry, workers, scientists, and engineers. This could not have been accomplished without the men of science who had the know-how and who designed the machines and taught the workers how to use them. After the battle of Britain Churchill remarked, with regard to heroic work by the RAF's fighter pilots, that scarcely in the history of the nation "had so many been so dependent upon so few." Likewise, our technicians, engineers, and scientists played a similar role in this country's war effort.

Fundamental scientific research in the past has known no national boundaries. Scientists could draw upon the wealth of scientific discovery throughout the world. But with the prostration of Europe, the source of many basic discoveries in the past, it is now imperative that the United States increase greatly fundamental research in science. Some may ask, why spend the taxpayers' money for basic research which may not have any immediate application? When Faraday, the famous English physicist, made his great discoveries in electricity, which were the forerunner of the whole modern electrical industry, he was asked by Gladstone about the use of his discoveries. He replied that it was like a newborn baby and how it developed only the future could say, but if the Government would keep an eye on it, no doubt they would find something in the future which they could tax. How true this statement was.

Since we considered this bill in the last session of Congress, there has appeared the valuable report by the President's Scientific Research Board, under the chairmanship of Dr. John R. Steelman. This Board consisted of representatives of the various agencies and included many of the ablest men in the executive branch of the Government. The report in five volumes made a thorough survey of scientific resources in the United States. No doubt the Members of this House are familiar with the Board's findings and recommendations.

This Board considered the future needs for scientific men in government, industry and in colleges and universities. For example, it is estimated that in 1957 the Nation would need 270,000 scientists, while today we have about 137,000 scientific workers. Industry must recruit more research scientists if they are to

continue to produce new and better products in the next few years. In fact, the full employment of our workers and the high level of our national income are greatly dependent upon the applications of the basic laws of science developed in the research and university laboratories.

At present in some of the newly organized Government laboratories there are many scientists who have had only partial training and are not fully equipped to carry out high caliber research work. As more well-trained scientists are available this condition will be remedied. As more and better trained men are produced by the universities the level of scientific institutions will be improved. Thus our universities now face a double problem, namely, of producing enough scientists to meet the present shortage and also to train men for future scientific expansion.

In order that our universities may expand their scientific programs it is essential that the Federal Government provide assistance. When the Government embarks upon a new program, it should be comprehensive and reach into every State of the Union. Financial assistance for expansion should be granted to both colleges and universities. Sometimes the importance of the liberal arts colleges in educating future scientists and inspiring them to enter the field of science is overlooked. According to the Steelman report, of the 44 institutions which rank in the highest group, in the number of graduates who have taken the doctorate in science for each 1,000 students, 39 of these institutions are liberal arts colleges, rather than universities. The following statement is taken from the Steelman report:

During the years 1936 to 1945, Furman University—

My own alma mater—

Oberlin College, Reed College, and Miami University (Ohio) together graduated more students who later completed doctoral work in physics than did Ohio State University, Yale University, Stanford University, and Princeton University combined.

I am proud that my alma mater, Furman, is in such distinguished company and has rendered such excellent service to science.

This record is, indeed, remarkable when the total number of students in the two groups of institutions is taken into consideration. However, it should be added that not all small colleges make such an unusual record. It is well known to graduate-school faculties that our small colleges are the source of many graduate students in our universities. To raise the scientific standards of these colleges, improve their equipment and faculties will materially raise the level of graduate work in the universities. Moreover, this policy will greatly increase the sum total of the Nation's scientific resources.

At present the most important scientific centers of graduate work are almost entirely confined to three regions; namely, the northeastern part of the United States, the Great Lakes region, and California. The institutions in these three areas granted about 85 percent of the

Ph. D.'s in science during the 10-year period 1936-45. In regions where scientific research has been developed to a high level the attracting of competent young people may already be approaching the saturation point. Moreover, the situation of a single science department with several hundred graduate students is not very conducive for the highest type of graduate training. As a national policy, it would be highly desirable to have a series of strong graduate schools throughout the Nation.

In the social security grants and the proposed program of Federal aid for the public schools included in S. 472 it is recognized that the States with lower economic levels are in need of greater Federal assistance. In the States of lower economic ability the colleges and universities have not yet been able to improve their educational standards because of lack of funds. The Federal-aid program for scientific research should help to bring the institutions of these regions up to the national level. In some of the smaller institutions the scientific equipment is quite meager, and the only way that their students learn about the common instruments for scientific measurements is by reading about them and from illustrations in textbooks. To give students the proper background for scientific careers they should learn the use of these instruments as undergraduates.

The direct attention to the nature of scientific research in the South, with especial interest to scientific men themselves, two important studies have been made. Dr. Wilson Gee of the University of Virginia, published in 1932 his book entitled "Research Barriers in the South," in which he analyzed and presented significant data concerning what he called the drag out of the South. In his analysis of the 1927 edition of American Men of Science, a biographical dictionary of approximately 14,000 eminent American scientists, he found that 1,094 of them had been born in the South. Of this group of southern-born scientists, only 154 or one-sixth had received their graduate training in southern universities, while the balance had been trained in universities outside of the South.

What is the situation today? Fortunately we now have a comparable study through the courtesy of Dr. M. H. Trytten, of the National Research Council, whose generous cooperation recently made available the results of his work. This study is concerned with the training and careers of 389 younger scientists from the four Southern States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and my native State of South Carolina, who took their Ph. D.'s in the 10-year period, 1936-45. Of this group of budding scientists, 95 individuals or 24 percent of the group, received their doctorates from 11 of our southern universities, although 78 of them took their degrees from the four following southern institutions, Duke, Florida, North Carolina, and Virginia. However, there were no doctorates in science conferred by institutions in the three States of Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina.

The balance of this group, 215 or three-quarters of these southern-born

scientists, earned their Ph. D.'s from 39 universities outside the South. The four universities, Chicago, Cornell, Iowa, and Wisconsin conferred doctorates upon 87 men in this group, which is only slightly less than the total number of 95 individuals who took their degrees from our southern universities. It is thus apparent that in terms of advanced scientific training the South is only slightly less dependent upon outside universities for the training of its scientific leaders than it was 20 years ago. For the 112 Ph. D.'s recipients from my own State of South Carolina, the story is substantially the same. Of this group of young scientists, only 35, or less than one-third were trained in southern universities; while the balance, almost 70 percent of the group, left the South for their graduate training.

Not only are our southern-born scientists trained in large numbers in institutions outside the South, but unfortunately, a substantial number of them find it necessary or choose to carry on their scientific careers in other sections of the country. The Gee study of 20 years ago, indicated that only 40 percent of the southern-born scientists listed in American Men of Science served in educational institutions, research agencies, government, and industry in the section of the country in which they were born and raised. In contrast, the Trytten study indicated that of the group of younger scientists, 207, or 53 percent, are now working in the Southern States. In the case of the 112 scientists from South Carolina, 57, or about one-half, are working in the South. We are glad that our southern scientists are in demand for scientific positions over the entire Nation. However, we are anxious to develop strong research centers to hold more of our promising young men and to attract superior scientists from other sections of the Nation in exchange for our southern-born scientists.

Despite this increase in the number of southern-born scientists who continue to work in the South, Dr. Gee's optimistic forecast in 1932, that "a similar analysis made 10 or 20 years from now will likely show a substantially different result due to the marked development of graduate opportunities in several leading universities" has not yet been realized. We continue to suffer from what he termed the "drag out of the South," and still export a considerable portion of that rare and much-needed commodity, trained scientific manpower, to other regions. However, this situation is not confined to the South. There is reason to believe that the training and location of scientists is not markedly different for the Rocky Mountain and Southwestern States.

It is largely by reason of data of this character and similar data that our southern educational and scientific leaders are very much interested in this legislation. They are anxious, however, that it will be so administered, particularly the scholarship and fellowship provisions, as to permit the development of a stronger group of institutions throughout the South for the better training of more scientists. We are anxious to en-

courage the training of a larger group of scientific leaders who will assist the South to staff properly its colleges, universities, and research agencies so as to provide a more effective basis for the development of our resources and for the training of better scientists. We do not object to the migration of our men in science or our leaders in other fields, but we want it to be more than a one-way traffic out of the South.

From the statistics made available by Dr. Trytten it is seen that the South is now producing about one-third of the scientists compared to the national average. Better and more scientific equipment and better trained professors are urgently needed. Moreover, first-rate laboratories will enable us to hold our first-rate men.

If there are scientific centers in a State, the people are more conscious of science and are more willing to support it. Also in terms of the general cultural value and the general diffusion of knowledge, a scientific center in a region is important. Therefore it would be for the advantage of the entire Nation to secure a better distribution of scientific research. More equitable distribution should apply not only to the South, but to the Southwest and the Rocky Mountain region which are lower than the national average in science training. According to the Steelman Report, institutions in 14 States granted no Ph. D.'s in science in the period 1936-45. Three of the States were in New England, 5 were in the South and 6 were in the Rocky Mountain region, and during the same period the universities in 26 States granted fewer than 4 percent of the total Ph. D.'s in science. On the other hand, the universities in 11 States granted 80 percent of the doctorates in science. By increasing the number of scientific centers there is no desire to curb or handicap our great universities, of which we are all proud. They should be equally included in this program but should not make up most of the expansion of training facilities under Federal aid. It should be remembered that northern and particularly eastern private universities have consistently been the recipients of large grants for research from foundations.

It might be argued that more research would be obtained by granting the funds to a few superior institutions. This would probably be true for the first few years. However, over a decade the general distribution of research centers would accomplish much more, and from the point of view of national security and welfare on which we are now spending large funds, the distribution of research centers over a wide area would be distinctly advantageous. During World War II a small number of the well-developed laboratories were used on research projects, since they were ready to expand and could produce results in a short time. However, the aims of a science foundation in peacetime are different and require a much more general expansion. In case of another national emergency we would have many high-grade laboratories on which to call for assistance.

The importance of this point of view was clearly recognized by the Bush report, Science, the Endless Frontier, published in July 1945, which made the following unequivocal recommendation:

It is, in fact, essential to the healthy growth of science that the Foundation should help to spread the research spirit as widely as possible throughout the United States. If the recruitment of future scientific personnel is to proceed from a sufficiently broad base, it is important that as large a number of students as possible be made aware of the research point of view. Many of our colleges and engineering schools are not now able to support a significant amount of research.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I want to endorse the objectives and organization of the National Science Foundation. I also should like to emphasize several items in order that the Science Foundation will be of the greatest value to science and the Nation. First, it should be administered by a board with a chairman and should be a part of the executive branch of the Government with the same general controls which regulate other agencies. Second, because of the lower economic level of the Southern States and because their training facilities, universities, and laboratories, are not yet as well developed as the institutions of the North, Middle West, and the West the Federal funds should be granted more generously, at least for a few years, to the institutions of the South and the Rocky Mountain States. This would enable the institutions of these areas to overcome their present handicaps and achieve the level of scientific training of other sections of the Nation.

To follow the practice I advocate would merely use Federal funds to bring about a badly needed balance. Third, the Foundation's board should be empowered to grant research funds only to institutions which meet certain minimum standards which it would establish to carry out the aims of the Science Foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill whether he believes, in view of the extensive hearings held by the subcommittee, that this amendment is necessary, or whether he agrees with our colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] that the amendment is not necessary. Scientists and scholars from Columbia University and other great institutions of higher learning which are located in the district of New York which I have the honor to represent have told me that many excellent men in the field of scientific research, with excellent backgrounds and records, are quite restive over being picked out as special objects of investigation when they are trying to cooperate in connection with the scientific effort of the Government. That is particularly true of the younger men, who feel keenly on the subject.

Mr. PRIEST. While I want to safeguard any measure of this sort, I share the opinion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], after having looked

into this subject rather extensively during the public hearings, that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is not necessary for the legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe that the Committee of the Whole certainly ought to be guided by the view of the subcommittee, which has examined the matter so extensively, and which I am sure shares the solicitude for the Nation's security, which prompted the gentleman's amendment. We certainly want those who do the research to proceed with full confidence and enthusiasm and a conviction of the fairness of the rules in effect.

Mr. HARRIS. It is my understanding that language contained in this bill which was reported by the committee, this amendment requiring the affidavit, is the identical language that is contained in the bill providing for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. JAVITS. That ought to be sufficient to satisfy the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think the position taken by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] should be concurred in by the House. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I can say to you that the amendment offered by my beloved friend from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] would require an FBI investigation of everyone who is to come under this act, as none of this work can be conclusive. Let me point out to you that the really dangerous people in the United States are not these young students. They are people like this man Fuchs, who can fool everyone, because no one can find out what their connections are. They are the really dangerous people in the United States.

I hope that the House will not accept this amendment, as it would place undue restrictions, not upon the candidates for fellowships, if you please, but upon the members of the Scientific Board set up under this bill. At least five members would have to be satisfied that the affidavits were reasonably true. That is beyond the capabilities of the members of the Board.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that this bill proposes that the Board shall consist of 24 members? The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Florida confines the decision to five members.

Mr. HINSHAW. Any five.

Mr. HARRIS. Any 5 out of the 24.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Let me call attention to the fact that an executive board is set up of nine members. Five must be satisfied as to the truth of the affidavits. They have not got to get all of the members to agree; only five, a quorum, have to be satisfied.

Mr. HINSHAW. They cannot possibly be satisfied except upon an FBI investigation. They are not investigators.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment has been adequately discussed.

I appreciate the sincerity of my colleague from Florida with whom I have worked on the committee. I merely feel that the amendment in this respect is not necessary and is unworkable.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman states that in his opinion the Rogers amendment is unnecessary. The adoption of the Rogers amendment, however, would not hurt anything, would it? It would simply be another safeguard; and, as the gentleman has explained, only a majority of the executive board of nine would have to be satisfied as to the truth of the affidavit.

Mr. PRIEST. I think it might hurt something in this connection, that if you take the time of a majority of this board to establish questions of the truth or falsity of affidavits it might become an endless sort of trial and investigation. That, I think, does not belong in legislation of this sort. I am just as anxious as is the gentleman from Florida or any other Member of this House to see that we do not give any aid to Communists, but I do believe that it might impose on five members of the executive committee rather serious responsibilities that would require a procedure that would be pretty well endless insofar as satisfying themselves that an affidavit was true. They might have a chain of affidavits. That could be an almost endless investigation in connection with one affidavit.

The language here used is identical with the provision of the AEC Act, and in the opinion of the committee, it is the best solution of this problem.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS of Florida) there were—ayes 49, noes 70.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PRIEST and Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 63, noes 73.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the following committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 19, strike out lines 6 to 10, inclusive. Page 19, line 11, strike out "(i)" and insert "(h)."

Page 19, line 23, strike out "(j)" and insert "(i)."

Page 20, line 7, strike out "(k)" and insert "(j)."

Page 20, line 15, strike out "(l)" and insert "(k)."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this matter has been discussed at considerable length earlier in the debate this afternoon. The committee amendment would strike out the language on page 19 from line 6 to line 10, inclusive. It seems to me that this amendment ought to be kept in the bill. It merely makes sure that this Foundation cannot supersede, curtail, or limit any of the functions or activities of other government agencies, Public Health Service or Agricultural Department or Defense Department or other agencies which are carrying on scientific research and development.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], a while ago said he thought it was covered in the next subsection, beginning with line 11. I do not see how the two either overlap or are in conflict. The subsection, lines 11 to line 22, says that the funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research can be transferred, if the head of the Department or agency so wishes, to this Foundation. I think that is good. But, to keep the preceding language in that the committee is moving to strike out would not interfere with any Government agencies making their funds available to the Foundation if they thought that was the best way to carry on the particular functions.

I do not want to belabor the point. It just seems to me we ought to make sure that this new Foundation is not going to have authority to interfere with or impede or curtail or limit or take over any functions that are now being carried on by various research agencies or other departments of Government, unless the latter so desire.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I thoroughly understand the gentleman's concern with the elimination of that language. May I suggest to him that if you put that language back in again you will nullify the effect of the amendment I offered.

I call your attention to the fifth report of the President's Scientific Research Board, and its recommendations on policies. I think this is exactly the sort of procedure that should be conducted. It is entitled "Balancing Research." It calls attention to the fact that one-fourth of all medical research projects in all agencies are in determining etiology. It then goes on further to discuss every specific research program. Then it makes this recommendation:

To the extent permitted by law, the agencies of the Government should move promptly to correct this imbalance. Because the research work of the Public Health Service is not directed to the medical problems of special population groups and because that agency has been charged by the Congress with responsibility for the health of the whole population, it should direct increased research effort to those diseases and impairments which are now receiving insufficient attention but which are major causes of death and disability.

I submit to the gentleman that with that type of a policy, knowing that we are ranging all over this field and perhaps placing too much emphasis on one thing and too little on another, we should give this Foundation power to examine the programs that they are undertaking, these people who are working in that field, and then tell us where the better emphasis could be made, and where we will get a sounder program. But, I think if you put that language back in you would, in effect, say, "Don't you even look at another agency's program."

Mr. JUDD. I do not see where the gentleman can find that meaning in the language. Rather, it says that the Foundation shall supplement, in full accordance with the gentleman's own quotation from the Hoover Commission report, where there is need or imbalance. It should determine and correct the imbalance by putting in additional research activities where they ought to be, if present agencies are not carrying them on adequately. But I do not want it to take over and operate programs that other agencies are now carrying on. It ought to supplement them, and there is nothing in the language to prevent its making recommendations for changes. That is good. But I have more confidence in the agencies that are already working in many fields and which have carried on the activities for a long time. They have invaluable experience. I want them to be left where they are, with this Foundation studying them and evaluating them, and then supplementing their work where there is any imbalance.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman has referred to the paragraph commencing in line 11 on page 19 in his discussion of the inadvisability of accepting the committee amendment which strikes out lines 6 to 10.

I call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota to the fact that in line 12 the phrase "scientific or technical research" is used, which has nothing to do with basic research. This is another instance of this Foundation going far beyond basic research. It can go into technical research.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I am as concerned as he about language in the bill in several places which could be construed to include functions far beyond those its sponsors have described to us.

But returning to the committee amendment, I cannot see how keeping those five lines in the bill can do any damage. It seems to me they constitute a necessary safeguard particularly during the first year or two when this new Foundation is getting under way. If experience demonstrates that its proper work is impeded under this language, and it cannot move to correct any imbalances that may exist, then we can take a second bite and strike it out later. But when this new Foundation is being set up, we ought to make clear just what we want it to do and not to do.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee I desire to support the committee amendment.

Let me call attention to the fact that the committee amendment strikes out the language contained in subsection (h) on page 19. There is a very good reason for striking out that language. That language says that the activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies. It is not intended by the Foundation that it will supersede. Of course, it is supplementing, but in order for the foundation to take any action to correct overlapping and duplication of scientific research in the many agencies of Government that are now engaged in scientific research it certainly should have the opportunity of making any devices to the Bureau of the Budget or the President or even to an agency itself if that agency can be persuaded that it is overlapping or duplicating the work of some other agency. If this language is left in, it is quite possible that they will have no authority to make any such recommendation. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and I think he will agree that the language should go out of the bill.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree with the statement the gentleman has made, and I think the language should go out.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Do I correctly understand that with this language out of the bill the gentleman believes the Foundation could curtail the activities of other agencies, and could supersede or limit or otherwise interfere with their activities?

Mr. HINSHAW. With the language out I think it is perfectly clear that the Heselton amendment, which provides that the Board shall evaluate scientific and research programs undertaken by agencies of the Federal Government, can be effective; that is, in the matter of evaluation. I do not see in any way that taking the language out would permit them to supersede. The language simply would not be in the act, and no questions could be raised as to whether or not they were superseding any functions of any other agency.

Mr. JUDD. If this language is removed from the bill, then the National Foundation, as the gentleman says, will not have the authority to supersede, but there would be nothing to prevent them from doing it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I know that the gentleman seeks every efficiency and economy in government. If he leaves this language contained in subsection (h) in the bill there will be no possibility of the Board's making any savings to the Federal Government by evaluating the overlapping and duplicating work that is now being done by the various agencies.

Mr. JUDD. But even with this language in the bill, the Foundation could still evaluate the activities being carried

on by other agencies and could make recommendations regarding overlapping.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think it would impair the value of the work of the Board in doing that evaluating.

Now I should like to address my remarks to the gentleman from New York, who criticized the language in line 12, to the effect that funds available to any department or agency of the Government for scientific or technical research shall be available for transfer with the approval of the agency.

Sometimes there are funds for technical research or development which cannot go forward until certain basic or scientific research has been done. If an agency of the Government wants to do certain technical work, they must have the basic scientific knowledge. If, in order to obtain that scientific knowledge, they desire to transfer any technical research funds to the Board for the purpose of doing basic research, then they should be permitted to do so. I think the gentleman from New York is incorrect in his assumption. I hope the amendment of the committee leaving subsection (h) out of the bill will be approved by the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to propound an inquiry to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority floor leader. It is my understanding that within a few moments a motion will be made for the Committee to rise. I wonder if the gentleman could inform us as to what the program will be, so far as the remainder of this bill is concerned, and on tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad that my friend made that inquiry so that I can advise the membership. It is true that after the disposition of this committee amendment the gentleman from Tennessee will move that the committee rise. The consideration of the remainder of the bill will go over to tomorrow. The first order of business tomorrow will be a motion to take from the Speaker's desk and send to conference the basing-point bill. Probably an hour will be taken on that particular question.

Following that, the continuation of the consideration of this bill will be the order of business and after that the rural rehabilitation trust funds bill will come up. How far we will go on that tomorrow I am unable to state, except that that will be the order of business.

To return to the program, it will be as printed—statehood for Alaska and then statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the committee amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively to the discussion of this measure this evening. I intend to vote for it. I am heartily in accord with the objects of this legislation. I did not intend to seek the floor or take any time until I saw that apparently something has happened that I never have known to happen before, and never expect to see happen again. You know usually when the lamb and the lion lay down together, the lamb is inside the lion before they lay down. That does not seem to be the case here. The Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Labor and, believe it or not, the National Association of Manufacturers are recommending the passage of this legislation. Who could object if none of them object?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4846) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD (at the request of Mr. HINSHAW) was granted permission to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain extraneous quotations.

Mr. FORAND (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Missoulan, of Missoula, Mont.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address prepared for delivery by the late Honorable S. O. Bland.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on conditions in Spain.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article and an editorial.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Buffalo Courier.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the lobbying report for 1949, notwithstanding the fact that the estimated cost will be \$381.50.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert an article from the American Magazine.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FUGATE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 4846.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HESELTON (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was granted permission to extend the remarks that he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain statistical data.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by the former Governor of Minnesota, Mr. Harold Stassen, at a Lincoln Day dinner.

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the 8-month-old coal dispute has precipitated this Nation to the brink of disaster. The situation is beyond the critical stage. Domestic coal users in western Michigan are without fuel; municipal power plants and schools have insufficient supplies and manufacturing concerns where thousands are employed now have nearly empty coal bins.

The President should have foreseen this impending disaster months ago. Instead he has played politics in refusing to make use of the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act until it is almost too late.

The American public is fed up with Mr. Truman's shabby lack of concern over the public welfare. Today I received a letter from a union man who is fed up with the Democratic administration. The letter concludes by saying, "I have one-half ton of coal and no work."

The President's last minute and half-hearted use of the Taft-Hartley Act reminds me of a football game where the obviously better team is losing 7 to 6 in the last quarter. The better team, cocky and self-confident, has one sure-fire touchdown play which it wants to save for the final and winning play of the game. In the last second of the game the quarterback calls the winning play but it does not work for someone missed a crucial block. The game is lost for there is no time or chance for a second try.

Mr. Truman in the coal strike, by his eleventh-hour use of the Taft-Hartley Act, pulled the same type of a boner. The loss of a football game is relatively unimportant, but the loss of a nation, our Nation, vitally concerns us all. I wonder how long the American people will continue to put up with purely political strategists who worry about votes rather than the public welfare.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 496, which I sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Thursday, April 6, 1950, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, on which day remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWS RELATING TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 497), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, that immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7058) to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

WHITE HOUSE PHOTOGRAPHERS' ASSOCIATION EXHIBIT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the Members an opportunity to witness a rather unusual collection of photographs now on exhibit at the Statler Hotel. It is the seventh annual exhibit of the White House Photographers' Association. It will remain on display through Friday of this week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a speech by the junior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter; also to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a resolution passed by the Clearfield, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial written by Wheeler McMillen.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in two instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a radio address recently made by Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor, on the subject of justice for Poland.

EXCISE TAX ON MOVIE TICKETS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have received from over 25,000 of my constituents, the good men and women of the Second Congressional District of Illinois, expression of their growing impatience with the unfair tax which the Eightieth Congress voted as a permanent and wholly unjustified burden upon their backs.

The tax upon tickets to the movie houses, where people of modest incomes find relaxation from the daily grind of work, was never intended to continue after the period of war necessity. It was adopted by a Democratic Congress strictly as a war measure, with the distinct understanding that when the war ended the tax would come off. While the war was on, our people were only too happy to pay this tax. Certainly when our soldiers were in the fox holes, no one in all America, fortunate enough to have movies to go to, complained about the hardship of paying a tax.

But the Republican Eightieth Congress voted to make this war-emergency tax a permanent peacetime tax. The Eightieth Congress did this in order to do a favor to the men and corporations in the high-income brackets. The Republican Eightieth Congress voted to make permanent the tax on the little people who attend movies so that it could get the money to pay off its debt to the big people to whom it was beholden.

The tax on tickets to the movie houses was imposed by a Democratic Congress strictly as a wartime measure. It definitely provided that the tax should end 6 months after the close of hostilities. I quote the exact words—"and ending on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war."

Then came the Eightieth Congress which the elections of 1946 had thrown into Republican hands. The Republican leadership of the House was under heavy obligations to certain large corporations and individuals in the highest income bracket. These corporations and rich individuals insisted upon heavy cuts in their income tax rate. So in order to give these large corporations and rich individuals what they wanted and were demanding, and at the same time to have the money with which to run the Government, H. R. 1030 was introduced by Mr. Grant, Republican from the Third district of Indiana, now represented in the Eighty-first Congress by Mr. Crook, Democrat. This bill was referred to the Republican-dominated Ways and Means Committee and on January 29, 1947, was brought to the floor of the House under what Mr. McGREGOR, an independent Republican from Ohio, called a gag-rule procedure—see page 666 of

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1947. Nevertheless, the rule was adopted, H. R. 1030 was passed and eventually became Public Law 17 of the Republican Eightieth Congress.

Of the eight members from Cook County, Ill., in the Eightieth Congress now living not one Democratic Member voted for H. R. 1030, the effect of which legislation was to saddle upon men and women, and even children, who find their relaxation from toil and worry in movie attendance, the payment of taxes which by right and reason were the obligation of the big corporations and rich individuals most able to afford it.

In short, the Republican Eightieth Congress gave a break to the big corporations and rich individuals at the expense even of school children who in peacetime had to go on paying out their pennies when they went to the movies.

You will find the roll call on the passage of this bill on pages 692-693 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1947. This is the way eight Members from Cook County, Ill., now living—two Members having since died—voted:

For the bill making permanent in peacetime the war-emergency tax on movie attendance: Vail, Busbey, Twyman, Church—all Republicans.

Against the bill permanently putting a tax on school children and their parents to help out the rich, high-bracket individuals and corporations: Dawson, Gordon, O'Brien—all Democrats.

Not voting: SABATH, Democrat—SABATH was absent but was recorded as paired with COLE of Kansas. His position therefore was established in opposition to the bill.

Mr. MADDEN was one of two Democrats from Indiana in the Eightieth Congress. There are seven Democratic Members in the Eighty-first Congress; and perhaps that roll-call vote on January 29, 1947, which gave everything to the rich at the expense of the poor and those in moderate circumstances was a factor in the change of the political complexion of the Indiana delegation. Mr. MADDEN voted against the bill. Due to sickness, the other Democrat was absent. He has since retired after long years of faithful service. Eight Republican Members from Indiana voted for the bill.

Now, let us examine H. R. 1030, authored by a Republican and forced through a Republican Congress under what even an indignant independent Republican cried out was gag-rule procedure. I quote the exact language of H. R. 1030:

Section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes) is hereby amended by striking out "and ending on the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war."

What the bill did was to make wartime taxes permanent taxes by striking out the date for their expiration.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], Democratic minority leader said—page 671 of the CONGRES-

SIGNAL RECORD of January 29, 1947—that—

The fact remains that the bill, now before the House, calls for the fixing of these wartime excise taxes permanently. * * * Despite all the efforts—

Republican—

to camouflage, "indefinite" and "permanent" in the sense of legislation are synonymous. * * * Any time we pass a law without a termination date it is permanent legislation.

So by passing H. R. 1030 the Republican Eightieth Congress made permanent a tax which Democratic Congresses had restricted to the period of hostilities.

Now, let us get the entire picture perfectly clear. In 1947 it was pretty generally agreed that it was prudent and necessary to continue certain excise taxes that covered luxuries and fell upon people well able to pay. The country thought this was wise; the President said so. But the average person using his own common sense and wanting to do the right thing, did not think that among the excise taxes to be fixed upon our people permanently, when the war necessity was over, were those that forced a tribute from a mother buying baby oil for her infant or a family in modest circumstances going for a bit of relaxation to a neighborhood movie.

Such taxes never could have been made a permanent part of our lives if the Republican-dominated Rules Committee of the Eightieth Congress had permitted the membership of the House to vote on such items specifically, and, if the Republican Party did not pass the bill. What it did was to give to the House a bill, which included both the luxury and the necessity items, under a rule which prohibited amendments. It was a case of forcing the House to take the whole dose. This was what Mr. MCGREGOR called "gag-rule procedure."

Mr. KELLEY, Democrat from Pennsylvania, who voted against the bill, said, as reported on page 692 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, 1947:

While I recognize the necessity for continuing taxes in order to reduce the national debt and to balance the budget, I do not think there is a necessity for making a tax bill inequitable.

The committee brought this bill before the House with a rule which prevented any Member of Congress from offering amendments. * * * Many of the necessities of life are still burdened with wartime taxes. If they were luxuries, one could have no objections; but here is a bill that does not discriminate. Moreover, this bill continues these taxes indefinitely. To my mind that means permanent. * * * I could not in conscience support such a measure without an opportunity to amend it in order to correct the inequities which exist in it. All this talk by the majority party—

Republican—

about reducing taxes—it would be well for them to practice a little justice in the tax bills they do draw up.

This is the story of the way the Republican Eightieth Congress, which cut to the bone the income taxes of those in the highest brackets, made indefinite and permanent the tax on a mother buying

baby oil for her infant and a family going out to the neighborhood movie.

The people of Chicago showed how they felt about it in November of 1948 when the Democrats—O'BRIEN, GORDON, DAWSON, and SABATH—who fought the battle for the little people, all were re-elected by landslide majorities and three of the four Republicans who voted for H. R. 1030—Vail, Busbey, and Twyman—were defeated.

I can assure my constituents in the Second District of Illinois that their voice in 1948 being the mandate to my vote in 1950, I shall do all in my power and to the extent of my vote and influence to put an end for all time to this tax on mothers and movie-attending families that the Eightieth Congress in its passion to give aid and succor to its high-income-bracket friends made indefinite and permanent.

I think that I am safe in saying that the pattern set by the Democratic delegation from Cook County in the Eightieth Congress in opposing this law will be the pattern followed by the entire Democratic delegation from Cook County in the Eighty-first Congress in supporting the repeal of such taxes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JONAS), for 15 days, on account of illness in hospital.

To Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. HAVENNER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. YATES, for Monday and Tuesday, February 27 and 28, 1950, on account of official business.

To Mr. ROOSEVELT, for Monday and Tuesday, February 27 and 28, 1950, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H. R. 7220. An act to expedite the rehabilitation of Federal reclamation projects in certain cases.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2328. An act to amend section 482 of the Revised Statutes relating to the Board of Appeals in the United States Patent Office.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 28, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1262. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Crop Insur-

ance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 483); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1263. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1264. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of \$100,000,000 in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year for assistance to the Republic of Korea (H. Doc. No. 481); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1265. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of \$2,950,000,000 in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year for expenses of the European recovery program (H. Doc. No. 479); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1266. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$60,000,000 for assistance to the Republic of Korea (H. Doc. No. 480); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1267. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation, involving an increase of \$6,140, for the fiscal year 1951 for the legislative branch, House of Representatives, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 484); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1268. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1269. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Honora Redman"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report pursuant to House Resolution 238. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to undertake a study of immigration and nationality problems (Rept. No. 1687). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 7302. A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 7351. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 497. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7058, a bill to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and

for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1692). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KEE: Committee of conference. H. R. 4406. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments (Rept. No. 1693). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6462. A bill for the relief of Sachiko Iwai; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6490. A bill for the relief of Margarita Funakura; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 7429. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to clarify certain authority of the Administrator of General Services with respect to transportation and traffic management, to provide for an adequate traffic-management service in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 7430. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, by creating a new title to provide for an adequate traffic-management service in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 7431. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board at Walker, Minn., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 7432. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to Jackson County public water supply district No. 1, Jackson County, Mo., an easement for pumping station and water pipe lines on lands of the United States at the naval industrial reserve plant, Kansas City, Mo.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 7433. A bill to direct the prompt distribution of the appropriation for the settlement of Sioux pony claims made by the act of December 31, 1945, Public Law 97, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 7434. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Providence, R. I., as "The Capt. Elwood J. Ewart Veterans' Memorial Hospital"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRANAHAAN:

H. R. 7435. A bill relating to the income restrictions placed upon the payment of certain pensions to the widows and children of veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 7436. A bill to supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize the expenditure of funds for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of roads certified as necessary in connection with the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7437. A bill to amend and clarify the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 7438. A bill relating to the forwarding and return of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, the collection of postage due at the time of delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7439. A bill to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 7440. A bill to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the armed forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for active pulmonary tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 7441. A bill to promote development and improvement of standards for frozen fishery products and to provide for voluntary grading, inspection, and certification of such products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7442. A bill to provide for the common defense through the registration and classification of certain male persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 7443. A bill authorizing the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, to acquire and improve a town site in Zapata County, Tex., for the relocation of communities in said county to be inundated by the waters of the Falcon Dam and Reservoir, being constructed in cooperation with Mexico under the water treaty of February 3, 1944; providing for the construction of a water and sewer system for such town site, for the relocation and construction of certain public buildings, and for the relocation of cemeteries; and providing for the exchange and conveyance of such properties in full or part payment for property to be acquired in connection with such reservoir; authorizing appropriations therefor; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 7444. A bill to deal with areas of serious unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 7445. A bill authorizing the village of Baudette, State of Minnesota, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7446. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7447. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to sound-

recording materials for use in connection with moving-picture exhibits and news reels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7448. A bill to provide an additional income-tax exemption to certain handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 7449. A bill to authorize appropriations for the eradication and control of halogeton on public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. J. Res. 424. Joint resolution granting consent of Congress to an agreement or compact entered into between the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois for the creation of the Bi-State Metropolitan Development District and the establishment of the Bi-State Development Agency for the comprehensive development of the metropolitan St. Louis area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. J. Res. 425. Joint resolution to establish a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. J. Res. 426. Joint resolution to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to increase the sugar quota for Puerto Rico from 910,000 short tons, raw value, to 1,150,000 short tons, raw value; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution consenting to the agreement or compact entered into between the State of Missouri and the State of Illinois for the comprehensive development of the St. Louis metropolitan area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 489. Resolution authorizing an inquiry into the progress of the denazification program in the American zone in Germany; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 490. Resolution to take off all taxes on bread and milk; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NOLAND:

H. Res. 491. Resolution relating to the installation of mechanism for visual recording and automatic counting of yeas and nays and of answers to quorum calls in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 492. Resolution providing for the employment of 10 additional telephone operators, office of the Clerk; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 493. Resolution providing for the employment of a foreman of laborers, Door-keeper's department; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 494. Resolution providing for the employment of a secretary to the Sergeant at Arms; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. Res. 495. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting an investigation by the Committee on the District of Columbia pursuant to House Resolution 340, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to lowering the high cost of food; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the pass-

ing of anti-poll-tax legislation; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the passing of antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, urging that the attempt to eliminate or reduce the depletion allowance on natural resources be defeated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 7450. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Malvina Davoli, nee Passini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7451. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Fujita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7452. A bill for the relief of Alice Moriyoshi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 7453. A bill for the relief of the Farmers Mutual Fire Insurance Co. of Sumner County, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 7454. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Preston Watters, the estate of Mrs. Jessie Nivens Watters, and the estate of J. W. Gillum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 7455. A bill for the relief of Edward C. Brunett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7456. A bill for the relief of Daniel H. Dulity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7457. A bill for the relief of Frank Lindsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7458. A bill for the relief of Jonna Marie Rasmussen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 7459. A bill for the relief of Dr. John M. Maniatis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 7460. A bill to exempt certain real property in the District of Columbia from taxation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 7461. A bill for the relief of Edward Pittwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1909. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of approximately 1,200 railway employees, requesting that the railway pension law be amended to read that it will be optional for railway employees to receive their annuity on reaching the age of 60 and having 20 years of railroad service or 30 years of service regardless of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1910. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 95 residents of Ellwood City, Lawrence County, Pa., in opposition to the Fogarty bill, H. R. 1570; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1911. By Mr. HAGEN: Resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Federal Re-

serve Bank of Minneapolis on February 9, 1950, petitioning the Congress to review the question of salaries for members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and to establish their annual salaries at levels commensurate with the responsibilities of their positions, with a view to achieving the highest type of public service in the field of monetary and banking policy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1912. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to lower the high cost of food; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1913. Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass anti-poll-tax legislation; to the Committee on House Administration.

1914. Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1915. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition requesting passage of legislation that would prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1916. By Mr. MILLER of California: Petition of the commissioners of the Housing Authority of the City of Alameda, Calif., requesting passage of S. 2246, a bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1917. By Mr. SHORT: Petitions of Mrs. James Mason, Dr. Kenneth Glover, Abb Hulen, Virgil Walker, and many others, of Mount Vernon and Lawrence County, urging the passage of the Langer bill, S. 1847, and the Bryson bill, H. R. 2428; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1918. Also, petition of the Joplin unit of Missouri Cosmetologists Association, urging the Congress to repeal the wartime excise tax on all cosmetics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1919. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Walworth County Petroleum Industries Committee, Walworth County, Wis., urging immediate and outright repeal of the Federal gasoline and lubricating-oil taxes and the Federal automotive excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1920. Also, resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanian-Americans held under the auspices of the local branch of Lithuanian-American Council, Inc., favoring immediate ratification of the convention outlawing genocide by the United States Senate; denouncing the Soviet policy of destruction of native population and take effective steps to make Russia respect the principles of the declaration of human rights; urging the Government to use its power and influence to help Lithuania and other Baltic States to regain their freedom and sovereign rights in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and Charter of the United Nations, and not to make peace settlement with Soviet Russia until this has been achieved; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1921. By Mr. WALTER: Petition of Pennsylvania Cooperative Potato Growers, Inc., Allentown, Pa., opposing the continued price-support program of the Federal Government on potatoes in any form; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1922. By the SPEAKER: Petition of O. A. Richardson, president St. Joseph County Industrial Union Council, South Bend, Ind., supporting the enactment of S. 110 and H. R. 1380, Labor Extension Service bills; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1923. Also, petition of J. E. Batten, Jr., president, McDowell County Education Asso-

ciation, Welch, W. Va., reaffirming its stand in favor of Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1924. Also, petition of Mrs. Clair J. Butterfield, president, Edinboro State Teachers College, Edinboro, Pa., requesting that full support be given Senate bill 246 with certain provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Father, as our thoughts are hushed to silence may we find Thee moving upon our minds, higher than our highest thought yet nearer to us than our very selves. Before the toil of a new day opens before us we lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts: May they be acceptable in Thy sight.

Prepare us for the solemn role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day, with its vast issues that concern not only our own dear land, but all the continents and the islands of the sea. Make us ministers of that love which will not halt its growing sway until it joins all nations and kindreds and tongues and peoples into one great fraternity. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 27, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. MURRAY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MURRAY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and the remainder of the week.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet briefly at 3 o'clock this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.