FLORIDA

Luther W. Reel, Eloise.
Edna Gowen Smith, Hilliard.
Wiley Bird, Live Oak.
Lynn H. Thames, Osprey.
Harry Gordon Higel, Sarasota.

GEORGIA

Estelle M. Jacques, Baconton.

HAWAII

Toshihiro Nakagawa, Kunia.
Adolph S. K. Leong, Lahaina.

IDAHO

Ellwood R. Werry, Shoshone.

ILLINOIS

Bruna R. Gherardini, Bulpitt.
Louis J. Frooninckx, Jr., Clifton.

INDIANA

Vernice L. Larkin, Cloverdale.
Richard C. Walker, Granger.
Charles Donald Manaugh, Hanover.
Kenneth E. Romine, Mentone.
Helen M. Cox, Oaklandon.
Thomas M. Gray, Otwell.
Arvil Weilbaker, Palmyra.
Louise W. Broyles, Pittsboro.
John E. Brewer, Summitville.
James L. Wall, Winchester.

IOWA

James Lawrence Klauer, Akron.
Woodrow J. Shearer, Columbus Junction.
Leroy W. Threde, Lake Park.
Fernando Gianni, Melcher.

KANSAS

Carl N. Couch, Atlanta.
Yoland L. Faris, Elmdale.
Charles Dwain Duecy, Galesburg.
John C. Bowman, Garnett.
Ruel Lazarus, Norwich.

KENTUCKY

Austin V. Thompson, Moreland.
William F. Gibson, Whitesburg.

LOUISIANA

Robert W. Gandy, Jr., Tallulah.

MAINE

Irma J. Gott, Southwest Harbor.

MARYLAND

Melvin H. Bowers, Lilypons.
Michael Keehan, Patuxent River.

MASSACHUSETTS

James E. Rogers, East Bridgewater.
Daniel F. Cahill, Lawrence.
Ralph Howard Bryant, South Lancaster.
Edmund L. Hannaford, Wellfleet.

MICHIGAN

Donald M. Brown, Addison.
William Bombyk, Applegate.
William R. Shortridge, Big Bay.
Robert J. Gitersonke, Bridgman.
Gust C. Burandt, Coldwater.
Elmer L. Wittenberg, Constantine.
Merle E. Kinney, Davisburg.
John T. Fahey, Goodells.
Charles R. LaClair, Hemlock.
Leon C. Stewart, Hersey.
Glenn R. Sabourin, Hillman.
Owen H. Austin, Laingsburg.
Robert L. Taylor, Lapeer.
Theodore W. Johnson, Ludington.
Lucile M. Mayer, Merrill.
Vincent E. Boyle, Milford.
Calvin F. McDivitt, Jr., Morrice.
Mary Lee Hawkes, Orchard Lake.
Albert F. Lenart, Smiths Creek.
Hubert A. Marcotte, Wolverine.

MINNESOTA

Royce V. Peterson, Aitkin.
John O. Opheim, Farwell.
Corallen J. Mickelson, Hanley Falls.
George B. Engelmann, Hewitt.
Roy J. Meyer, Jasper.
Hugh J. McCaffery, Lake Hubert.
David R. Wollan, Starbuck.
Delbert W. Brekke, Tamarack.
William P. Horan, Wells.
John A. Stenson, Wright.

MISSOURI

Miller L. Coleman, Aurora.
George L. Adams, Blue Springs.
Lester A. Green, Centerview.
Robert W. Bounds, Centerville.
William D. Compton, Dodson.
Joseph H. Goeke, Greentop.
Myron H. Holloman, Ironton.
Francis B. Bockwinkel, Liguori.
Verne C. Duvall, Lockwood.
Louie M. Griffy, Marston.
Ted L. Muse, Niangua.
Stiefel J. Wilkerson, Novelty.
Noland K. Deaver, Paris.
Charles W. Hyder, Polo.
Harley K. Warren, Richland.
Cecil L. Smith, Smithton.
Dallas D. Hickerson, Wardell.
Harry M. Tarrant, Webb City.

MONTANA

William Watt, Crow Agency.
Howard E. Wagner, Hardin.

NEBRASKA

Ferdinand L. Peisiger, Blue Hill.
William H. Smith, Franklin.
Harry B. Burton, North Platte.
Carl Wells, St. Edward.
Jack M. Latham, Springfield.

NEVADA

James A. Fortune, Mina.
Hugh W. Mildren, Yerington.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Linden E. Sheehan, Pittsfield.
Ina P. Andersen, Rumney.

NEW JERSEY

Calvin G. Piper, Hillsdale.
Florence A. Bailey, Mizpah.
Francis W. Huntley, Port Republic.

NEW MEXICO

Morris L. Dickerson, Fairacres.

NEW YORK

Harry F. Reed, Camden.
Hugh L. Spencer, Canaseraga.
Philip C. Hopson, Churchville.
Eugene P. Smith, Deposit.
Millard Eugene Austin, Rushford.
William L. Farley, Watertown.

NORTH DAKOTA

Walter Gerszewski, Minto.

OHIO

Joseph F. Prosser, Cleveland.
Francis J. Dannemiller, Doylestown.
Mary B. Federspill, Empire.
Julian A. Wierzba, Gypsum.
Raymond W. Wortman, Leipsic.
Carl Edward Fratz, Litchfield.
Robert V. Tracy, Loveland.
Forrest Finley, Malta.
Paul E. Puhl, Maumee.
Arthur Lee Fair, Millersburg.
Howard R. Miller, New Lebanon.
Von D. Spahr, Jr., Ohio City.
Walter K. Billman, Spencer.
Lewis L. Newland, Waynesfield.
James E. Mattox, Westerville.

OKLAHOMA

Don W. Fowler, Boise City.
Seymour Gibson Smith, Duncan.
Myrtle Maxine Friend, Hunter.

OREGON

Alexander Moore Hamilton, Medford.

PENNSYLVANIA

Raymond Maulfair, Grantville.
LaRoy Cleveland Best, Neffs.
Frank A. Kovacs, Schnecksville.

SAMOA

Edward Hunkin, Pago Pago.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Joseph E. Powell, Moncks Corner.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Knute Tennyson, Quinn.
Norman E. Gruenzner, Stickney.

TENNESSEE

Jack G. Frazier, Dayton.
Thomas H. Graham, Jr., Taft.

TEXAS

Wayne G. Watson, Denver City.
Earl M. Cryer, Hamshire.
Harold R. Spain, Haskell.
Maynard C. Watkins, Jarrell.
Reuben S. Morrow, Kaufman.
Ray D. White, Kingsbury.
Joseph M. Tosch, Mesquite.
St. Elmo Murphy, Nixon.

UTAH

Amy H. Esplin, Orderville.

VIRGINIA

Richard D. Collison, Dayton.
Samuel N. Thornhill, Gladstone.
Lloyd N. Doyle, Ridgeway.
Carl L. Campbell, Winchester.

WASHINGTON

Arnold L. Leliefeld, Clayton.
Kenneth W. McNeilly, Colfax.
George E. Wilken, Dryden.
Harry S. Burlingham, Redondo.
Charles J. MacDonald, Sultan.
Elsie P. Tipton, Tillicum.
Albert E. Heric, Walla Walla.

WEST VIRGINIA

Robert Rogers Vanaman, Arthurdale.
Ivory N. Steele, Holden.

WYOMING

Harold E. Wheatley, Encampment.
Otterbine Marcus Phillips, Upton.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 31, 1950

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

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

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, assistant minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We would lift our eyes unto the hills eternal, knowing that our help comes from Thee, O God. We would laud and hallow Thee for Thou art good and hast done us good. We have had at Thy hand bountiful benefits all our days. Thy sunlight has made our path daylight. The dark night has had its star; and when our need was great our night has had its sun.

Remembering Thy past benefits, grant us to rely upon Thy sure mercy as we take up the opportunities of this new day. Help us that in all our ways we might acknowledge Thee, knowing that Thou wilt direct our paths.

"Set our feet on lofty places;
Gird our lives, that they may be
Armored with all Christ-like graces
In the fight to keep men free.
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 28, 1950, was dispensed with.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

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 July 28, 1950, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1049. An act for the relief of Amy Alexandrovna Taylor and Myrna Taylor;

S. 1779. An act for the relief of Phil Meyers, also known as Gil Meyers;

S. 1792. An act for the relief of Thomas Nicholas Epiphaniades and Wanda Julia Epiphaniades;

S. 2077. An act for the relief of Francisco Gonzalez Perez; and

S. 2864. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 157) authorizing the Department of Justice of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

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

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], on page 447, line 18, to strike out "$2,391,930,000" and insert "$2,450,000,000."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement the time between now and 2 o'clock is divided equally, to be controlled respectively by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. It is understood that we will start to vote at 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The time between now and 2 o'clock is divided equally between and controlled by the two Senators.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, and I ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator refer to his amendment to the Hayden amendment?

Mr. KEM. No; it is an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot offer an amendment to the committee amendment at this time. It must be to the so-called Hayden amendment. Otherwise it would be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. KEM. I suppose it does not make any difference in the final analysis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first vote would come to the Senator's amendment to the Hayden amendment. Therefore the Senator would get the same result.

Mr. KEM. Yes. I have no objection to its being so considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish his amendment to be stated?

Mr. KEM. I should like to have my amendment stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 447, line 18, in lieu of "$2,450,000,000" it is proposed to insert "$1,950,000,000"; on page 448, in line 2, beginning with the word *"Provided,"*, to strike out all to and including the words "limitations herein specified:", in line 7, page 448; on page 448, lines 8 and 9, to strike out the word "consolidated."

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

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I notice that the Senator's amendment is in three parts. Does the Senator wish to have each part considered separately, or all of them en bloc?

Mr. KEM. En bloc.

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

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

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the Senator has offered an amendment to the Hayden amendment. As I understand, the Hayden amendment raises the appropriation from $2,391,000,000 to $2,450,000,000.

Mr. KEM. The purpose of my amendment is to decrease the appropriation by the amount provided in my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator from Missouri fixed the amount proposed by his amendment, so that if it is applied to the $2,450,000,000, there will result the saving contemplated by him?

Mr. KEM. My amendment is drawn as an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's amendment is really an amendment to the committee amendment. Under the parliamentary situation it had to be offered to the Hayden amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder whether the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri is so drawn so as to bring the reduction down to the figure of $1,950,000,000?

Mr. KEM. I should like to have it considered so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first vote would come on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 minutes.

As Senators will note, the amendment I offer would reduce the amount to be appropriated to the Economic Cooperation Administration for the fiscal ending June 30, 1951, to $1,950,000,000. Furthermore, the amendment would eliminate from the appropriation bill the sum of $276,761,473, which was carried over from last year's appropriations. The total saving effected by this amendment would be $718,691,473, or a saving of approximately $1,000,000,000 in the original budget estimate.

I should like to invite attention particularly to the fact that the amendment would in no way affect the appropriations for assistance to the Republic of Korea, the military-aid program, or several other programs included in the foreign-aid section of the pending measure. My amendment applies solely to the economic-aid program for western Europe.

The unexpended balance for the fiscal year 1950, which amounts to more than $276,000,000, is the amount that was appropriated to the ECA but not used during the last 12 months. I see no justification, Mr. President, for its being reappropriated. As I have said before, Administrator Hoffman is to be congratulated on making this saving. But the amount should be a saving to the United States. Merely because a saving was made in 1 year is no reason why it should be made available in another year.

Mr. President, this is a time for realism. It is a time for us to think and act in the light of things as they are. It is a time to reject and repudiate all unrealizable and visionary plans and schemes. It is my firm conviction that the amount provided in the bill for foreign aid is unrealistic in view of the position in which we now find ourselves both from a financial and military point of view. Our national debt is more than $257,000,000,000. Even if $10,000,000,000 would cover the added cost of the Korean war during the present fiscal year, the deficit, in the absence of an increase in taxes, would amount to approximately $17,000,000,000.

It is no wonder, Mr. President, that our foreign friends cannot understand why we are not paying our own debts, or at least balancing our budget, instead of paying their debts and building at the cost of the American taxpayers, expensive improvements all over western Europe, with the exception of Spain.

A few days ago the ECA released its report to the Advisory Board. In this report, on page 21, there is an interesting table entitled "Counterpart Fund Withdrawals by Purpose, in Dollar Equivalents, as of May 31."

This table contains a breakdown of the purposes for which ECA has permitted the participating countries to spend the Marshall plan matching funds, the so-called counterpart funds. $1,042,000,000 worth of counterpart funds have been used to retire the debts of several Marshall-plan countries. The amount thus used, it will be noted, is in excess of a billion dollars; $558,000,000 worth have gone for electric, gas, and power projects in Marshall-plan countries; $331,000,000 worth for agriculture and forestry;

$224,000,000 worth for railroads; $196,000,000 worth for manufacturing establishments; $57,000,000 worth for roads, waterways, and harbors; $208,000,000 for housing; $75,000,000 worth for merchant and fishing fleets.

From a military standpoint it is certainly not in the interest of our boys on the fighting front for us at this time to be giving away critical materials, vast quantities of things that may be necessary to prosecute the war. The kinds of materials I have in mind are $200,000,000 worth of industrial materials produced in the United States, including iron, steel, aluminum, copper, zinc, and industrial chemicals. Those materials the ECA proposes to send to western Europe in the year for which provision is now being made. ECA also proposes to give away $448,700,000 worth of industrial machinery and equipment; $7,500,000 worth of rubber and rubber products; and more than $77,000,000 worth of petroleum and petroleum products.

So, Mr. President, we are increasing our own debt day by day, and it is proposed that we continue the shipment to Marshall-plan countries of vast quantities of critical war materials which we ourselves might well need before too long.

Not only that, Mr. President, but we are facing the specter of inflation. Nothing will feed the fires of inflation more than, first, the issuing of obligations of the Government to cover a deficit; second, creating a shortage in the available supply of goods. The large appropriations for foreign aid in the pending bill will have a direct effect in both respects.

Mr. President, I sometimes think the people back home in their thinking are a bit ahead of those of us who sit here in the Halls of Congress. Sometimes it is difficult to see the forest for the trees. A few days ago I received a letter from one of my fellow citizens in Kansas City, Mo. He describes himself as "a little man, a cab driver and my wife is a waitress, but we can read, and listen and wonder. We are beginning to see why we must pay such exorbitant taxes, and beginning to wonder what kind of men are leading us."

Then he says:

> Do you blame us? Where does Congress get the idea the rank and file of the people are in favor of the Marshall plan? They are not now, and never have been. I talk to over 30 passengers every night, and not 1 in 20 is in favor of it, and the ones who are, have relatives over there. There is something decidedly smelly about the whole aid-to-Europe program.

Mr. President, I have had occasion before to refer to shipments of war materials by Marshall-plan countries to Russia and her satellites. This is an ironical situation. It was hardly to be expected, in view of our overgenerous gifts of economic aid to the participating countries. However, the facts are plain, and, so far as I know, have never been denied.

For instance, it has been frequently said on the floor of the Senate that the Marshall-plan countries have 96 separate trade treaties with Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain. Great Britain, for example, has bilateral trade agreements with Russia, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, and Poland. Pursuant to these treaties a wide variety of materials, many of them potential articles and materials of war, are being constantly shipped by the Marshall-plan countries to Russia and the satellites.

On July 17 I put into the RECORD a table of shipments of war materials from Great Britain, Belgium-Luxemburg, and France, to Russia. The information in these tables was furnished me by the Department of Commerce. The original tables covered only the year 1949. The Department of Commerce later furnished me additional information covering shipments made to Russia and the satellites from the Marshall-plan countries during the first 4 months of 1950. I have now some further information which covers the month of May this year, bringing the information approximately up to date. This information shows that a great deal of such material is being shipped, and the shipments of certain materials are at a constantly accelerated rate.

I have emphasized the shipments of war materials from Marshall-plan countries to Russia because I believe it is a very important matter. It is important to know whether our boys who are having to face tanks in Korea, which are superior to any we have on that front, are facing equipment which has been fabricated from goods shipped to Russia by our allies.

The Department of Commerce has furnished me with information showing that in one case war materials imported into Great Britain have been reexported to Russia and the satellites. During the 5 months which ended May 31, 1950, more than $2,633,900 worth of machine tools were exported by Britain to Russia, Finland, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Four hundred fifty-four thousand five hundred and thirty-eight dollars worth of these tools were exported during the month of May alone. That is new information, so far as I am concerned.

During the 5 months which ended May 21, 1950, Britain reexported—note this, Mr. President—reexported more than $67,320 worth of machine tools. Machine tools are being given to Great Britain under the Marshall plan.

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

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the time is limited, and I suggest that the eminent Senator from Vermont secure time from the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. I know the views of the Senator from Vermont on this matter very well, and I think he belongs on the other side.

Mr. FLANDERS. I intend simply to raise a question as to the information the Senator has just given.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. KEM. I decline to yield at this time. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator later.

In connection with our own consideration of the item in the appropriations bill for foreign aid, I believe the Senate will be interested in some figures which I have obtained from the State Department respecting the number of ships, combatant and otherwise, which the United States turned over to Russia during World War II. I have been surprised at the lack of success which the administration has had in securing the return of those ships.

These figures show that we transferred to the Russians 585 naval craft of various types, and that 459 of those naval craft are still in the hands of the Russians, and reported to be in operable condition. We have been able to get back from Russia only 28 ships. Others were reported as lost, damaged, and stuck in the ice.

Of the 96 American merchant ships which Russia had at the end of the war, 84 are still in the hands of the Russians, and presumably in usable condition. We have had returned to us seven tankers and one old cargo vessel. Merchant ships which the Russians retained include 36 Liberty ships.

The naval craft which were transferred to the Russians include 3 ice breakers, 28 frigates, 77 minesweepers, 78 large submarine chasers, 62 small submarine chasers, 205 torpedo boats, 36 LCI's, that is, landing craft—infantry; 17 LCT's, that is, landing craft—tanks; 2 LCV's, that is, landing craft—vehicle; 2 LCS's, that is, landing craft—support; 54 LCM's, that is, landing craft—mechanized; 4 floating repair shops, 15 river tugs, 6 pontoon bridges, 1 motor launch, 1 plane personnel boat.

The ships we have been able to get back consist of only 1 ice breaker and 27 frigates.

My information is that a request has been made by the State Department for the return of only 217 of the naval ships, and there has been no request whatever that any of the merchant ships be returned.

I may say, Mr. President, in passing, that I think several questions should be answered by the State Department. Why have we not been able to get any more of our ships back? Who determined that a request for our merchant ships should not be made? Who has been conducting the negotiations for the return of a part of the naval ships with so little success? The soft policy against Russia at Yalta, Potsdam, and since, has played a major part in placing the United States in the unfortunate position in which it finds itself today.

Mr. President, I now want to say a few words as to why I think that is very significant. That has to do with the ability of the Marshall-plan countries to defend themselves. On July 27 Mr. Winston Churchill was reported as speaking in the House of Commons, as follows:

> "It looks as if there is at present no effective defense in western Europe beyond the Channel." He said that unless government spokesmen could prove otherwise, he believed "the preparations of the western union to defend itself certainly stand on a far lower level than those of the South Koreans."

In the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 23 there appears a very interesting article, an Associated Press dispatch from

Frankfurt, Germany, written by Wes Gallagher. I shall quote from it in part:

If war comes between the West and Russia, the United States will have to fight and pay the lion's share of it.

A glimpse at western Europe's defenses today shows them not only feeble and inadequate, but with little prespect of real strengthening in the future.

President Truman's request Wednesday for $10,000,000,000 more for defense means each American taxpayer will be paying nearly 50 cents out of each dollar for defense. No western European is paying more than 25 cents on each dollar and most of them far less for their defense.

There are varied reasons why some nations are not paying more. Many suffered such heavy war damages they have had to devote their attention to rebuilding economically. France cannot get large defense budgets through its strife-torn assembly without tumbling the government.

Budgets of seven of the main nations of western Europe show less than $4,000,000,000 will be spent on arms this year. This compares with $25,000,000,000 being spent by the United States, which represents 48 percent of the total United States Government expenditures.

Mr. President, I ask at this time that there be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table of the comparative defense budgets of these countries, all in dollars.

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

Comparative defense budgets

[All in dollars]

Nation	For defense	Percent [1]
Britain	$2,186,800,000	20.0
France	1,200,000,000	18.9
Netherlands	223,000,000	25.0
Belgium	163,662,520	11.0
Italy [2]	123,000,000	6.5
Denmark	48,000,000	16.5
Norway	40,000,000	12.5

[1] Percentage of total budget.

[2] Total Italian defense budget is $538,380,000, but major portion goes to civil aviation, veterans administration, housing, etc.

Mr. KEM. Then to continue from Mr. Gallagher's dispatch:

Even if all the western European nations would put aside their sovereignty, increase their budgets and push building up of their defenses, military men estimate it would take a minimum of 2 and probably 4 years to build adequate forces to balance current Russian power.

So, Mr. President, we find ourselves having loaned to Russia during World War II a tremendous armament of naval ships and a great fleet of merchant ships. We have had no success or practically none in getting those ships back, although many of them, as I have just said, are understood to be in sound operable condition. In other words, they are in condition to be used against the United States; and now we propose to continue to build hydroelectric plants, railroad terminals, railroads, aqueducts, bridges, and military highways in western Europe, where in the course of time, if Mr. Churchill is correct, and if what Mr. Gallagher says is true—the ability of the countries of western Europe to defend themselves to protect these gifts of ours will be somewhat dubious.

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

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have allowed myself 30 minutes, and I should prefer to continue with my speech. Then, if some time remains, I shall be glad to yield to the able Senator from Utah and to the able Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield at this time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words more about the way our money is being spent. As I have said, I think this is a time for realism. Yet, Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star for July 15 revealed that ECA is in the night-club business in Rome; we are reported as helping to pay the rent for a swank Roman night club. According to the Evening Star's report, the club is replete with creamy furniture, sumptuous decorations, and a doorman clothed in green and gold. Someone may say that the amount involved in that undertaking is small—only $15,000. However, Mr. President, $15,000 would pay for a 155-millimeter howitzer so badly needed in the front lines in Korea today.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that the issue before the Senate today is a rather clean-cut one, namely, is it to be funds for creamy furniture in a night club in Rome or funds for a gambling casino in Le Havre—also being built with ECA funds—or is it to be money for guns and modern equipment for our boys in the front lines in Korea today? As Mr. Truman has said, "You have got to make up your minds. It is one or the other."

Mr. President, in view of the course of events, I think it is out of order for us to make commitments to the extent provided in this bill for economic aid in western Europe at this time.

If my amendment is adopted, the taxpayers of the United States will be saved, and will have available for other purposes, in excess of $700,000,000; and still the ECA will have available for its program in western Europe the princely sum of $1,950,000,000.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the Senator's time is exhausted. If it is not, I should like to ask him a question in his time.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, have I consumed my 30 minutes? I think I have about done so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has approximately 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KEM. Then I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri if he was saying, a few minutes ago, that $67,000,000 worth of machine tools had been exported from America to England and that the identical machine tools were reexported from England to Russia.

Mr. KEM. I said that at the same time that we were giving machine tools to Great Britain, machine tools were being exported by Great Britain to Russia and the satellites. I said, further, that the records show that in the month in question, England imported an amount of machine tools which subsequently were exported—the same, identical machine tools—to Russia and the satellites.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Missouri did not give the figures for that transaction, did he?

Mr. KEM. Yes, I did.

Mr. FLANDERS. Were those the figures for the same, identical machine tools?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to repeat them.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the question I was asking.

Mr. KEM. I do not know whether they were Marshall plan machine tools, but they were identical machine tools shipped from the United States.

Mr. FLANDERS. Sixty-seven million dollars' worth, as I recall.

Mr. KEM. It was $67,000 worth, I believe.

Mr. FLANDERS. Oh, then I feel concerned, but not quite as much concerned as I feared I was going to be.

Mr. KEM. I shall repeat my statement, for the benefit of the Senator from Vermont. During the 5 months ended May 31, 1950, more than $2,633,900 worth of machine tools were exported by Britain to Russia, Finland, Poland, and Czechoslovakia—$454,538 worth of these tools were exported during the month of May alone.

During the 5 months which ended May 31, 1950, Britain reexported more than $67,320 worth of machine tools, and machine tools are being given to Britain under the Marshall plan.

Does that clear up the matter?

Mr. FLANDERS. That answers the question, yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has used 31 minutes.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment I have offered to the committee amendment on page 447 in line 18, namely, to strike out "$2,391,930,000" and insert "$2,450,000,000."

I should like to state that when this item was under study by the Appropriations Committee, it received very careful consideration. Upon recommendation by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], we voted an amount of $2,500,000,000. On that question, on a record vote, the result showed 11 in favor and 10 opposed.

It had been suggested by other members of the committee that the amount should be $2,450,000,000; and at that time I moved to reconsider, in order that we might have a more nearly unanimous committee report. That was done; and by a vote of 17 to 3 the amount was fixed at $2,450,000,000.

Subsequently, a few days later, a motion was made to cut the appropriation by 10 percent under the budget estimate. The action on that question resulted in the further reduction of $58,070,000 which leaves the amount that now appears in the bill.

It is to restore the appropriation in the amount voted in the committee by a majority of 17 to 3 that I have offered the amendment to the committee amendment.

In regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri to my amendment to the committee amendment——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator on what date that vote was taken in the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. About 3 weeks ago..

Mr. KEM. Let me inquire what day of the month it was.

Mr. HAYDEN. On June 29.

Mr. KEM. That was just 2 days after the operations began in Korea. Would the Senator from Arizona agree that our situation has taken on an entirely different aspect since that date?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; and therefore I am more than ever convinced that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri to my amendment to the committee amendment should not be adopted, for the following reasons: It is a favorite maxim of Josef V. Stalin that "production wins wars." He has made that statement many times from the platform and has repeated it in his writings.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Was it not also a favorite maxim of Lenin's that, "We shall cause the Americans to spend themselves to their destruction"?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, everyone knows that the Communists would like to see a financial panic in this country. But permit me to proceed.

The greatest single deterrent to an all-out Communist attack on the peace of the world today is that Stalin and his Politburo know that in two World Wars the United States has demonstrated its capacity to produce abundantly every type of munitions and all the material needed to carry on that kind of war. The decisive factor is always military strength resting upon a firm, secure foundation of economic strength.

The critical importance of western Europe to the free world can be illustrated with a few figures: Western Europe has 274,000,000 people. The Soviet Union and its satellites in Europe have approximately 255,000,000 people. Steel capacity in western Europe, including of course, that of Great Britain, is about 50,000,000 tons a year as against 31,000,000 tons in all the Soviet sphere. Coal output in western Europe is about one and one-half times as great as in eastern Europe, counting in the Soviet Republic. Western Europe's electric power is now almost five times larger than that of eastern Europe, and its system of transport is infinitely superior, as is its level of skills.

Why should we allow the Communists to more than double their ability to defeat us by securing possession of these industrial resources of western Europe?

It is only against this background that the supreme significance of Marshall-plan accomplishments can be properly appraised. During the first 2 years of its operation, it has sparked an increase of 24 percent in average industrial production for all participating countries. This becomes all the more dramatic and heartening when we look at individual figures for industries of central importance to defense production. There has been, under the Marshall plan, a 52-percent rise in steel output, and 58 percent for cement, along with 21 percent for electric power, and 17 percent for hard coal. At the same time, there has been a 30-percent rise in the yield for all grains, 19 percent for fats and oils, and 16 percent for meat.

Hence in the event of a shooting war on the Continent, western Europe is now in a much better position to feed itself without the need to ship vast quantities of American and Canadian foods in bottoms that would then be required for war matériel.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Of this whole allocation, how much money is to go for food?

Mr. HAYDEN. The point is that we do not now have to send wheat to Europe, because they are producing it themselves.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point. So when the Senator says they need food——

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not say that. I said the conditions had improved so that the European people can feed themselves, but that we can help to improve their economic position.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That implies that we need to continue the same amount of food shipments.

Mr. HAYDEN. It implies nothing of the kind. It implies less need for foodstuffs, as I have just stated.

Mr. WHERRY. Why should we not then transfer the aid funds to military needs, if food is in abundance and clothing is in abundance?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not think the Senator heard me.

Mr. WHERRY. I heard every word.

Mr. HAYDEN. If we can help to create a sound economic situation in western Europe, with ability on their part to support their armies, then they are in a much better position to fight communism.

Mr. WHERRY. Well, they have food, they have clothing—what else do they need except military equipment? That is the point the Senator from Missouri made.

Mr. HAYDEN. Their need is for more steel and more coal to use in making munitions.

Mr. WHERRY. They are getting the steel from us, from which to manufacture the equipment.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; they are making it themselves.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator say now that food and clothing are taken care of, that military equipment would be the next thing in order, so far as appropriations are concerned?

Mr. HAYDEN. If I had to say that, then I would also say that we should cut down in our economic effort in the United States and put the money into arms and a larger army.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly our unnecessary expenditures should be cut down and transferred not only to home but also in order to further the national defense. That is exactly the position the Senator from Nebraska has taken, and that is exactly what the Senator from Missouri has been suggesting.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask the Senator from Nebraska to please debate that question in the time of some other Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona declines to yield further.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Marshall plan is developing an integrated economic power which in turn is giving rise to an integrated military power both of which are being welded with our own. Let us never forget that the Atlantic Pact could never have been signed, or if signed, would have been meaningless, unless the Marshall plan had first revived and vitalized western Europe's economy; unless the Marshall plan had first pushed back the Communist thrust to take over; unless the Marshall plan had made it possible for western Europe to turn out some arms today, but many tomorrow, for its own protection and ours.

Too sudden a diversion of Marshall-plan aid from general industrial purposes to specific military purposes, at this stage, would plunge western Europe into that disorder from which it has only lately emerged. It would derange, for the sake of an immediate and piddling arms production, the soundness of an economy which promises prodigious arms production later on. In this whole situation, timing is the key. Let us always keep in the front of our minds the central fact that western Europe has become laboratory and pilot plant for a United States foreign policy that is bold, affirmative, and tough-minded. The Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact are the twin motors of that foreign policy and the forerunners of its application elsewhere. What has been done in western Europe can be duplicated wherever necessary in the rest of the non-Communist world.

Let us therefore, not be guilty of the murderous stupidity of impairing the Marshall plan which has proven its value by its deeds, and which against handicaps has shown that the ways of freedom can win. The Marshall plan has pioneered not only the single greatest success of our foreign policy but has also fashioned the formula for a foreign policy that makes sense. It brings to its job an accumulation of skills and experience that can develop and extend that formula around the globe. The Marshall plan, in its aims and techniques is the hard core of our foreign policy, tested and tempered. To do it damage would be in Bismarck's phrase "worse than a

crime, a blunder"—a blunder that would haunt us all our days.

Let me ask, how can a starving people, a dispirited people, be expected to fight when they have no incentive even to live, much less to fight? To the extent that we have restored and improved the economic condition of the people of Europe, we have made it possible for them to develop a fighting spirit which can aid us in a world-wide defense against the advance of communism. My judgment therefore is that the proposal of the Senator from Missouri is contrary to the best interest of our own national defense. I have always said that we might practice altruism, and we might well say that we could not see people starved, but the prime purpose of and the controlling reason for the Marshall plan has been the defense of the United States of America.

Any wavering of United States interest in the Marshall plan, any crippling cuts in financial support for any of its interlocking activities would have a disastrous effect upon western Europe today. For the Marshall plan is not only the sign and seal of United States partnership but also the way by which western Eurpoe can attain the strength, economic, political, moral, and military, which, in today's world, are the precursors of peace.

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

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I find that I have prepared remarks that would require somewhat longer than 15 minutes for delivery. Therefore, I shall ask unanimous consent that the early part of my statement be incorporated in the RECORD, and that I may proceed with that part of my statement which I feel is important to the discussion which is now under way.

Before doing that, I may say that, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and as one who has watched very closely the historic progress of European recovery through the ECA program, I rise to oppose any further reduction in the amount to be appropriated for the ECA. I wish also to announce my support for the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to raise the amount of new money for economic cooperation from $2,391,930,000 to $2,450,000,000. This figure, added to the estimated carryover from fiscal 1950, would make available to ECA a total of some $2,727,000,000.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in my remarks the few pages which I shall pass over without reading.

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

My support of this figure rests on two grounds. The first is that sharp reductions have already been made, and that any further substantial reduction this year would gravely imperil the whole program.

My second reason is that today, more than ever, the ECA program is a vital element in the defense of the United States.

Let me consider first of all the question of reductions. It was anticipated from the beginning that the annual figures for ECA would decrease at a rate of about $1,000,000,000 a year, beginning at about $5,000,000,000 and declining to about $4,000,000,000 in the second year, $3,000,000,000 in the third, and $2,000,000,000 in the fourth and last year.

We have done better than that, Mr. President. In the present year the figure authorized by the Senate, plus the carry-over from fiscal 1950, was about $2,977,000,000. The committee figure, as adjusted by the Hayden amendment, brings us to a total of about $2,727,000,000. This is eight and three-quarters percent below the amount authorized by the Senate. It is also over 9 percent below the $3,000,000,000 originally forecast for the third year of the program.

Nevertheless, the question has been raised whether a greater reduction cannot safely be made, in light of the other great demands upon our economy. An amendment has been proposed which would bring about a reduction in available funds, as compared with the amount authorized, of nearly 35 percent. We have heard another proposal that the entire program should be abolished. I feel that these proposals should be immediately answered.

There are several points that we must remember. The first is that the ECA has been so cooperative in cutting its earlier estimates that in light of recent domestic price rises the actual size of the 1951 ECA program, in terms of goods and services, will have to be very substantially reduced. A decline in United States prices enabled the ECA on May 25 to submit a reduced estimate of $2,933,000,000, including carry-over, which was 1½ percent below the total authorized by Congress. The Hayden amendment brings us to a total figure more than 7 percent below this final ECA estimate.

But since that final ECA estimate was made, prices in this country have advanced rapidly. They are already at or beyond a point where the program originally planned by ECA for the current year would cost some $300,000,000 more than the revised estimate. In effect, the price rise in this country, even allowing for a resulting increase in European dollar earnings through exports to the United States, has already brought about a further material cut in the size of the program which ECA can carry out this year. We must remember that fact in considering any proposed new cuts.

The second fact which we must remember is that a cut in ECA dollar aid is multiplied many times in its dampening effect on the European economy. In very many instances, where dollar aid allows a European businessman to buy a key piece of machinery in the United States, or to buy raw materials for processing in his own factory, the resulting increase in economic activity in Europe is several times the amount of the dollar aid involved. These are the multiplying factors which have made it possible for the total economy of western Europe to rebound so rapidly in the first 2 years of the program. Naturally, when the impact of every ECA dollar is multiplied in this way, the impact of any reduction in the ECA program is multiplied in the same degree. Thus a relatively small reduction in this carefully calculated appropriation for ECA will have an adverse effect on the European economy far out of proportion to the amount of money we save in our national budget.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, having discussed two of the points, I proceed now to the next one.

The third point I want to stress is in answer to the argument that the Marshall-plan countries no longer need our aid because, it is said, they are already better off than they were before World War II. In my judgment this is entirely incorrect. To be sure the industrial production of the participating countries is now 120 percent of the 1938 level. But if we are to have the whole picture clearly in mind we must also remember the following factors:

First. Agricultural production, even though the ECA program has raised it almost as dramatically as industrial production, is still below prewar levels.

Second. The income from the so-called invisible exports—overseas investments, shipping, tourism, banking, and other services—which before the war accounted for a very significant share of European income and an even larger share of their foreign exchange, is now a mere fraction of the prewar figure.

In studying this question we have all been interested in raising that figure so far as we could, but at the moment it is merely a fraction of the prewar figure.

Third. To make up for the wear and tear of the war years, capital investment, as distinguished from consumption, is claiming a larger share of current production than it did before the war.

Fourth. The total population of these Marshall-plan countries has increased considerably since 1938.

All these factors add up to the undeniable fact that the conditions of life in these countries today are still well below those of 1938. We cannot do away with this fact simply by ignoring it. Dramatic progress has indeed been made since the almost desperate period before ECA began, but a great deal more needs to be done before western Europe can go ahead without dollar aid.

Now, the three major points which I have inserted without discussing them, I shall now sum up.

First. Because even with the Hayden amendment we will be making a 9 percent cut in the amount authorized for ECA, and because of the sharp increase in American prices in recent months the ECA program for fiscal 1951 will have to be very substantially curtailed as compared with original plans—even if no further cut is made. That is one of the things which have been very clear, especially since the Korean crisis. Prices have gone up, and further aid has been cut accordingly.

Second. Because of the fact that every dollar of ECA aid means several dollars of new economic activity in the participating countries any reduction in a carefully planned ECA program means an adverse effect on European recovery several times greater than the amount of the reduction. Of course, that applies also to every dollar they get to put into plants to make military matériel.

Third. Despite spectacular production progress since the dark days of 1947 the conditions of life in the ECA countries are still well below those of 1938, and much further progress must be made if we are to have stable economies in Europe.

The facts lead inevitably to the conclusion that the reductions already made

are very substantial and that if we go beyond these reductions we will jeopardize the entire movement toward European recovery and self-reliance, which, Mr. President, I feel are an essential part of an all-out military activity in those countries.

Now, Mr. President, even if these points are agreed to, the question remains, What good is this program to us, the American people? What is it worth, especially in light of the new military emergency? In concluding I wish to address myself to that question.

In my judgment, the ECA program for European recovery is more than ever a vital element in the defense and security of the United States. From the beginning this program has been presented to us, and quite accurately so, as a measure of defense against communism. I may say in passing that I think it is more than that; I think it is also a positive, constructive program to enable these free peoples with whom we share a common civilization once again to live decently, to maintain and develop their free institutions, and once again to contribute to the free world the tremendous strength and vitality of which they are capable. But let us for the moment view the ECA program simply as a defense against communism, because even though that is the negative side of the picture it may be a matter of life and death today. In my judgment the importance of ECA from that point of view is greater than ever. There are two reasons for this, one political and psychological, and the other military.

First, as to the political aspect, it is known that people who are hungry and discontented turn to extreme political movements. That is why the Communist Parties had such tremendous successes in France and Italy just after the war, and we know what a vital part the passage of the first ECA bill in 1948 played in preventing the Communists from winning the Italian election that spring. Even in other countries, where communism is not numerically strong on the surface, its potential power—and that of other extremist groups with which communism collaborates when it is convenient to do so—is greatly enhanced by the presence of miserable and disaffected groups whose governments are unable to improve their lot.

That is true all over the world today. That is the angle which the Russians are using with such terrible effect.

The contribution which the ECA program has made in preventing these disastrous political developments can never be measured, but there can be no question that it has been vitally important. It has immeasurably bolstered the political and psychological defenses of western Europe. If it is abandoned now, those defenses will be in grave danger.

The second reason why the ECA is vital to our security has directly to do with military defense. Because we in America have viewed western Europe as a strategically vital area—perhaps the most vital in the world outside our own shores—and because we have seen that Communist possession of this area with its great industrial power and its long Atlantic coast line would place us in the gravest kind of military danger, we negotiated and ratified the North Atlantic Treaty, and we inaugurated a program of military assistance to these countries. Now, in the face of the Korean crisis, it is expected that this military assistance program will be greatly accelerated, and that a great share of the new equipment required for the common defense will be manufactured in Europe.

I desire to stress that statement. A great share of the new equipment required for the common defense will be manufactured in Europe. That is what we will be doing with the military-aid program and the ECA program.

But this military-defense program cannot succeed unless these countries maintain and increase their economic health. At the beginning we made it clear that European recovery would have priority over the military program under the Atlantic Pact. Now, it is obvious that the priority has had to be reversed under the pressure of circumstances. But it is as true as ever that to build up military defense without also building up the economic foundations of the countries concerned would be like building a structure on sand. There is no essential part of the economy of a country that does not contribute to its total posture of military defense. Roads, hydroelectric-power projects, food production, manufacture of steel, clothing, and countless other items are basically necessary for defense. And these are the very sectors of the European economy in which the ECA is capable of building up production and economic health.

In addition to this basic relationship between economic progress and defense, it now appears essential that ECA should contribute directly to military production in the participating countries by releasing counterpart funds for manufacture of military equipment. That is my own personal judgment, and I think it is important that we should consider it at once.

In light of these facts, Mr. President, I think we would be clearly mistaken if we were to take the view that ECA and the military program are incompatible. Far from being in conflict, they vitally reinforce each other. Taking them both together, in the strategically vital area of free Europe, we are now planning a greatly expanded over-all effort. Simultaneously we are planning a shift in the emphasis of that effort in the direction of greater military defense. I may add that this expanded effort, and this shift in emphasis, both apply to the European countries themselves, fully as much as they apply to the United States.

But this shift in emphasis need not mean, and must not mean, abandonment or drastic curtailment of economic recovery. Economic recovery becomes more essential than ever, viewed as an integral part of the political and military defense and the military potential of these countries, whose safety is so vital to our own.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I urge the rejection of any amendment further reducing the appropriation for the Economic Cooperation Administration. In my carefully considered judgment, this appropriation is a basic element in the defense and security of the American people at this critical time.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I have time to yield, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator where he proposes that the Government of the United States get the money which he wants to send to western Europe for economic aid?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It must come from all the people, realizing that it is a part of our strategic defense in his critical hour.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator realize that the budget is out of balance, and will be more out of balance, approximately $17,000,000,000, for the current year if we appropriate $10,000,000,000 for military defense?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from New Jersey does realize that, but we must tighten our belts.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from New Jersey know of any proposal to raise that very large amount of additional money during the current fiscal year?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. This year and next year I think we can do it. The Finance Committee is now studying the subject.

Mr. KEM. Just where does the Senator propose to get the money?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not a member of the Finance Committee, but I have discussed it with Senators who are members of that committee, and they think it can be found on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. KEM. Where can we get this enormous sum of money?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I imagine it will have to be done by increasing income taxes all along the line.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator think our economy can stand such an increase of income taxes?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That would apply to the whole military budget. All the bill calls for on this point is $2,000,000,000. The military budget is $13,000,000,000, plus $10,000,000,000, plus $4,000,000,000, the request for which will come to us today.

Mr. KEM. I understood the Senator from New Jersey to say that the military should have priority.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The military certainly must have priority, but I consider the economic program which I am discussing to be a high point in the whole military picture. Without economic recovery, we cannot have military recovery.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator whether it is not true that the Senator from Missouri is against all ECA appropriations. He offers an amendment to cut them a certain amount, but is it not a fact that he is not for any of them, and never has been?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I cannot answer the question of the distinguished Senator from Texas. No doubt the Senator from Missouri can answer it himself. The Senator from Missouri is troubled by the enormous figure for military expenditures, and overlooks, it seems to me, the fact that for ECA it is only $2,000,000,000 as against $20,000,000,000, at a time when this $2,000,000,000 is as important to our security program as any part of the military program.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I fully agree with what the Senator from New Jersey has said as to the necessity and the importance of the ECA program. The Senator from New Jersey has been discussing our fight against communism and the urgency of taking care of western Europe. Does the Senator from New Jersey mean western Europe from the standpoint of particular governments, or western Europe as a geographic unit?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So far as the Senator from New Jersey is concerned, of course the immediate matter before us at the present time is the ECA program with respect to ECA countries. If I gather what the Senator from New Mexico has in mind, he is indicating that we should include all of western Europe. I agree with him that we should consider it as a geographic unit and move right in on that basis. I would include Spain, too.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I ask that he be granted one more minute so that I may ask another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time is under the control of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator from New Jersey agree with me that if this fight against communism is worth while, and if the ECA program is worth while—and I believe ECA as a whole is worth while—both Germany and Spain should be included in the program if the desires of the Senator, which he has stated so well, are to be realized.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In order to clarify my position I may say that I think Spain should be included in our considerations. So far as the people of Japan and Germany are concerned—and I include Japan also—I think they too should be given the opportunity at least voluntarily to come in and defend their own countries and civilizations. They should not be made to stand defenseless against being attacked.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only that, but the geography which is involved should be considered as well. If we are to take care of western Europe, how can we carry on the fight without including Germany and Spain?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think western Germany should be included, and I should like to see all of Germany included in order to prevent the onrush of communism.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Kem amendment which seeks a reduction in ECA appropriations to $1,950,000,000. The "watchdog committee," after an elaborate study, presented very firm evidence before the Appropriations Committee, in which it recommended $2,200,000,000. If we add the amount of money which the Administrator has not used during the last year, which is upward of $200,000,000, the Kem amendment provides an amount which comes close to the amount which the "watchdog committee" felt was necessary for ECA.

Mr. President, I believe an emergency exists. Certainly I would be willing to appropriate all the money and shall vote to appropriate all the money that is necessary for the military to accomplish the mission in the face of the challenge which now confronts the administration in the Korean situation. However, I ask my distinguished colleagues who are arguing against the Kem amendment, on the theory that we cannot cut any one of the projects covered, to turn to page 383 of the hearings on the foreign aid appropriations. There we find listed 22 projects, including Jamaica irrigation project, Gold Coast road development project, Northern Rhodesia road project, and British Honduras road project. I was in British Honduras last year. That project has not even been started. All that is being done about it is to attempt to sell to the people the idea of British Honduras. Several hundred thousand dollars are asked for that project. Project after project of similar character could be listed. Mr. President, I would ask those who say seriously that they want to preserve the resources of the country if they feel that projects such as that, which they would not even start in this country today, are more important to our national defense than are the bullets and tanks which our soldiers now need? I ask them to answer that question. That is the whole thing in a nutshell.

We must use money that we do not need to spend on the foreign front and we must use money that we can spare on the domestic front to carry on military operations. I believe the expenses for military operations will increase. By way of a thumb-nail sketch only, we have MAP, $4,200,000,000, and if we add to that figure the new military appropriations which are being asked and the appropriations for foreign aid, and similar items, such appropriations will aggregate nearly $30,000,000,000.

I appeal to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to scrutinize these projects. I believe the President will scrutinize them. I would not be at all surprised, when he reviews the appropriations for foreign aid and also those for domestic purposes, that he will either rescind some of them or impound the money, which we need so badly at this time for our military forces. That makes sense.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I have only 15 minutes. However, I shall be glad to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have only a brief question to ask the Senator. I agree that all of it amounts to a lot of money. It runs into billions of dollars. Making these appropriations will hurt the American people. However, unless we do, what will we have instead?

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to the question of the Senator from New Mexico, the first thing we should do is to meet the challenge on the battlefield. Developments such as the road project in British Honduras can wait until we decide the issue in Korea. If we are to stop such projects in this country, we must stop them overseas as well. I was in British Honduras last year. To complete that road will take many years, and it has nothing to do with the present situation with which we are faced. I believe every Senator should see the reasonableness of the situation. I do not say that we should cut out all ECA appropriations. I say that with the recommendations of the "watchdog committee," together with cuts that can be made on projects such as those I have mentioned, the amount proposed under the Kem amendment can easily be adequate.

I rose to explain the amendment which I shall offer, and it is the only one I intend to offer. It has to do with the sale of strategic materials to the satellite countries and Russia. The amendment will be stated after 2 o'clock. The purpose of the amendment was suggested to the Senator from Nebraska by the debates on the floor of the Senate, participated in by many Senators, particularly my good friend from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. Its purpose would be to strengthen section 117 (d). That section provides:

> The Administrator is directed to refuse delivery insofar as practicable, to participating countries of commodities which go into the production of any commodity for delivery to any nonparticipating European country which commodity would be refused export licenses to those countries by the United States in the interest of national security.

So far as I am able to determine, no organization has been developed by the ECA Administrator to effectuate this requirement. The difficulty which I am sure and other Members of the Senate have experienced in trying to get statistics with relation to western Europe-eastern European trade proves that point. The "watchdog committee," to which I have referred previously, in its analysis of the ECA program, as published in March 1950 discussed this point in detail. It pointed out very forcefully the failure of the ECA to obtain cooperation from the participating countries, as provided for in section 117 (d). This is what the committee said. I read from their report:

> The problem confronting Congress is the fact that after nearly 2 years the wholehearted cooperation of European countries

receiving American aid in controlling the east-west trade has not been obtained. It presumably could be obtained if section 117 (d) were strengthened by directing the Administrator to withhold economic assistance from all countries which do not satisfy him that they have put into effect controls which prevent shipments of goods to the iron-curtain areas which the United States itself does not permit.

In this connection it must be recognized that this problem might fall more directly into the sphere of the North Atlantic Treaty and its administration. Nevertheless, certain countries receive economic assistance which do not participate in the foreign military assistance program. The fundamental question then remains as to whether American dollars should go to countries which do not carry out our policies concerning trade with Soviet-dominated countries.

I have been quoting from the report, Senate Document No. 142. We are confronted with a problem which not only I but the other Members of the Senate have presented in great detail. I have offered this amendment, which I am sure will strengthen the particular section of the basic ECA Act to which it is directed, which act was intended to accomplish the very thing that is intended by the amendment.

Certainly there is no doubt as to what we need. I should like to place in the RECORD at this point, because my time is very limited, exhibit A. Let me state that last year, 1949, according to information from the most recent reports, which are difficult to obtain, the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce, shows that there was $1,098,000,000 worth of trade between western European and eastern European countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that exhibit A be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

EXHIBIT A

Western European trade with eastern Europe

	Total, 1949
Austria	$75, 771, 000
Belgium-Luxemburg	115, 097, 000
Denmark	55, 473, 000
France	105, 616, 000
Germany	59, 248, 000
Greece	4, 780, 000
Iceland	3, 662, 000
Ireland	288, 000
Italy	86, 247, 000
Netherlands	107, 002, 000
Norway	54, 987, 000
Portugal	939, 000
Sweden	109, 213, 000
Switzerland	70, 314, 000
Trieste	1, 891, 000
Turkey	30, 838, 000
United Kingdom	217, 539, 000
Grand total	1, 098, 905, 000

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this exhibit shows the different countries which sold the goods. They include Belgium-Luxemburg—$115,000,000 worth; France, $105,000,000 worth; Netherlands, $107,000,000 worth; Sweden, $109,000,000 worth; United Kingdom, $217,000,000 worth. And there were others.

The total for the first 3 months of 1950, according to the figures I have been able to get, which are not complete, was $186,347,000. I am told that the sales are seasonable and that the first 3 months of this year compare quite favorably with the first 3 months of 1949.

Mr. President, I ask that the table showing these exports be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

EXHIBIT B

Exports by ECA countries to eastern Europe, first quarter of 1950

Austria	(1)
Belgium-Luxemburg	$19, 603, 000
Denmark	12, 318, 000
France	18, 694, 000
Greece	1, 231, 000
Germany	(1)
Iceland	1, 489, 000
Ireland	(1)
Italy	26, 897, 000
Netherlands	15, 747, 000
Norway	8, 255, 000
Portugal	373, 000
Sweden	21, 541, 000
Switzerland	14, 016, 000
Turkey	3, 651, 000
United Kingdom	42, 532, 000
Total	186, 347, 000

[1] Not available.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the Washington Star of yesterday there was an article relative to the question I have been discussing. One of the paragraphs states:

> Leaks, owing to transshipments, are heavy and difficult to block. The United States has many checks on leaks and places a great share of the responsibility for preventing them on the American exporter. Also ECA investigators in Europe follow the goods to their final destinations. Still transshipments to the Soviet bloc reportedly have been numerous in western Europe. A recent report to Congress—

That is the report of the "watchdog committee"—

> A recent report to Congress stated that an estimated $200,000,000 in goods had been smuggled out of bizonal Germany in 1948.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator believe that the $200,000,000 worth of goods were all strategic and critical materials, or were they merely ordinary goods?

Mr. WHERRY. With the information I have at hand I cannot say that every bit of the $200,000,000 worth of goods was strategic material. What I propose by my amendment is to provide that no ECA country shall be paid any of the funds if it continues to ship to Russia goods such as oil, steel, and especially machine tools which can be used by the military for the purpose of making war, and which, as the distinguished Senator from Missouri pointed out very forcifully upon the floor of the Senate, were being shipped to Russia to be used in making more tools to produce more machinery which could be used against our forces in the field.

Mr. HAYDEN. Food, of course, is a war material.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator really advocate the absolute stoppage of all shipments of food?

Mr. WHERRY. No; my amendment does not provide for that at all. Under my amendment, if a participating country should ship food to the Russian Army, they would not get any more food, but so long as England, for instance, uses the food she obtained under ECA, and did not give it to the Russian Army, there would be no restriction. It is a very good amendment, and I hope the chairman of the committee will accept it, because it provides only that the material which is sent to a participating country must not be used to help the Russian forces. Certainly everyone should be for that. The Senator from Arizona does not want materials which can be used against American boys to be furnished to Red China through a satellite country does he?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course not.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not want to have such materials shipped to some other country, and to go to the North Korean forces so as to help them defeat our boys, does he?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly not.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am seeking. Support my amendment, and all that will be stopped.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator indicated that $200,000,000 worth of these supplies were strategic materials.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. The Senator knows I love him, he is one of my good friends, but the Senator from Nebraska never made such a statement. He showed that $200,000,000 worth of goods were being sent over. I did not say they were all strategic materials.

Mr. HAYDEN. How much was? That is the question.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the Senator would find out. Our Intelligence does not know, and I cannot find that out. No one can find it out. I say it is the responsibility of the Administrator to enforce section 117 (d) of the basic act. If he knows that goods are being so shipped, he should stop the shipment of such materials to Russia.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator to the possibility, which I hope may eventuate, that we and the other free nations will develop enough military strength so that in a year or 2 years we will have such great strength that we will be able to retrieve the influence we threw away in 1945, and that then we can reasonably hope that the free elements in the satellite countries will have a chance, with our influence, working through the United Nations, to regain their freedom, and that the iron curtain will then be pushed back perhaps to the eastern frontier of Poland.

In that situation, does not the Senator from Nebraska think it would be a very great pity if we cut off all our channels of political influence and all our channels of intelligence, thereby putting the whole weight of the war on the backs of our own soldiers, and ignoring the fact that modern war is won in part by political and economic means? The Senator does not want to bring about that result, does he?

Mr. WHERRY. No. The Senator made a very positive and a very constructive statement. I am not at this time talking about the reduction amendment, I am talking about the amendment I offer, referring to strategic materials. That is what I am discussing. I wish to make the point that my amendment does not restrict in any way the relationship between the countries concerned, so long as the countries do not intentionally—and I emphasize the word "intentionally"—violate the provisions of section 117 (d) of the basic act, which provides that they shall not send strategic materials, knowingly, to one of the satellite countries, if it is a potential enemy. The Senator agrees with that, I am sure.

Mr. President, may I have another 2 minutes?

Mr. KEM. I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for two more minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am satisfied the Senator from Massachusetts desires to reach the same objective I have in mind.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I have just 2 minutes. Let me complete this point, and then I will yield. I read from the article in the Washington Star of yesterday:

In the interest of national security—

And that is what the Senator desires—

In the interest of national security, American officials believe technical information as well as strategic goods should be kept from the Soviet. But in the absence of censorship, the Nation has to rely on a voluntary control plan. The OIT has undertaken to advise American businessmen in doubt as to what may be sent.

Mr. President, what I should like to have established, and it would be provided by the amendment, would be a coordinated export license system applicable to the European countries which work with us, in order to prevent the export of strategic materials, and a coordinated plan so that these countries will not intentionally export materials which can be used by Russia or the satellite countries for war purposes.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I understood that the Senator's amendment was worded so broadly that it would stop virtually all the export trade.

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. LODGE. I would go along with an amendment which would prevent the sending of purely military materials, but I do not wish to cut off our channels of intelligence and make it impossible to use economic and political methods in the struggle in which we are engaged. The President has said——

Mr. WHERRY. Let me read my amendment at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Permit me to finish this thought. The President has said that one of our aims is to liberate Korea and that another of our aims is to become strong enough to resist aggression. Of course, those are two of our aims, but I think the President could have gone further. I think Americans want us to regain the initiative and organize peace in a free world. That is what I think the President ought to say. If we take young men away from their homes and jobs it ought to be for some great purpose: We ought to accomplish something radically new and that means a type of war we have not had before, because it involves the political and the military.

Mr. WHERRY. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator from Massachusetts. Let me read the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield me one more minute?

Mr. KEM. I yield the Senator from Nebraska one additional minute.

Mr. WHERRY. I will read the amendment:

Provided further, That, during any period during which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations—

Which is the situation now—

no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which exports or permits the exportation, to the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics or any of its satellite countries (including China and northern Korea), of any article or commodity—

Which is the language in section 117—

usable by, or which may be used in the manufacture of any article or commodity which may be useful to, the armed forces of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics or such satellite countries.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that includes food.

Mr. WHERRY. If food were used intentionally to help bolster the Russian Army the Senator would not want that to be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the amendment, and also the complete article published in the Star, part of which I read, but which I did not complete.

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

On page 448, line 24, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That, during any period during which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which exports or permits the exportation, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including China and northern Korea), of any article or commodity usable by, or which may be used in the manufacture of any article or commodity which may be useful to, the armed forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or such satellite countries."

WAR POTENTIAL GOODS REACHING RED SATELLITES DESPITE CONTROLS—FLOW OF MATERIALS DIMINISHES, BUT TOO MUCH IS GETTING BY, UNITED STATES OFFICIALS SAY

(By L. Edgar Prima)

Despite a stringent export control system here and pledges of cooperation from Marshall-plan countries, war-potential goods still are being shipped behind the iron curtain from the United States and western Europe.

Officials of the State and Commerce Departments and ECA say the flow is being cut down, but that too much is getting by, both openly and secretly.

Here are the reasons:

1. The Marshall-plan nations do not have a formal joint export control set-up. Most have individual systems, none of which is as strict as ours, while others apparently have no controls worthy of the name.

2. Leaks, owing to transshipments, are heavy and difficult to block. The United States has many checks on leaks, and places a great share of the responsibility for preventing them on the American exporter. Also, ECA investigators in Europe follow the goods to their final destinations. Still transshipments to the Soviet bloc reportedly have been numerous in western Europe. A recent report to Congress stated that an estimated $200,000,000 in goods had been smuggled out of bizonal Germany in 1948. Bizonia produces many strategic items which the Russians are willing to buy at premium prices.

3. The customs systems of western Europe are far below the effectiveness of United States customs, and some prohibited goods undoubtedly are exported illegally by Americans each year.

In this connection, an ECA official said, "Some of the Marshall-plan nations do not have any clear idea of what and how much some of their exporters are shipping."

MAJOR PROBLEM IS EUROPEAN

It was stressed that the problem is not so much the transshipment of goods produced in the United States. This problem is under fairly good control.

More important are shipments of items produced in western Europe and sent to other ECA countries or to Switzerland and then to iron-curtain nations.

For months, some legislators, led by Senator KEM, Republican, of Missouri, have been asked what the United States is doing to stop such leaks.

An opponent of ECA, Senator KEM said on July 17 that Commerce Department officials made it clear to him that Marshall-plan countries "still are making substantial shipments of war materials to Russia and her satellites."

He recommended that ECA Administrator Hoffman be given the power to halt all ECA aid to those countries permitting such shipments.

Senate Republican Leader WHERRY, who plans to introduce an amendment to the ECA portion of the omnibus appropriations bill tomorrow, agrees with Senator KEM. His amendment would bar ECA funds to any nation exporting to Russia or its satellites anything that might become useful for military purposes.

The attitude of ECA, State and Commerce Department officials, however, is that such a step must be accompanied by "moral suasion." These nations are sovereign and would resent our interference, they explain.

EACH MUST MEET PROBLEM

Further, these officials hold that each nation has to meet the problem in light of its own trade and political relations with the Soviet bloc as well as its interest in the common security.

This explanation drew the sharp retort of "hogwash," from Senator KEM. He asserted that we had no reluctance about interfering in the Italian elections of 1948 nor in trying to promote the Schuman plan for a European iron-steel pool.

The American control system was set up in March 1948 to check the export of scarce strategic materials and to halt all shipments of such goods to the Soviet bloc as a matter of national security.

The Secretary of Commerce is in charge of the system. An interagency Advisory Committee on Requirements represents the Central Intelligence Agency, National Security Resources Board, ECA, and the State, Defense, Interior, and Agriculture.

The group helps with the security review of individual cases and the strategic evaluation of commodities. It approves the Positive List of Commodities, which is broken down into the so-called 1-A and 1-B lists.

1-A EXPORTS FORBIDDEN

Articles of greatest importance are in the 1-A category and may not be exported to iron curtain countries. They may be shipped to other countries, under license, however.

Items on the 1-B list, of lesser importance, may be exported to the Soviet orbit in certain restricted quantities.

An applicant for an American export license must furnish much specific information and faces criminal action for falsification. He must describe in detail the commodity to be shipped. He must name the country in which the goods will be consumed and the ultimate consignee. He must also list the names and addresses of all interested parties (agents, brokers, middlemen, etc.) and give specific details on the end-use of the item to be exported.

Marshall plan nations have been informed of our positive list and told why controls are important to the common security.

"We meet with the representatives of these countries in informal, continuing consultations," Wright, the State Department's assistant chief of the Economic and Securities staff, declared.

NATIONS ARE COOPERATING

"They know what we want and we are working it out on a cooperative, mutual defense basis. We don't feel we ought to go beyond that," he added.

(It has been reported in some quarters that the United States brought the matter of British oil shipments to the Chinese Reds to the attention of London. The shipments were stopped soon thereafter.)

Earlier this month, Senator KEM, quoting data from the Ofice of International Trade, told his colleagues that during the first 4 months of 1950, Great Britain shipped to Russia more than $1,087,000 worth of machine tools, a tenfold increase over the same period last year.

He listed in detail the amounts of machinery, ball bearings, steel-mill products, electrical goods, and even arms, sent to the Soviet and its satellites by Britain, Belgium, France, and Luxemburg.

The Senator stressed the importance of machine tools and Senator FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, a machine-tool manufacturer, supported him in principle.

"I should like to enunciate, sir, a profound truth, which is that the only inanimate thing which reproduces itself is a machine tool," Senator FLANDERS said.

Robert N. Golding, ECA consultant and former general counsel of the congressional ECA watchdog committee, had an explanation.

SOME TOOLS NONSTRATEGIC

"There are strategic machine tools and nonstrategic machine tools," he declared. "Why, we have some we'd be willing to ship to Russia today if she wanted them."

He insisted that before one became alarmed over a line in a trade report that a general item had been shipped one should try to ascertain specifically what the item was.

"For all we know the electrical goods sent to the Soviet orbit by the western Europeans might have been light bulbs."

Mr. Golding conceded, however, that we don't get very complete information on what the Marshall plan countries ship.

In an interview at his office, Mr. Golding expounded on the meaning of east-west trade for the recovery of Europe. Last year it totaled $2,600,000,000.

"If the Marshall plan countries are to get certain foods and raw materials from the east they must ship machinery and manufactured goods. That's all there is to it. If they don't, the Russians will cut off the trade. And the Europeans would look to us to supply the needed items," he warned.

Mr. Golding added that the aim of east-west trade should be to increase the economic strength of western Europe in relation to the east.

There is one other related problem which the Commerce Department has under consideration, but for which there is apparently no real peacetime solution. That is the control of technical data.

In the interest of national security, American officials believe technical information as well as strategic goods should be kept from the Soviet. But in the absence of censorship, the Nation has to rely on a voluntary control plan. The OIT has undertaken to advise American businessmen in doubt as to what may be sent.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, since we have very limited time remaining, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement I have prepared on the pending legislation.

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

Mr. LEHMAN's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I am, of course, deeply gratified that the Appropriations Committee in the face of the present crisis has now recommended the full appropriation of $26,900,000 for the point 4 program. In view of the committee's action, my amendment to make this full amount available for the self-improvement and perhaps even for the self-preservation of democratic nations is unnecessary. I have never faltered in my belief that the full amount of $26,900,000 is essential if we intend to initiate and encourage any kind of a realistic, cooperative economic effort among nations which, though friendly to us, and anxious to become self-sustaining, do not have the organizational and technical talent to use fully their own resources.

As I have said, I am deeply gratified that the Committee on Appropriations has acted to restore the funds which the President recommended for implementing point 4.

I would like to take this occasion to say that I am aware of the need for economy in Government expenditures. I have joined, and will continue to join, my efforts with other members of this body in cutting down on expenditures for purposes which are nonessential to the security, operation, and welfare of this Nation.

But economy is simply a slogan if we do not balance our expenditures in such a way as to use fully all the money we are putting into these efforts to improve the welfare of this Nation and insure its security.

We proposed, for instance, to spend upward of $30,000,000 for a program of information and propaganda designed to convince the peoples abroad that our motives are unselfish and that we do desire to advance their welfare and insure their security as well as our own. I have urged an increase in this appropriation, too, and it is very likely that we will finally spend for this purpose far more than the amount now provided in current legislation.

Speaking from a strictly selfish viewpoint, we can say that our investment in the United Nations has now paid rich dividends. The peace-loving nations of the world have thrown their moral weight and, in some cases, their physical strength behind the efforts to repel aggression in Korea. This weight was and is being exerted through the United Nations. We dare not weaken that organization by skimping or hedging on a vital economic program which is to be carried out under its auspices.

In mid-June 54 nations, including the United States, met at Lake Success to pledge funds for the program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas.

At that meeting at Lake Success the United States was one of 50 countries which pledged a total of $20,000,000. The United States pledged $12,000,000. This pledge was, of course, contingent upon a congressional authorization and appropriation. That pledge was made in good faith, although the other nations were perfectly aware that the American Congress had the last word on the expenditure of funds. I am confident now that the Congress of the United States will live up to that solemn commitment.

One of the chief difficulties in the Senate's consideration of the point 4 program is perhaps our lack of understanding of it. Most of us have little appreciation of the specific activities intended to be carried out. We can understand the information program in terms of the Voice of America, but the point 4 program is much less easy to comprehend. I understand that the chief difficulty faced by the Appropriations Committee in considering this proposal was the lack of a concrete and itemized program.

Since this program is an international program, based upon cooperative undertakings with other countries, no detailed and itemized schedule of activities was possible until the nations involved had been consulted for their views on what services they required.

The contemplated program is in two parts: A program of activities through the United Nations and a program contemplating bilateral arrangements between the United States and individual countries. No part of this point 4 program is or should be unilateral. This is not a ready-made program—it must be tailored to suit the interests and requirements of the countries involved. The basic theme of the point 4 program is the extension of technical assistance in all fields of endeavor. We intend to make available to foreign countries our own rich store of technological and scientific knowledge, in industrial, agricultural, public health, and educational fields. We propose to send experts and advisers, seeds and disease-resistant strains of special crops, and to export the knowledge we have to raise the standard of living, to cut down disease and epidemics, and to increase the productive output of all these countries.

For 10 years the United States has been carrying on technical-assistance programs through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and under the terms of Public Law 402. Our technicians have visited many countries abroad. This Institute of Inter-American Affairs, in cooperation with Latin-American countries, has developed demonstration projects which have changed the living conditions and the way of life of thousands of impoverished and disease-ridden people. By demonstrating modern scientific techniques, health has been improved, working conditions made tolerable, and more and better food put into the mouths of hungry individuals.

American geological experts have given expert advice and made preliminary surveys which have resulted in the location of entire new fields of critical ores and minerals. We have shown how to reclaim wasted lands, we have eradicated malaria, we have stopped epidemics, we have brought hope to areas where hope was lost, we have given stability to governments struggling to rehabilitate their economies.

I should like to give some specific examples: A child health specialist of the United States Children's Bureau, working in the town of Nuevo Laredo, on the Mexican border, was instrumental over a 2-year period in reducing the deaths of children under 1 year of age by more than 50 percent. Clinics for the treatment of yaws, established by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs in Haiti, helped cure 100,000 farm workers in that country. Drainage work carried out by the Institute for the Control of Malaria made it possible to bring 10,000 acres of farmland back into cultivation.

Pioneer work in this field has also been done by the World Health Organization. In one rich agricultural area in India malaria had been so severe that 104 villages had been totally abandoned. World Health Organization teams, in the space of less than 1 year, succeeded in eliminating infected mosquitoes from the area surrounding these villages. Refugee families came back to the villages to bring back into production lands urgently needed to meet the tremendous food shortages facing India today.

The point 4 program would include not only work in the field of health but in the development of natural resources.

Tungsten, tin, and deposits of lignite coal adequate to support an important mining industry have existed in Thailand. In that country a team of three United States and four native geologists has just completed a basic survey of these resources as a preliminary to the large-scale developments of these deposits.

In Brazil, the cooperative work of United States and Brazilian geologists has uncovered the largest manganese reserves in the Western Hemisphere. Such developments help to meet the needs of these countries as well as of the world generally, and provide new sources of income and employment for the country in which they are located.

In Liberia, United States technicians have helped map out roads and the timber supply, and to open up iron deposits. American agricultural experts have helped expand rice production for the local market, and the production of palm oil and cocoa for export. In one village near Monrovia, the result has been to increase the average cash income of the people from $5 to $35 per person.

In El Salvador, American agricultural technicians have helped develop and distribute to the farmer new corn varieties which produce 45 to 60 bushels per acre, instead of the old varieties which produced only 12 bushels per acre.

In the Philippines, fish is second only to rice in the national diet. The work of American fishery experts under our technical aid program for the Philippines is resulting in replacing primitive-type fishing gear with more efficient devices. The price of fish to the consumer has decreased because of the more plentiful supply, and the quality of the marketed product is improving.

The rural education program of the institute of inter-American Affairs in Bolivia has resulted in nearly doubling the number of rural school centers. The project has directly or indirectly benefited well over half a million children and adults.

The impact of these activities on the economy and living conditions of other peoples is tremendous. And they know that it is the United States which is cooperating with them to make such improvement possible.

The UN, as I have stated, has also been at work, through its specialized agencies, providing technical advice and assistance in various areas of the world. These efforts have been on a small scale because the funds available have been small and the number of technicians available for this work has been limited. I have already referred to the activities of the World Health Organization. It is this kind of work which led the chairman of the UN conference which formulated that UN program, to call it the most constructive program so far prepared by the UN.

This then is the point 4 program. It is not a relief program. It calls for no shipment of food, goods, or other commodities. It calls for no capital loans or grants.

It is simply a program for the sending of experts from this country and from other countries to share their technical knowledge with those who have little or none. It calls for bringing to the United States alert young scientists and professionals from these underdeveloped nations so that they may learn first-hand our methods and our techniques.

I have tried to bring it out of the half light of vague generalities into the full light of specific details. I have tried to indicate its importance in the great struggle which is agitating the world today. I would like to say to this Senate that the point 4 program, or even the promise it holds forth—for it will take some time for this program to show results—may mean as much in the present world struggle as the military measures which we must and will take.

Point 4 establishes the essential framework for the building of the structure of world peace for that day—and I pray it may come soon—when we will no longer be forced to think in terms of war, of death, and of conflict, and may turn with full heart to goals of peace, freedom, and fullness of life for ourselves and our fellow men.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, it is somewhat amazing to me that in this unusual hour of peril to our Nation and to other free countries throughout the world, there should be offered amendments which would emasculate the European recovery program. If there was ever a time when men should yield and bend, regardless of their previous positions with respect to the European recovery program, it is at this particular hour in the history of our Republic. But, instead of that, we find the same Senators who have fought the Marshall plan from the very beginning, still on the floor of the Senate making the same kind of arguments against this recovery program which has done so much to place the western European democracies once again upon their economic feet. Yet, the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would, if they were adopted, absolutely destroy the European recovery program in its entirety.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator issued a challenge.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have only 10 minutes. I ask the Senator please not to ask me to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make the statement that whatever the Senator from Nebraska may say about his amendment in the form in which it is at present, as the Senator from Massachusetts said and the Senator from Arizona has said, certainly food is war material, and if food is sent to the people of Russia, or her satellites, even though it is not sent direct to the army, it is replacing food that goes direct to the Russian Army. That is a fact that cannot be challenged. But to destroy all the trade between the east and the west in Europe—and that is exactly what would be done by the amendments—is to destroy the Marshall plan. Mr. President, this means in no sense that I am for shipping real war material, such as planes, tanks, and guns, to Russia or any of her satellites. The Senators who have been against the ECA program from the beginning desire to destroy it through the back door if they possibly can, by means of the type of emasculating amendments they have offered. They have tirelessly attempted to defeat this program by making it unworkable.

Mr. President, if it were not for the Marshall plan at this moment, in my humble judgment—and I think it is the judgment of the great mass of American people—the European countries who are now the beneficiaries of the Marshall plan would be under the iron and tyrannical heel of communism. If it were not for the Marshall plan, the Kremlin, the men of Moscow, at this very moment would have France, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, in their tyrannical and enslaving grasp. Only England would be standing up against the threat of the infiltration of the communistic poison. Yet, notwithstanding the communistic threat throughout the whole world at this very moment, which, in view of what is now happening in Korea, is very evident, for we know who is behind the North Korean movement, we know the power which is behind it, we find Senators still clinging to the old isolationist stand in the United States Senate, saying in effect "Give them nothing. Cut the appropriations for the Marshall plan down a billion dollars." We can live alone in this atomic world.

That would destroy the plan in its entirety. It would destroy the morale of the free people of the countries of western Europe. Never in the history of America have we had such need for friends and allies as we have at this very moment. This is a crucial hour, one of the most dangerous hours in the history of America. Yet there are Senators who seek to destroy a plan which has done so much to keep communism from spreading its poisonous tentacles throughout the western democracies,

having a population of 270,000,000. We need them as our friends. We need them as our allies. We need them at this hour. We should give them not only the kind of assistance we give them under the Marshall plan, but also give them military aid to meet the challenge of communism, the onrush of communism, which seeks to sweep over the world and enslave us all.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot yield.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri talks about being realistic in this hour. I wish more Senators were as realistic as those who have been going along with the Marshall plan and the military-assistance program, the Atlantic Fact, and all other bipartisan measures the last few years in our efforts to find the road to a durable peace. I submit that the junior Senator from Missouri has consistently advocated a short-sighted and ineffectual foreign policy. His course is not the wise one at this hour of history. Certainly through aid to Turkey and Greece, by the Marshall plan, we have kept communism from spreading throughout Europe, as it is in China today.

Mr. President, I say we are the ones who are the realists in this hour, and that the Senator from Missouri and others who join with him in trying to reduce the appropriation by $1,000,000,000 are still unrealistic, they are still living in the McKinley age of 40 years ago, believing that this country can get along without the people of western Europe.

The Senator from Missouri says we have to see things as they are. We who favor the Marshall plan contend we do see things as they are. As a result of what is going on in Korea this very moment we contend we can look into the future and see the great dangers which exist to the American Republic.

Mr. President, the affair in Korea is not a local one. No one knows what will happen tomorrow. A move similar to that in Korea may be made in other parts of the world, followed by a communistic tirade such as we have heard against us recently. So to reduce the ECA appropriation at this moment is to play directly into the hands of Stalin and his group of international bandits who run the Politburo in the Kremlin at Moscow. Of course, Stalin would like to have that done. He has never wanted the Marshall plan. He has fought against it from the beginning. He would not permit Poland or Czechoslovakia or other countries to come into the Marshall plan because he saw in the Marshall plan something worth while for the economic recovery of those nations across the sea. Recovery in their economic affairs is a direct aid and comfort and help to the United States of America.

Mr. President, appropriating for ECA aid is not throwing money down a rat hole; this amendment is a direct blow at England. Who was it who first came to our aid in Asiatic waters? It was England with her fleet. She is also sending ground troops to help us along. Yet, for the past months and years, we have heard tirades against socialistic England whenever we have tried to grant and loan her money under the ECA program.

As I said before the Korean affair on the floor of the Senate, when the chips are down in the world-wide conflagration in which we may be engaged, we will find England—regardless of the kind of government she has; and no one detests socialism more than I do—standing by the side of the United States of America. At the present time she is our real ally in Europe and Asia.

To hurt England at this hour, through cutting off money under the ECA program, not only will be doing a disservice to our western European allies, but it will be doing a disservice to the safety and security of our own country. It will give aid and comfort to communism.

I repeat that at this particular hour we need all the friends we can have. We should do nothing to disturb the relationship which exists at this moment with respect to the ECA funds which we are sending across the water.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will not vote for any of these crippling amendments. They are emasculating amendments, designed to cripple the ECA to the point where it cannot be effective, to the point where Paul Hoffman, the great Administrator, will have no possibility of administering it in an efficacious way.

The Kem amendment would defeat our purposes in that respect and would disturb the morale of the people of western Europe, at this time when we in America should do everything within our poor power to raise and lift their morale.

So I hope the Senate at this hour will be more realistic than it has ever been before. I hope Senators who in the past have voted against ECA appropriations, at this time will give ECA the benefit of the doubt, because ECA needs the cooperation of all Members of the Senate—America needs this unity and the free world needs it. The Senate must rise to a level of high wisdom. We must reject amendments which would bring utter chaos to our friends abroad.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes.

Mr. KEM. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there seems to be some question about the report of the "watchdog" committee and where it came from. I should like to call attention to the fact that the report is to be found on page 265 of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee, and it was given to the Appropriations Committee members.

Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader would have us believe that those who have not voted to provide every dollar that ECA has wanted are responsible for the situation which exists today.

To the contrary, the responsibility for the situation existing today rests on the present administration because of its policy in regard to Asia. No one can deny that. That is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the policy in regard to Asia the administration has had up until very recently has now been completely repudiated, it has adopted a policy entirely contrary to what its policy has been.

So far as China is concerned, the administration's policy was to "wait until the dust settles." The administration has followed a policy that the situation in China had nothing to do with ECA or with Korea.

I voted for China aid, I voted for Korean aid, and I voted for the sending of military equipment to Korea. However, what has the administration done in that connection? Under the military assistance program of last year this administration allotted the South Koreans only $2,600,000. However, how much did the South Koreans get? They did not get a dime's worth. They finally were allotted a little wire for repairs which cost $200. It is on the way there now, and has not yet been paid for.

Yet some Senators claim that the responsibility for what has happened rests on the shoulders of Senators who had the nerve to stand on this floor and ask that such action be justified or else that the policy be changed. What has happened is the fault of this administration, Mr. President, which ever since 1944 has followed a policy of "wait and let the dust settle in China."

I voted againt confirmation of the nomination of the present Secretary of State, the man who was the architect of that policy, and who still is Secretary of State and still is the architect of the foreign policy of the United States, and will continue to be until he has been repudiated by the President. The vote I cast against the confirmation of his nomination is the best vote I ever cast.

Why should anyone want to vote for money in support of a policy of the kind I have indicated? Why should anyone wish to support a policy of "wait until the dust settles"? How can anyone dispute the fact that today our boys are being attacked by troops using equipment and supplies, including gasoline, which, under our policy, have been allowed to go to the Chinese Reds?

Mr. President, my amendment will clear up such a loophole and will make it possible for us to make sure that no further strategic materials will go from this country to Russia and her satellites, in eastern Europe or Red China.

Let us be united in stopping such things. That is the way to win the war in the Pacific.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the question before the Senate at this time is an amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri, relating to the ECA.

The minority leader has seen fit to take a considerable amount of his time to talk about political considerations and the Secretary of State and what happened in China. I do not care to discuss those matters. I am willing to discuss

them, but they are not before the Senate.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] calls for a very large cut in the ECA appropriation.

Is the Senator from Missouri really interested in the ECA appropriation, or is he endeavoring to cripple ECA and wound it and cut down its appropriation? I have before me the records of the vote on the original Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. Among Senators who voted "nay" at that time, the name of the Senator from Missouri shines like an evening star. When we examine the vote on the question of the passage of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, we find that among the "nays" is the name of the Senator from Missouri.

When we examine the vote on the question of the passage of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, among the seven "nays" is the name of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Again, Mr. President, when it came to the question of furnishing military assistance to Europe, allied more or less with the general principle of the ECA, we find among those voting "nay" the name of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

And when it came to the question of the North Atlantic Treaty, lining up the democracies of western Europe with Canada and the United States and other countries, we find that among those who voted "nay" was the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, with that sort of a record behind the Senator from Missouri—opposing the North Atlantic Treaty and the arms aid and the ECA—can we expect anything good, so far as ECA is concerned, to come from the hands of the Senator from Missouri, who has been against it? Yet he appears as its friend. He wants to amend the act. He wants to cut the original item as we agreed upon it in committee by about $1,000,000,000. The proposal would cut the amount of the appropriation in the pending bill from $2,391,930,000 to $1,950,000,000.

Mr. President, this is not the time for us to halt or to equivocate on the ECA program. A time of peril is not a time to retreat. This is no time to run for cover. We initiated this program to aid in the economic rehabilitation of western Europe. We realized when we did so that economic rehabilitation is, after all, in aid of military preparation and military defense. Military defense cannot proceed except upon the basis of a sound economy. The reports from western Europe regarding what has been done under ECA are astounding, so much so that they sometimes shake one's credulity. Production in those countries has been vastly improved; in most cases, to a point above the prewar level.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not send to western Europe the message that we are lacking in our willingness to continue this program to the point of achieving its result.

Reference is made to our solemn responsibility to Korea and Asia. We are aware of those responsibilities, but we cannot, before the whole world, send forth a message that we are weakening, that we are unable to meet our responsibilities, that we are unwilling to keep faith with the powers of western Europe whom we have assured of our aid through the ECA program, through the Atlantic Pact, and through the arms-implementation program. I stand for all those things.

Mr. President, the free governments of Europe, the United States, and Canada are all tied up with a single faith. We could not, if we would, cut ourselves loose from them. If democracy is to survive, the free nations which advocate democracy must stand together, must keep the faith, must carry out the programs designed to accomplish the survival of democracy and freedom, and which are designed to bring about the destruction of the evil and fatal policies of communism.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not disagree with what the able Senator from Texas has been stating in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but it seems to me—and I think it important to bring it up at this point—that the world is faced at the present time, as we are meeting here, with the necessity of having a united front—one that cannot be sabotaged—with the change which takes place tomorrow with Mr. Malik assuming the chairmanship of the Security Council?

It seems to me that the able Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the State Department should be able to work out some method or propose some resolution whereby no person may assume the chairmanship of the Security Council without first taking an oath to support the action of the Security Council. To invite or permit Mr. Malik to gain the chairmanship by rotation is like permitting a member of the Capone crime syndicate to head the FBI. Certainly, if we are going to do these things which the able Senator from Texas has expounded, we should have some additional cooperation in keeping Mr. Malik from taking his seat.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for two more minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California. His ideas and mine have gone along pretty much together in regard to foreign problems. However, to do what the Senator from California suggests would probably require action by the United Nations. Whether that could be accomplished between now and tomorrow, when Mr. Malik takes over as President of the Security Council, would be doubtful. It would at least be a very difficult undertaking.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that I contacted Mr. Hickerson, of the State Department, this morning and pointed out that the President of the United States is not permitted to assume the Presidency until he has taken an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It seems to me that today the United Nations Security Council could adopt the resolution that no one could assume the chairmanship without agreeing to uphold and defend the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator from California, and if that can be accomplished, I hope that our representatives and others will advocate it. But, Mr. President, I do not view the return of Mr. Malik to the United Nations with any satisfaction whatever. I cannot believe that he is going to take the position as head of the Security Council for any good purpose, so far as the things recently done by the United Nations are concerned, or so far as its ultimate objectives are concerned. Mr. Malik is proposing to return to the Security Council for some strategic purpose. I trust that members of the Security Council will, while keeping their own counsel, see to it that he does not undermine the high purposes of the United Nations.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Does not the able Senator from Texas think that Mr. Malik has probably returned with the express purpose of confusing American public opinion and weakening our whole military effort?

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator. I think his return is largely tied up with propaganda. Russia wants to pretend before the world that she is the peace advocate, and that the United States and Great Britain are the imperialists. I doubt not, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, that Malik's purpose is not a good one, but that he is an emissary of confusion, distraction, and disturbance, which he hopes will spread throughout the world, as a part of Russia's propaganda methods.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. We cannot turn back on the course we have charted, at this particular juncture in world affairs. We want unity. We want the world to know that we stand just where we stood before—in unison with the free nations of western Europe. If Europe is to survive, if we are to survive, we must stand together for freedom and for democracy.

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

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I can only wish that those of us who have opposed ECA from the beginning had been as successful in persuasion as we have been in prophecy.

I well remember that when the original bill was presented in this body the Senator from Texas raised his voice until the rafters of the Chamber resounded——

Mr. CONNALLY. There were no rafters in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Texas said, "We are voting for the peace of the world." ECA was sold to us as a policy of insurance against war.

I well remember, Mr. President, when the first bill was before us. Its proponents told the Senate, "You have two alternatives; either pass this bill or arm yourselves to the teeth." The Senate passed the bill. The ink was hardly dry on the President's signature when the administration was back again, presenting the largest war budget in the peacetime history of the United States. We voted for that budget. Then the administration came back again and said, "It is not sufficient to arm the people of the United States; we must arm the people of 12 nations of western Europe." So we did that. And so on and on and on.

Each prophecy has fallen short of performance. Each time it has been necessary for the majority leader and for the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to come back with additional proposals, each time involving the expenditure of vast sums of money. It would not have been so bad if we had the money to spend, but we have been mortgaging the future of the United States. We have been placing a lien on the Nation to be paid sometime, somehow, by our children and our children's children. All the time we have been causing an inflation which is rising like a great monster to plague us. The people suddenly find that the money backed by the credit of the United States in which they have had faith does not have the purchasing power that they thought it would have.

Mr. President, there is so much about the ECA bill that is based on a delusion that I do not know how to start discussing it. Much is said about the defense of western Europe, and it is contended that if we pass the bill we shall aid western Europe in defending itself. I have before me the budget estimate for July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951, revised May 4, 1950. Running through the budget at random I see that the United Kingdom is to have 33 projects in 19 territories which call for specialized items of equipment from the United States to be used in improving basic economic conditions in the territories which will lead, in time, to further developmental activity.

I see that the Belgian Government is to have money for road building and development projects in the Congo.

France is to have money to improve roads, to open up new production areas in west and equatorial Africa and in the Cameroons, for the development of soil conservation in Algeria, rice production in Morocco, and for the development of iron deposits in French Guinea.

The Portuguese Government is to have money for the erection of a livestock utilization plant in Angola. Involved, among other things, would be a slaughterhouse, a byproducts plant, a quick-freeze cold-storage plant, a steam and power plant, and a cold-storage plant for the distribution of meat products. Approximately 6,000 metric tons of meat each year could be supplied to Brazzaville, Leopoldville, and other equatorial African markets, metropolitan Portugal, and the United Kingdom.

The Netherlands is to develop small farming projects in Dutch Guiana, to make possible the immigration of Dutch, Indo-Europeans, and possibly others to Surinam. In Surinam it is proposed to have a project involving the reclamation of 5,000 hectares of coastal land on which to raise rice and other products.

All of these projects are to be paid for by taxes on the American people.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I rise to announce that what I have recognized in the European recovery program has been a good investment of American dollars toward permanent peace, bringing to our side the support of the nations of western Europe in our attempt to establish permanent peace in the world.

The present Presiding Officer was with me on the visit which he and I were privileged to make to nations of western Europe. We traveled by car from Frankfurt across to Munich. We were in the company of 5 other Members of Congress who visited 13 nations of western Europe. We talked not only with farmers, small-business men, and corporation executives, but with men and women in the governments of those countries, and we commenced to sense that through the ECA and the Atlantic Pact we were rehabilitating the best citizens and restoring to the channels of commerce the hidden dollars of those nations. Yes, Mr. President, we were enlisting the best efforts of France, Italy, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, Great Britain, and Greece in an attempt to try to rebuild their economies and their governments.

When we visited Norway we found the people very enthusiastic. They were rebuilding their fishing fleet, which meant so much to them; they were rebuilding their merchant marine, which meant much to their commerce. It was ECA dollars which made that possible.

Mr. President, when I returned to the United States, in speaking to citizens of my State I told them that I thought through ECA funds we had made a good start toward permanent and lasting peace.

I have in my hand a letter which I received today from Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange. I shall quote only a few words from his letter. He says:

> ECA as a means of meeting the threat of communism has been an outstanding success. This is not alone the judgment of the National Grange, but is the unqualified conclusion of the four national farm organizations that inspected the work of ECA in May and June of this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may I have half a minute?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield half a minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter from Mr. Albert S. Goss printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., July 31, 1950.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: ECA as a means of meeting the threat of communism has been an outstanding success. This is not alone the judgment of the National Grange, but is the unqualified conclusion of the four national farm organizations that inspected the work of ECA in May and June of this year.

The elements of this outstanding success of ECA in checking aggressive communism are the identical elements needed to check it as the war becomes hotter. These elements are: (1) expanded industrial output of Europe; (2) agricultural production at least equal to that of prewar; and (3) a consequent faith among Europeans, and a fear among Communists that we are determined to continue unabated our opposition to communism through ECA.

The most important task of ECA, and the most difficult part of its task, lies ahead. We should not make the fatal mistake of reducing its funds at this critical stage below its full needs. We anticipate intensified Russian efforts in many parts of the world to divert us from our purpose of promoting sound European recovery before the job is completed. We hope that you will give full support to the continuation of this essential program.

Sincerely,

A. S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a Republican I rise to support the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee with respect to ECA, and I would quickly invite attention to these points:

Point No. 1 is that in my judgment the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee are in keeping with the spirit and intent of the great Republican platform of 1948 in which we pledged to the American people that we would keep partisanship at the water's edge, so far as foreign policy was concerned. In my judgment, any attempt to cut the heart out of the ECA program by the Kem amendments at this time cannot be reconciled with the spirit and intent of that plank of the Republican platform.

Point No. 2 is that it can now be stated that in February, March, and April, 1947, we were nearer to war than the American people realized. I speak as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. There were many of us in those critical months who expected the Russian troop movements which were westward in those days to take Trieste and Italy by force, if necessary. The Congress took some very quick action on two fronts to show Russia that we were willing to defend the peace. We proceeded with the appropriations necesary to

strengthen our military defenses in Europe, and we proceeded with ECA. I happen to be one who believes that ECA, as much as has our military appropriations, strengthened our position in Europe. I am not on the floor of the Senate today going to cast a vote that will weaken the position of the allies we need in Europe in the critical months and years ahead, because I believe, Mr. President, that Russia will try to lick us——

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

Mr. MORSE. I shall not yield to the Senator from Missouri. I am talking about his amendment which I think is an undesirable amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not vote for an amendment which would weaken, in my opinion, the strength of my Nation in the critical months ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of State, dated July 27, 1950, and a letter from William Foster, Acting Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, dated July 27, 1950.

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

JULY 27, 1950.

The Honorable TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: I have read the letter which Mr. William C. Foster, Acting Administrator for the Economic Cooperation Administration, is forwarding you with respect to the importance of the appropriation for the European recovery program.

I concur completely in Mr. Foster's letter and wish to take this opportunity to endorse his statements to you.

You will recall that this question of the importance of ECA funds was raised when I appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee earlier this week. I should like to emphasize again that the mounting economic strength of western Europe is of paramount importance to the fulfillment of the policies which the United States Government has been pursuing. I cannot urge too strongly that the Congress take action to provide adequate funds to support this mounting strength.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1950.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: It is expected that the Senate will vote very soon on the appropriation for the European recovery program. This vote and the amount to be appropriated take on new significance in view of the struggle in which we are now engaged.

I think it vital that certain considerations be emphasized in advance.

Vast new expenditures for military purposes are called for and in light of this circumstance all proposed appropriations must be strictly scrutinized so that resources can be husbanded for the most essential needs. But among such needs high priority must be given to the sums required for maintaining the economic strength of our friends and increasing their military strength as well.

It is important to recollect that early in 1948 the Communist threat to western Europe was a clear and present danger. The Marshall plan has not only so far prevented this threat from being translated into action, but has greatly increased the strength of western Europe to resist the danger. The continued need for world-wide strength to prevent further aggression and to preserve the peace is apparent.

It is this strength which the current vote on ECA will decisively affect. It is this strength which obviously must be made up out of the resources of the whole free world and not the United States alone. And the rest of the free world, particularly the free nations of western Europe, are now, as a result of Marshall aid, in a position to contribute substantially to that end.

What are the political, phychological, and economic changes in the OEEC nations that two and a quarter years with ERP aid have accomplished and which justify that statement?

Those changes include: A greatly increased industrial and agricultural production; an attainment of reasonable internal financial stability; a political stability allowing for freely chosen democratic governments with constantly declining totals of Communist voters; the sharp reduction of arbitrary restrictions on intra-European trade; the institution of the European Payments Union with its promise of convertibility within Europe; and a steadily growing belief by the people of Europe in their own future.

Without the assistance furnished by this country through the Foreign Assistance Act, this strong economic base could not have been built. And a strong economy and stable society is the foundation of military strength. In the months ahead, this economic base will have to bear a far heavier load as the free nations of western Europe build up their military strength. It is, therefore, more essential than ever that ECA assistance be continued so that the European economy can carry the load of rearmament, as well as contribute to the maintenance of a decent standard of living.

It is clear that such a continuation of ECA assistance, together with mutual defense assistance, will guarantee more security and a greater increase in military strength for each United States dollar that is spent than we could possibly achieve relying on United States production alone.

This multiplying effect has been demonstrated many times over the past 2 years in the industrial field. For example, electric power capacity in western Europe has vastly increased since April 1948. This increase results mainly from expansion of plants through capital investment, of which about 95 percent was contributed by the European countries themselves, and only 5 percent from ECA dollars. Yet without this 5 percent in dollars the development could not have been built. Similarly, in military items, though the ratio of total production to dollar investment may not be so dramatic, the effect of each dollar made available to Europe will be multiplied many times.

In this connection and because of our own military effort, question has been raised regarding future use of local currency counterpart funds. While it is clear that in some countries at least a portion of the counterpart could well be directed toward expanding facilities to be used for production of military equipment, there are many instances where present use of counterpart should be maintained best to help attain this new objective. For instance, where the major portion of a nation's counterpart is now being released for such purposes as development of electrical energy supply, improvement of basic transportation facilities, such as roads and railroads, or increasing the facilities of important seaports, these developments can contribute substantially and directly to increasing production for military purposes or to the movement of troops and supplies. It is true, moreover, that wise use of counterpart will further increase the multiplying effect to which I referred and our efforts will be directed to that end.

Up to this point the Marshall plan has been chiefly concerned with building resistance to communism within certain of the participating countries; from now on equal emphasis must also be given to building resistance to aggression from without. But in either case the proved principle of the Marshall plan is applicable; that American aid brings increased returns when coupled with self-help and mutual aid by the participating countries. On the other hand, withdrawal of adequate support by the United States would result in almost immediate economic disruption of the western European nations.

Therefore, I urge in the national interest and in order effectively to wage the peace, that you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of your committee, all of whom are so aware of these dangers, press for a fully adequate amount.

The Marshall plan is firmly identified in the European mind as the symbol of United States partnership in attaining peace and strength. Any sharp curtailment of Marshall aid might well be profoundly misunderstood as indicating a loss of United States interest in the economic stability of Europe. However, a further endorsement by the Senate will give confidence in the present and hope for the future to the entire free world.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FOSTER,
Acting Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will proceed to vote on the pending question, which is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have an amendment which I should like to offer at the proper time. It refers to the first section of chapter X–B, with reference to the Economic Cooperation Act as it now stands. Would I be precluded from offering an amendment to that section after action is taken on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment would not be in order until the amendment proposing to change the figures is disposed of. After that is disposed of the Senator's amendment would be in order.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Anderson	Connally	Gillette
Benton	Cordon	Graham
Brewster	Douglas	Green
Bricker	Dworshak	Gurney
Bridges	Eastland	Hayden
Butler	Ellender	Hendrickson
Byrd	Ferguson	Hickenlooper
Capehart	Flanders	Hill
Chapman	Frear	Holland
Chavez	George	Humphrey

Ives	McClellan	Saltonstall
Johnson, Colo.	McFarland	Smith, Maine
Johnson, Tex.	McKellar	Smith, N. J.
Johnston, S. C.	Magnuson	Sparkman
Kefauver	Malone	Stennis
Kem	Martin	Taft
Kerr	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Knowland	Morse	Thye
Langer	Mundt	Tydings
Leahy	Murray	Watkins
Lehman	O'Conor	Wherry
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Williams
Lucas	Robertson	Young
McCarran	Russell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Chair will state the question before the Senate. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], inserting the figure $1,950,000,000, in lieu of $2,450,000,000, and striking out certain language on page 448, lines 2 and 8.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. WHERRY requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is detained because of attendance at the funeral of a close personal friend and is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—12

Butler	Frear	Martin
Byrd	Kem	Mundt
Capehart	Langer	Wherry
Dworshak	Malone	Williams

NAYS—59

Anderson	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Benton	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Murray
Bridges	Humphrey	O'Conor
Chapman	Ives	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Knowland	Sparkman
Ferguson	Leahy	Stennis
Flanders	Lehman	Taft
George	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	Lucas	Thye
Graham	McCarran	Tydings
Green	McClellan	Watkins
Gurney	McFarland	Young
Hayden	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—25

Aiken	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cain	Kilgore	Taylor
Darby	Long	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Tobey
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Myers	Withers
Hoey	Neely	
Hunt	Pepper	

So Mr. KEM's amendment to Mr. HAYDEN's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my understanding is that I have 10 minutes on the amendment. I shall take but 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, with respect to the appropriation for ECA, I would like to point out how the committee arrived at the amount in the bill of $2,391,930,000. When we first considered the amount in the committee we voted on a figure of $2,500,000,000 as recommended by its chairman, the Senator from Tennessee, and the committee agreed to this figure on a vote of 11 to 10. Since many of the members of the committee who had voted against a figure of $2,500,000,000 had indicated they would support an appropriation of $2,450,000,000, the committee agreed to have a roll-call vote on the lesser amount. I made the motion to reconsider. I did not feel it would be desirable to have the committee recommending an appropriation which had been agreed to in the committee by a margin of only one vote. On the vote in the committee on an amount of $2,450,000,000 for ECA there were 17 yeas and 3 nays. So the committee had by a substantial majority recommended an appropriation of $2,450,000,000.

Several days later, on July 7, 1950, when the committee was in session considering other chapters of the bill, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] made a motion that all items in the foreign-aid chapter which had not been cut at least 10 percent under the budget estimate be cut 10 percent under the budget estimate, exclusive of the funds for mutual defense assistance. The committee voted on the motion of the Senator from Michigan, and it carried by a vote of 11 to 10. This meant that ECA would be further reduced by $58,070,000 to allow an appropriation of $2,391,930,000. This is how the figure was arrived at.

The following day when the committee was again in session one of the members of the committee who had voted in favor of the Ferguson motion stated he was willing to move to reconsider and restore the amount to $2,450,000,000, as originally adopted by a vote of 17 to 3. It was agreed not to do this, since the report had already been printed, and the matter could be considered further on the Senate floor.

In view of this background, and especially in view of the fact that the figure in the bill of $2,391,930,000 was agreed upon by such a close vote, I move that, on page 447, line 18, the figure "$2,391,930,000" be stricken and the figure "$2,450,000,000" be inserted in lieu thereof, as approved by our committee by 17 out of the 20 members.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is detained because of attendance at the funeral of a close personal friend and is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—42

Anderson	Humphrey	Morse
Benton	Ives	Murray
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kefauver	Pepper
Douglas	Kerr	Robertson
Eastland	Leahy	Saltonstall
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, Maine
George	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Graham	Lucas	Sparkman
Green	McCarran	Stennis
Gurney	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McKellar	Thye
Hill	Magnuson	Tydings

NAYS—29

Brewster	Gillette	Martin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler	Holland	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Capehart	Kem	Watkins
Dworshak	Knowland	Wherry
Ferguson	Langer	Williams
Flanders	McClellan	Young
Frear	Malone	

NOT VOTING—25

Aiken	Hunt	Schoeppel
Cain	Jenner	Taylor
Cordon	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Darby	Long	Tobey
Donnell	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Downey	McMahon	Wiley
Ecton	Millikin	Withers
Fulbright	Myers	
Hoey	Neely	

So Mr. HAYDEN'S amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now before the Senate is on the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the economic cooperation provision and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 448, line 17, following the colon after the word "amended", it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided further*, That after November 1, 1950, no funds herein appropriated shall be made available to any nation of which a dependent area fails to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on last Friday, shortly following the adoption of the unanimous-consent agreement to vote today, at a time when at least I and a number of other Senators were of the firm opinion that no particular action was to be had on the economic cooperation section of the bill on last Friday, a point of order was raised to that portion of economic cooperation provision beginning after the word "amended" on line 17, on page 448, striking the remainder of that particular section.

Mr. President, it was my intention to discuss any point of order that might be to that particular section, but I did not have the opportunity to do so because I was at a meeting at that time and had not anticipated that such action would be taken then. Business has transpired since the point of order was raised, and I understand under the precedents that an appeal cannot now be taken from the ruling on that point of order.

I therefore had prepared the amendment which I have sent to the desk, and, as it states, it provides "that after November 1, 1950, no funds herein appropriated shall be made available to any nation of which a dependent area fails to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties."

Anticipating a point of order, Mr. President, I should like to say that I have tried to check the amendment as best I can with the authorities, and the best advice I can secure is that unless new duties are imposed upon some administrative official, such as the Department of State, then the amendment is in order, and I think, that no new duties are imposed upon any official, especially in view of the Connally amendment to the authorization act this spring, which specifically provides: "In any case where the Department of State determines that such discriminatory restriction is maintained or imposed," and so forth.

Mr. President, because I am limited as to time, I should like to have the entire Connally amendment, which is found on page 3 of Public Law 535, the print I have in my hand, in subsection (n), printed at this point in my remarks.

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

(n) It is the sense of Congress that no participating country shall maintain or impose any import, currency, tax, license, quota, or other similar business restrictions which discriminate against citizens of the United States or any corporation, partnership, or other association substantially beneficially owned by citizens of the United States, engaged or desiring to engage, in furtherance of the purposes of this title, in the importation into such country of any commodity, which restrictions are not reasonably required to meet the balance of payments conditions, or requirements of national security, or are not authorized under international agreements to which such country and the United States are parties. In any case where the Department of State determines that any such discriminatory restriction is maintained or imposed by a participating country or by any dependent area of such country, the Administrator shall take such remedial action as he determines will effectively promote the purposes of this subsection (n).

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have only 5 minutes.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, my amendment will particularly affect the inexcusable and unconscionable violation of the rights of American citizens in Morocco. I opposed the insertion of such an amendment last year based upon the solemn promises of the State Department and of the ECA that they would, under the power which they already have under the ECA Act and which is admitted by Mr. Hoffman and the State Department, correct these abuses and see that American citizens doing business in Morocco secure equal, fair, and equitable treatment with other nationals and in full accordance with treaties which are in existence between this country and Morocco. In spite of its promises and in spite of its solemn assurances, the ECA has wholly and completely failed to take action. In spite of the admonition of the Connally amendment this spring, the ECA has done nothing to correct these abuses. In spite of the fact that the State Department itself has repeatedly said in writing that Morocco is violating its treaty with the United States, so far as

American nationals are concerned, the abuses continue.

So, Mr. President, I no longer feel constrained to take the word of the State Department or to trust the assurances of the ECA that it will correct the manifest injustices which I think every Member of the Senate knows exists.

I dislike the necessity of putting in the bill a mandatory clause of this kind, but it is the only way by which to get action by the State Department and the ECA—which not only is charged from the standpoint of its patriotism, but is directly charged under the Connally amendment of this spring, with taking action to correct those abuses. However, those two great departments have wholly and utterly failed and refused to do anything to correct them.

Mr. President, I have supported ECA, and I am still supporting ECA.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa in order until the committee amendment in line 18 has been adopted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. My amendment is an amendment to perfect the committee amendment, which we agreed will be treated as though it were the text of the bill. I think I am entitled to have a final decision on that question of the adoption of my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa is offered as an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is not this amendment subject to a point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No point of order has been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair overrules the point of order, because it seems to the Chair that the amendment is a limitation on the appropriation, based upon the provisions of the ECA Act, as passed by the Congress, and with particular reference to what is known as the Connally amendment to that act, which stipulates that it is the duty of the Department of State to consider and determine whether there has been any violation of a treaty agreement. The amendment merely provides that if there has been such a violation, the appropriation shall not be available. The Chair thinks the amendment is a limitation, and overrules the point of order.

This question is subject to debate for 5 minutes by any Senator who desires to occupy that time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, how much time is available?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Five minutes is available to any Senator who wishes to discuss this question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the amendment, I wish to read one or two paragraphs from the letter of the Acting Administrator of ECA in regard to the amendment:

In the first place, I believe that the proviso is wholly unnecessary. It is adopted from an amendment proposed to and rejected by the Congress this year in the course of considering the authorizing legislation for ECA. At that time it was pointed out that a procedure had been established in Morocco last December for consultation between American and French authorities to deal with complaints of discrimination against American businessmen. Since that time almost all the specific complaints concerning such discrimination have been brought before the consultative group. An investigation just completed on the ground in Morocco shows that this new procedure, which involved some delays in its early stages, has been speeded up considerably within the last 6 weeks and that the majority of the complaints of the American businessmen have been satisfied. This consultative machinery makes it possible for cases of discrimination to be established and identified, and the authority expressed in the Connally amendment to the ECA Act enables the Administrator for Economic Cooperation to take such action, including suspension of dollar assistance or refusal to release franc funds, as is suited to the particular situation.

In the second place the proviso would, in its operations, be seriously damaging. It would, of course, be wholly contrary to the basic theory that the program is based on cooperation among the free countries and not on coercion by the United States, but quite apart from this, the actual operation of the proviso would be ruinous to the carrying out of the recovery program for France, for it is at France that the provision is directed. As I have noted above, ECA is now in a position to deal with discriminations against American businessmen, taking such measures as are best suited to meet and cure the discrimination complained of.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should simply like to say to the Senator, if I may do so, that without passing at all on the justice or the injustice of the situation or the question of whether the State Department has been sufficiently diligent in connection with this matter, it seems to me that the amendment goes against one feature of the Economic Cooperation Act, a feature which is vital to the entire conception of ECA, namely, that the recipient nations under the Marshall plan must get all their imports from soft currency areas, wherever it is possible to do so—whereas this amendment would require that France get imports in dollar areas. If we once admit that principle, then the entire ECA Act is in danger of being converted into a subsidy for American products.

For that reason, I intend to oppose the amendment, although I am quite prepared to admit that the State Department has been dilatory in dealing with this subject.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I read further from the letter of the acting Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration:

The suggested proviso would go far beyond this and might require a complete cessation of aid to the whole French Union, a sanction wholly out of proportion to the circumstances. The proposed amendment to the authorizing legislation, which was rejected by the Congress, would have operated to freeze the entire franc counterpart fund. The present proviso is apparently designed with the same sanction in mind. However, presumably in an effort to justify its inclusion in an appropriation bill, it has been recast so as to affect the expenditure of appropriated dollars as well. Hence it might operate to shut off all aid in an effort to insure that no local currency counterpart fund can be created for the ultimate benefit of the French recovery effort. This would be an even more drastic penalty and one directly opposed to the whole spirit and purpose of the Marshall plan.

Mr. President, this amendment is directed at France. France is in the throes of economic recovery. France is in a perilous condition, so far as the world situation is concerned. Surely the Congress does not want to do anything which would adversely affect France in her economic recovery at this particular time. So I hope the amendment will be rejected.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator from Illinois aware that last year I went along with the exact position which is set forth in the letter the Senator from Illinois has been reading, doing so based upon the promises of the State Department and of the ECA that they would correct the situation and that they had the power to correct it?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I know nothing about that, and I do not know whether the State Department has been diligent or has not been diligent.

My point is that if the acting Administrator of the ECA is correct in the letter I have been reading, which he has sent to the Senator from Texas—so far as the amendment is concerned—and I believe he is correct—then if we are going to cripple France at this stage of the game in her economic recovery, by means of adopting an amendment of this kind, we shall be striking a serious blow, in my opinion, against the entire Marshall-plan recovery program.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois—because a year ago I felt that there was some validity to the point made by the State Department—whether he believes that even the ECA Act can set aside a treaty which has been ratified between two sovereign governments, and, of course, in that connection ratified by the Senate of the United States, or whether the Senator believes that any law can set aside a treaty.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not agree at all that a law can set aside a treaty.

But I say, and repeat what I said a moment ago, that regardless of any technical arguments which might be made about the treaty aspect of the case, we are in a rather serious situation. Regardless of any technicalities which might be raised with respect to whether or not a treaty has been violated or has

not been violated, it seems to me that in this case we should rely upon the word of the acting Administrator, when he says definitely that this amendment will injure the recovery program in France. Certainly if we injure the recovery program in France, we shall be doing a disservice to the entire ECA program and shall be impairing it.

This is the time, it seems to me, when we ought to stand firmly back of the ECA program and should defeat amendments which would in anywise cripple it in any part whatever. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] is detained because of attendance at the funeral of a close personal friend and if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—43

Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bricker	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Cordon	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	McCarran	Tydings
Ellender	McClellan	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
George	Martin	Williams
Gillette	Maybank	Young
Gurney	Morse	
Hendrickson	Mundt	

NAYS—29

Anderson	Hayden	McFarland
Benton	Holland	McKellar
Chapman	Humphrey	Magnuson
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Flanders	Kefauver	Pepper
Frear	Kerr	Robertson
Fulbright	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Graham	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Green	Lucas	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Jenner	Schoeppel
Darby	Kilgore	Taylor
Donnell	Long	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McCarthy	Tobey
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ecton	Millikin	Wiley
Hoey	Myers	Withers

So Mr. HICKENLOOPER's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to the committee amendment, which has been printed, and which is lettered "E." I desire to call up the amendment at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 448, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That, during any period during which the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities while carrying out any decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which exports or permits the exportation, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including China and Northern Korea), of any article or commodity usable by, or which may be used in the manufacture of any article or commodity which may be useful to, the armed forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or such satellite countries."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not desire to use all my time now. The amendment has been discussed. If there is to be opposition, I should be glad later to use the time allotted me. If there is no opposition to the amendment, I am ready to vote on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. 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:

Anderson	Bridges	Chapman
Benton	Butler	Chavez
Brewster	Byrd	Connally
Bricker	Capehart	Cordon
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Ecton	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Ellender	Kefauver	O'Conor
Ferguson	Kem	O'Mahoney
Flanders	Kerr	Pepper
Frear	Knowland	Robertson
Fulbright	Langer	Saltonstall
George	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Gillette	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Graham	Lodge	Sparkman
Green	Lucas	Stennis
Gurney	McCarran	Taft
Hayden	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Hendrickson	McFarland	Thye
Hickenlooper	McKellar	Tydings
Hill	Magnuson	Watkins
Holland	Malone	Wherry
Humphrey	Martin	Williams
Ives	Maybank	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HAYDEN. My point of order is that the amendment as offered imposes additional duties on ECA in that it must find that some countries which would be entitled to the benefits of the recovery program are exporting or permitting the exportation to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of any article or commodity which may be useful to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or satellite countries. It would impose a duty upon the Administrator which is not now authorized by law.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Chair rules with reference to the point raised I should like to modify the amendment by inserting in line 10, after the word "including" the word "Communist" so that it will read "Communist China and Northern Korea." The word "Communist" is not now included in the amendment. I should like to modify it in that respect.

Mr. President, is the point of order made by the Senator from Arizona open for consideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is. It lies in the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, section 117 (d) of the basic act provides:

> The Administrator is directed to refuse delivery insofar as practicable to participating countries of commodities which go into the production of any commodity for delivery to any nonparticipating European country which commodity would be refused export licenses to those countries by the United States in the interest of national security. Whenever the Administrator believes that the issuance of a license for the export of any commodity to any country wholly or partly in Europe which is not a participating country is inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of this title, he shall so advise the department, agency, or officer in the executive branch of the Government exercising the authority with respect to such commodity granted to the President by section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, and, if differences of view are

not adjusted by consultation, the matter shall be referred to the President for final decision.

The next section deals with the termination of assistance.

Mr. President, the watchdog committee, on page 16 of its report, stated very emphatically as follows:

The problem confronting Congress is the fact that after nearly 2 years the wholehearted cooperation of the European countries receiving American aid in controlling east-west trade has not been obtained. It presumably could be obtained if section 117 (d) were strengthened by directing the Administrator to withhold economic assistance from all countries which do not satisfy him that they have put into effect controls which prevent shipments of goods to the iron-curtain areas, which the United States itself does not permit.

In this connection it must recognized that this problem might fall more directly into the sphere of the North Atlantic Treaty and its administration. Nevertheless, certain countries receive economic assistance which do not participate in the foreign military-assistance program. The fundamental question then remains as to whether American dollars should go to countries which do not carry out our policies concerning trade with the Soviet-dominated countries.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The argument should go to the point of order, not to the merits.

Mr. WHERRY. I am arguing the point of order, Mr. President. In carrying out the recommendations made by the watchdog committee there is a limitation as to what the money can be spent for if the policy is not carried out. Therefore, it is not legislation in an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to ask the Senator a question.

The watchdog committee report suggests an amendment to the basic act, which has not been ratified by Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. However, I say that that is the basis for this amendment, which is not an affirmative amendment but a limitation upon an appropriation bill, requiring that no assistance be given to countries which do not carry out in principle what is inherent in the basic act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is trying to ask a question on the point of order. Does the Senator concede or does he take the position or is it his opinion that the adoption of the amendment would impose additional duties on the Administrator of the ECA or anyone connected with it?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to hear the Senator on that point.

Mr. WHERRY. That is required under the basic act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator point to the language in the basic act which requires such action?

Mr. WHERRY. Section 117 (d).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator read it again?

Mr. WHERRY. Section 117 (d) provides:

The Administrator is directed to refuse delivery, insofar as practicable, to participating countries of commodities which go into the production of a commodity for delivery to any nonparticipating European country which commodity would be refused export licenses to those countries by the United States in the interest of national security.

The section continues in provision after provision with respect to what the Administrator shall do. It is my opinion that the Administrator has not done it, even though it is provided for in the basic act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Would not those articles be subject to refusal of export licenses?

Mr. WHERRY. The difficulty is not primarily with export licenses issued here. The difficulty is that the Administrator is not requiring the same precaution in export licenses from ECA countries to Russia. Therefore I am asking that the provision of the basic act be carried out insofar as licenses to those countries are concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is undertaking to determine under the basic act which shipments from cooperating countries to noncooperative countries are in such category that export licenses would not be granted for the shipment of those specific article into a noncooperating country.

Mr. WHERRY. The basic provision is that licenses shall be refused by the Administrator for the same articles for which we refuse export licenses in America in direct shipments to Russia or satellite countries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the point regarding which the Chair is making inquiry. What identical articles are involved in this amendment on which our country would not issue export licenses?

Mr. WHERRY. They are all strategic articles, on which a board passes. The Secretary of Commerce sits on that board. The Defense Department is also represented. In the past 6 weeks the board has begun to tighten up on many of these strategic materials, such as oil, which are finding their way into satellite countries.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to point out that in reading the report of the watchdog committee the Senator from Nebraska has indicated that the committee recommended that the basic law be changed or modified, and that is what his amendment seeks to do. In other words, he is seeking to legislate.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is listening to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. The "watchdog committee" clearly indicates that the law as it now stands is not satisfactory to the committee, and that it should be changed. That is what the Senator from Nebraska is trying to do. The law which he quoted states that the Administrator shall, so far as practicable, do certain things. The Senator would specifically require the Administrator to do those things whether he believed them to be practicable or not.

Mr. WHERRY. I respectfully disagree with my colleague from Arizona. I again call attention to the fact that I read the basic act, section 117 (d), which sets forth what we are attempting to do here——

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has read from the report of the "watchdog committee."

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator let me finish? In support of the fact that I felt there was need for this amendment I quoted from the "watchdog committee" report. The Senator from Nebraska knows that a legislative act can be amended. The Senator from Nebraska is not attempting to write legislation into an appropriation bill, any more than the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was attempting to legislate in an appropriation bill. I propose a restriction or a limitation in an appropriation which has been written into the law already.

The Senator from Nebraska is on sound ground so far as the amendment is concerned. If the Senator from Arizona does not agree with it, that is another thing. Certainly the point of order does not lie against my amendment if we proceed on the established precedents. It is restriction on a legislative act, which does not call for affirmative action beyond what is already provided in the act itself. That is the reason I read the act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A limitation on an appropriation, if it changes an existing law or imposes additional duties on an administrative officer, would not necessarily be in order. The question before the Chair is not an easy one to decide. The question before the Chair is whether this restriction imposes any additional duties upon the Administrator of the ECA or any other officer with respect to the satellite countries, the Soviet Union, Communist China, or North Korea.

The Chair would like to take a little time to consult the Parliamentarian with respect to that question, because the Chair is undecided about it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I say a word on the point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The basic act, as read by the Senator from Nebraska, definitely states that the Administrator shall do certain things insofar as practicable. I emphasize the words "insofar as practicable." Under the Senator's amendment the Administrator is directed to do certain things. When that direction or authorization is added to the duties of the Administrator we are giving additional duties to him which he did not have under the basic act. In other words, he can take certain action now, so far as practicable, in connection with the disposition of certain articles from one country to another. The decision is up to him. Under the Senator's amendment the Administrator would be compelled to do certain things whether he wanted to do them or not. Certainly that would involve the imposition of additional duties.

Mr. WHERRY. May I say another word before the Chair makes his decision?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will listen to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I maintain that the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Nebraska narrows the act. The present provisions of section 117 (d) are very much broader than what the junior Senator from Nebraska is attempting to do with his amendment. All that the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska would do would be to withhold funds from countries which have not conformed to the provisions of the basic act with regard to strategic materials only. The basic act is much broader. It applies to all commodities which go into the production of any commodity for delivery, and so forth. All I am asking for is enforcement of the act with respect to strategic materials, because if we cannot get compliance on the broader scale, certainly we want it on strategic materials, because the time is here when all of us ought to be unanimous in directing the Administrator to refuse to permit strategic materials such as oil to be sent to ECA countries and then to be sold by them to satellite countries or to Russia, to be used against our boys. The Senator from Nebraska is narrowing the obligations of the Administrator to apply only to strategic materials. If the Administrator had complied with the provisions of the act there would be no need for the amendment of the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word on the question of the limitation. It is fundamental that a limitation is purely negative. It cannot direct, it cannot enlarge, it cannot change the responsibilities or the duties of the administrator under the original provision. So that if the pending amendment in any wise adds to the duties or the obligations of the Administrator, it is out of order. That is all I care to say.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The basic act provides that the ECA Administrator shall act "so far as practicable." That gives him discretion to determine whether it is practicable to supply to the countries concerned goods which may be exported by them to nonparticipating countries and used for the manufacture of arms or supplies which might be useful to them in any conflict with us. That is the effect of it.

The amendment probably requires the ECA Administrator to be a little more alert in carrying out that duty. The Chair thinks that the basic Act would prevent him from providing any assistance to a country which shipped or permitted the shipment of any goods to Russia or a satellite country which might be used by them in any military operation against us. That gives the Administrator considerable discretion and latitude, whereas the amendment probably restricts his discretion, and makes it more mandatory for him to do these things.

The Chair does not see any "fatal infirmity," as Chief Justice Hughes once described a law on which he was passing, between the amendment and the basic law, and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Five minutes may be used by any Senator who desires to speak against the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

The Senator for Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—33

Brewster	George	Malone
Bricker	Gillette	Martin
Bridges	Hendrickson	Morse
Butler	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Byrd	Ives	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cordon	Kem	Taft
Dworshak	Knowland	Watkins
Ecton	Langer	Wherry
Ferguson	McCarran	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Young

NAYS—39

Anderson	Hill	Magnuson
Benton	Holland	Maybank
Chapman	Humphrey	Murray
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Douglas	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Ellender	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Lehman	Sparkman
Graham	Lodge	Stennis
Green	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	McFarland	Thye
Hayden	McKellar	Tydings

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Jenner	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Darby	Long	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McMahon	Tobey
Eastland	Millikin	Vandenberg
Hoey	Myers	Wiley
Hunt	Neely	Withers

So Mr. WHERRY's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "B" of July 28, 1950, to the committee amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 448, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the period at the end of the sentence and insert in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided further,* That in carrying out the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, the President shall encourage the cooperating nations to forgive indebtedness incurred with one another during World War II, or to delay payments on such indebtedness for so long a period as United States assistance shall be required for the debtor nation."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I will take 3½ minutes of my 5 minutes myself.

During World War II the United States Government extended $48,700,000,000 in grants and credits to its allies, the major portion of which was in lend-lease.

In the same period other nations extended minor credits to allied nations to carry out the successful prosecution of the war.

The United States looks for repayment of only minor sums out of the vast amount of World War II aid extended. Where it seeks repayment at all, it has been most willing to grant indefinite delay so as to occasion no hardship to former allies.

As we now undertake economic aid and the rearming of several nations in the mutual-defense assistance program, this Nation finds that some of the receiving nations are saddled with relatively heavy debts incurred during World War II for military supplies.

Great Britain, for instance, extended aid to the Netherlands, France, Greece, and Turkey during World War II. Now it seeks repayment of these wartime loans. Other nations, likewise, extended World War II credits.

It would seem only just that repayment of World War II indebtedness should be postponed during such time as the United States is called upon to equip debtor nations with military supplies or furnish economic aid.

The nations that have been aided so generously by the United States Government ought now to be lenient to nations that contracted military debts in the last war.

Repayment of World War II military debts at this time may retard the recovery of a debtor nation or delay military preparedness needed now.

Turkey, for instance, owes Great Britain approximately £30,000,000. This amount is not large in the British economy. It represents a major obligation in terms of the Turkish economy. The gold reserves of Turkey have been drawn

down from approximately $208,000,000 in 1947 to approximately $165,000,000 today. We are called on to aid Turkey, both through ECA and through military assistance.

At the same time we are aiding Great Britain.

It seems to me that in carrying out the provisions of economic assistance or of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 we ought to encourage the forgiveness or postponement of World War II debts contracted between participating nations because, in the end, the money comes from the United States, anyway.

This amendment does not direct the President to take any action that would interfere in any way with the sovereignty of other nations. It does not require him to impose any intolerable burden upon any other nation. It only expresses the sense of Congress that he should encourage nations receiving our aid to lessen the load which debtor nations carry today because of credits extended during the wartime period.

In effect the amendment merely asks the President to use his good offices to see if this can be brought about. I think it is a sound thing because, if we are aiding Turkey, and she owes money to Great Britain, and if Great Britain is pressing Turkey for collection, then certainly the money will come out of the United States both ways.

Therefore, I think the amendment is very sound.

I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the views expressed by the Senator from New Hampshire, pointing out that this is not a mandate on the part of the Senate, but this is an effort on our part by amendment which asks the President to encourage our associates in ECA to give the same kind of treatment to other countries in the Marshall-plan program with regard to World War II indebtedness that we in the United States ourselves are extending to our associates in the Marshall-plan program. It seems to me that is simply injecting an element of realism into this whole business. The amendment simply assures that each of the members of the Marshall-plan program shall receive the same consideration from other creditor countries as the United States, in turn, has extended to such creditor nations as are debtor nations, insofar as our own books are concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to the point of concluding my sentence.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield the next half minute to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as I view the amendment I see in it only a direction for cooperation. It is quite in the spirit of all the things we are trying to do with our allies and our friends the world over. I think the amendment is entitled to the support of every Member of this body.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hardly know what the amendment means. I do not, of course, intend to cast any reflection on my friend from New Hampshire. It seems to require the President to do something which is certainly not in order on this appropriation bill, as I believe, and I make a point of order against it. The idea of our asking other nations to forgive each other their debts is remarkable indeed. Such a provision certainly ought not to be on an appropriation bill which authorizes so much money to be given to other nations. By this bill we are appropriating money for certain foreign nations. The Senator's amendment would ask other nations to forgive debts owing to them. How can we ever expect to collect any of the money we have loaned other nations or given to other nations after we make a statement such as is proposed by the amendment? It seems to me the amendment is subject to a point of order. If it is not subject to a point of order, it ought to be voted down, and I hope it will be voted down, and not put in the bill.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator understands, does he not, that we are advancing money to Turkey for economic aid and military aid, for example. If Turkey is being forced by Great Britain to pay old war debts, similar to war debts owing to us and such as we have in large part forgiven, it will only mean that we will be furnishing money to Great Britain, and then she will get more money by siphoning off some we provide for Turkey. The amendment does not direct the President to do anything. It simply asks him to use his good offices to stop demands for payments owing to them.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator feels as he does with respect to forgiveness of debt, why does he not introduce a bill covering that point? Why does he propose to hang such an amendment onto this appropriation bill? It seems to me the amendment is out of place in every sense of the word. I believe it is not in order on an appropriation bill, and I hope the Chair will hold that it is not in order. If the Chair does not hold that it is not in order, I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order. The amendment does not limit the appropriation carried in the bill. But it does issue a direction to the President of the United States to encourage the cooperating nations to forgive indebtedness incurred with one another during World War II, or to delay the payments of such indebtedness so long as we are furnishing money to any of these countries. Presumably the President could by negotiation, by taking up an issue of that sort with the other nations, encourage them to do that thing. But he is not required to do it. It is entirely within his own judgment as to whether or not he shall undertake it.

This amendment says he shall do it; therefore, he is directed by the amendment to proceed with negotiations with all these countries, to see whether they will forgive the indebtedness to them by other countries or postpone its payment.

The Chair thinks that amounts to issuing to the President of the United States a directive that is not contemplated by any present law. Therefore the point of order is sustained.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in order to be consistent, I appeal from the Chair's decision on the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.]

The "ayes" appear to have it; the "ayes" have it, and the Chair's ruling on the point of order is sustained.

The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I call up the amendment to the committee amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 448 of the committee amendment, before the period in line 24, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which, in the opinion of the President, has failed, refused, or neglected to support the United Nations in the Korean war by supplying armed personnel, materials of war, or services."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this amendment to the committee amendment is very plain in its purpose and in its direction. Today we are in a war. It may be called a police action; but to the men who are fighting and dying over there in Korea, trying to stop that Communist aggression and conquest, it is war. Officially it is a war of the United Nations, but with the United States doing the fighting. That is the situation up to this hour.

Other members of the United Nations have been called upon to furnish assistance in fighting personnel, materials, and services. Some of them have most modestly responded; others have done nothing as yet to assist. There has not been up to now the enthusiastic response and support which is necessary and that we have the right to expect and demand.

I do not believe we should be expected to spend millions of dollars, nor should we tolerate it, to build up the economy of any country participating in the ECA program if that country is able and should fail or refuse, as a member of the United Nations, to furnish either fighting personnel, war materials, or services in this conflict.

This amendment to the committee amendment simply provides that if any country participating in and a recipient of ECA founds fails, refuses, or neglects to furnish either fighting personnel, war materials, or services, then, when such country fails to do so, if in the President's opinion that country could do so,

the President in his discretion can stop the spending of ECA funds in that country and for that government.

Mr. President, that should be done. That is all the amendment to the committee amendment provides. It is not compulsory; it leaves the matter to the discretion of the President of the United States.

Someone has said, "We ought not say that now out loud; that we should tell them that in a whisper when we give them the money."

Well, Mr. President, let us tell it to them now in the language of this bill. Let us whisper it loud enough so that when the President says, "Give us some help," these countries will know that the Congress of the United States is back of the President, giving him our moral support, and that the Congress and the people of this Nation do not want this ECA money—which is appropriated by us to help in the fight against communism—to be spent in countries which will not, when the crisis, the real test comes, stand up and be counted in the fight against communism.

That is all there is to the amendment.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield 1 minute to the junior Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish enthusiastically to support and endorse in full the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment.

The battle call has already been sounded; it was sounded more than a month ago. Our men are actually fighting and dying on the battle line. The blue-and-white flag of the United Nations has been unfurled, representing a new forward step in international affairs. However, we are the only country whose men are actually fighting and giving their blood and dying on the battle line.

The operation of the amendment will not be arbitrary, for it leaves discretion with the President. There is plenty of time to put the amendment into operation, and there is plenty of time for these nations to have advance notice.

It seems to me that this is the test; this is it.

All these years we have been charged with having been the cause of the failure of the League of Nations. Now we have taken a leading part in the United Nations, and today we are on the battle line.

So it seems to me that this is the test; and no one who is acting in good faith in connection with the recovery program can object to this step.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to endorse wholeheartedly the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment.

Today we have a new kind of citizenship—citizenship in the United Nations. Every member of the United Nations is in effect a citizen of the United Nations, and in time of war they can be classified only one way or the other: they are either for the new nation of which they are a citizen or they are against it. In a case of this sort, when a country gives aid and comfort to the enemy, that country is guilty of treason, to all effects and purposes.

I think the time has come when the people of the United States, through their Senate and their House of Representatives, should speak and be heard as advising the President that we expect that the citizens of the United Nations, the members of the United Nations, will take either one side or the other in the great conflict now going on in Korea, the aggression of the North Koreans against the South Koreans. In this conflict, all nations who are members of the United Nations must demonstrate that they are either for or against the United Nations. Those who give aid and comfort against the United Nations are in effect themselves guilty of acts of aggression. They should not be given aid by the United States of America when we are trying to fight communism not only in Korea but in other parts of the world.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the amendment, I ask that it be again stated by the clerk, so that all Senators will understand it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas wants the amendment again stated by the clerk, and I yield that much time—if it does not take all the remaining time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will restate the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 448, before the period in line 24, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: *"Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which, in the opinion of the President, has failed, refused, or neglected to support the United Nations in the Korean War by supplying armed personnel, materials of war, or services."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Arkansas would be willing to let the amendment go to conference, to be considered there. I think it is subject to a point of order, but if the Senator is willing to let it go to conference, we will accept it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the able Senator. Of course, it will have to go to conference, and I am perfectly willing that it go to conference. But I hope it will be retained in this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that the amendment is subject to a point of order. However, the Senator from Illinois will not raise the point. I do not raise it because I am confident that the Senator from Arkansas, in this amendment, is facing in the right direction so far as the United Nations organization is concerned, and insofar as all men who believe in the free way of life are concerned.

I should like to advise the Senate that, at the first meeting we had with the President of the United States, the Cabinet, and high members of the military, the Army and the Navy, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and I, at that very first meeting, advocated this very thing. We thought it was very necessary that all nations partiicpating in the United Nations organization show their good will and their intention of going along with us by doing something along this line. Since that time, the nations have indicated their willingness to help, and I think it is a source of something really worth while for the United Nations and the free world to have all these nations doing something which they can do for the free world, something which indicates that they are with us in this fight. That is what the Senator from Arkansas is aiming to accomplish, by giving the President the power to do the things enumerated.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely want the other countries to know that we are furnishing this money, and that the eyes of America are upon them. We want to know whether they are ready to stand up and be counted to the extent of their ability, whenever a crisis comes. If not, I do not favor spending time or money with them.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LUCAS. In a moment. I should like to make a further observation with respect to certain countries sending military and other forms of aid. We must realize, when we think of the 59 nations of different languages and different types of munitions, and so forth, so far as military aid from them is concerned, it could become a liability rather than an asset. At the same time, they can furnish materials or articles that will be of aid in connection with this crisis. They could send troops, even though they could not speak our language, to be used for example in bringing out those who are wounded, or for certain kinds of field duty, or to do something in the rear of the front lines, so far as menial services are concerned. I think that is what the American people desire.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what we want.

Mr. LUCAS. This is a step in the right direction, and I certainly shall not object to it.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Illinois says there have been promises and expectations held out. Will the Senator be more specific? We have promises, but the only things that are definite I think are that Turkey is sending, or offering to send, 4,500 trained combat troops; Thailand, 4,000 soldiers; and Bolivia, 30 officers.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know what 30 officers from Bolivia could do in Korea.

Mr. STENNIS. I am not referring particularly to them. But let us be as specific as we can as to what has actually been put on the line, or sent, or

representations made that it will be sent at any particular time.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that England is now preparing to send 6,000 infantrymen, engineers, and artillery. They will all be foot soldiers. It is my understanding Australia is sending foot soldiers, and that another nation is probably sending some.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I shall yield in a moment. I am now quoting from memory, but I know that there are countries which have expressed a willingness to do what is being suggested here. The more we can discuss it and the more the Congress becomes interested in such a program, the better it will be for our own country, and the better for all the peoples concerned.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator think that the subject ought to be debated more at length, and that it is unfortunate when it comes up under the 10-minute rule?

Mr. LUCAS. I might debate it at great length, and go along with everything said in furtherance of it. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

ASSISTANCE FROM AUSTRALIA—EDITORIAL FROM THE SYDNEY DAILY TELEGRAPH

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I received by air mail from Australia an editorial which appeared in one of the leading Australian papers. I think it is a splendid editorial. It points up what the people of Australia should do. They should back up the United States, now that the United States is asking for support in the United Nations, or through the United Nations organization. And, Mr. President, because the discussion relates directly to what nations should do in support of the United Nations and the United States in this Korean crisis, it seems to me that this editorial would be very timely, if it were permitted to be printed in the body of the RECORD as part of the discussion of this over-all question. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

LISTEN, MR. MENZIES! OLD FRIENDS ARE CALLING FOR HELP

If the gentlemen in Canberra have the vaguest idea of this nation's best interest, they will announce, without any more beating about the bush, that Australia will support the hard-pressed Americans in Korea with a division of land troops and more squadrons of fighting planes.

The reasons why we should give this aid, without hedging, should be obvious to every Australian who remembers how we felt in 1941 when this country lay wide open to invasion.

If the Americans are swept out of Korea and Formosa the Russian front will be triumphant throughout Asia.

Whatever friends we have still on the Asiatic Continent will desert us.

Then Australia will be far out on a lonely limb.

UNO and collective security—the alliance of free peoples—will die.

And the first nation to suffer from that death will be white Australia.

Of all nations, this one depends on the aid of others—and especially on American aid.

What saved us from battle on our soil and conquent in the last war except American help?

Not a thing.

Can we expect similar help again—as we will certainly need it again—if we let the Koreans murder Americans in another Dunkerque without doing everything we can to help avert so terrible a disaster?

The Americans are closely watching all the peoples who have given flowery lip-service to UNO in the last few years and have received in return generous United States aid.

If these peoples sit on the sidelines now, while Americans die in an outnumbered struggle, many American people will argue that they would be wiser to spend their money on themselves and let the rest of the world sink.

That might be a foolish, emotional reaction in the long run, but it would be understandable.

We are told that some British people enjoy the spectacle of Americans fighting while Britain for once is at peace.

That is a stupid satisfaction, which is likely to be very short-lived.

For only one thing keeps Britain or any of us at peace at this moment—Russia's fear of American industrial strength backing up a solid British-American front.

Those who crow over the United States' embarrassment in Korea are helping to smash that front—a job on which Moscow has spent millions of her propaganda funds.

They would have their happiest day of all time at the Kremlin if the Korean struggle ended with Americans feeling that Britain and her Dominions had let Americans down.

For that would damage the only military and political combination which may draw a line to Russian ambitions.

To forestall this blow to our friendship with the United States we and the rest of the British Commonwealth must show that we are prepared to give as freely and as generously as we expect Americans to give when we are in difficulties.

This is a moment for action which counts only the needs of our friend.

If we let that friend call to us in vain now we can expect no answer to our own appeals when our time comes to face the yellow flood.

PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA TO VISIT THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact, since Australia has been mentioned, that tomorrow, at 2 or 2:15, the Prime Minister of Australia is to be the guest of the Senate, and is to deliver a brief address. The Chair hopes all Senators will be present to greet the Prime Minister, who is in this country to confer with our Government regarding the nature and extent of the assistance Australia may give in the Korean situation.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may have one additional minute.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this same question was raised in the committee, and we were told by those from the Department of Defense that there was a parallel situation in a number of countries, that is to say, that the President or the Premier could not commit his country without referring the matter to the legislature, and that that was going on all the time. Reports have been made that help will come, but the announcement could not be made at this time, because the legislatures of the countries had not approved it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator, I think, is correct about that. It will require some time. In other words, we happened to have our troops in Japan, nearby. We are sending them, and also, of course, some from this country. But other countries are sending troops, and they are on the way, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has again expired. All time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] to the committee amendment.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has been accepted by the committee. [Putting the question.] The amendment is agreed to. The committee amendment is still open to amendment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment offered by me may be read at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In chapter X–B, it is proposed to strike out all after line 3, on page 447, down to and including line 17; and, at the proper place in chapter XI, insert an amount equal to the sum stricken from the chapter X–B, to be used for defense purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

SUGGESTED 10-POINT PROGRAM FOR WINNING THE WAR

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, no one believes that the $10,400,000,000 currently requested by the President is anything but a start. However, the President has not yet outlined what is involved in the police action which he inaugurated without requesting the approval of Congress, except through additional appropriations.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada is suggesting a 10-point program and an outline for emergency procedure. Only one amendment is needed. The remaining nine can be brought about through Executive order.

First, transfer ECA funds to the war chest.

Second, stop the pressure from our State Department to recognize Communist China.

Third, stop Marshall-plan countries from arming Russia and her satellites.

Fourth, call on England and France to cancel their separate nonaggression pacts with Russia.

Fifth, reduce our domestic Government budget by 20 percent and add

three and one-half billion dollars to the war chest.

Sixth, transfer to the war chest the $500,000,000 available for domestic peacetime public works.

Seventh, transfer to the war chest the one and one-fourth billion dollars available for military assistance to foreign countries and unify our military efforts.

Eighth, remove from the State Department Dean Acheson and his satellites.

Ninth, establish a definite foreign policy, describe the areas, and name the nations whose integrity we must currently protect for our own ultimate safety, and notify the world and our own people what we mean to protect.

Tenth, appropriate the necessary funds to build a national-defense organization, spearheaded by an Air Corps and a submarine fleet that will be notice to the world and to our own people that we can enforce our commitments.

Mr. President, supporting the 10-point program, I submit the following:

First. Transfer ECA funds to the war chest. ECA assistance for building up European peacetime industry was to be a peacetime endeavor. While we must pay for a new war, our people cannot be expected to carry the burden of 16 foreign countries on their backs.

Second. Stop pressure from our State Department to recognize Communist China. My fellow Senators will recall that Mr. Acheson told us that the United States would not use its veto power to block United Nations' recognition of the Communist regime in China. Apparently, this was the last official act on the part of our State Department before the Soviets started their attack on South Korea. We cannot, with any degree of consistency, fight communism on the one hand and recognize it on the other.

Third. Stop the 16 Marshall plan countries from arming Russia and her satellites through the 96 trade treaties which have been made between those countries. We should take every reasonable means to see to it that the 96 trade treaties are canceled immediately.

NINETY-SIX TRADE TREATIES WITH RUSSIA AND IRON-CURTAIN COUNTRIES

The 16 Marshall plan, ECA nations, have 96 important trade treaties with Soviet Russia and such iron curtain countries shipping them everything they need to consolidate their gains and to make war.

Both England and India, through their spokesmen, Bevin and Nehru, have said that they intended to remain neutral, they wanted to trade with Russia and the Communist countries.

Now, these same nations, erstwhile allies, and other nations, have recognized Communist China without consulting this Nation, at least without the American people being informed, thus leading us into a foreign policy not only distasteful but which may be definitely dangerous.

Therefore, it is high time that the State Department discharge their constitutional responsibility and make up their mind and inform the American people and the Congress of the United States just what our foreign policy should be before it is too late. It is later than we think.

A list of the 96 trade treaties which the 16 Marshall plan countries has made and which are in good standing at this time will be found on pages 818 and 819, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1950.

Fourth. Call on England and France to cancel forthwith their nonaggression pacts with Soviet Russia. It is time for the countries which we have befriended to choose sides.

NONAGGRESSION PACTS

I shall quote briefly from a nonaggression pact signed by Anthony Eden, representing Britain, and V. Molotov, representing Communist Russia. This treaty, signed by these two men representing their respective countries of Britain and Russia, which is still in full force and effect, contained two significant articles. Article 6 in the Soviet-Britain Pact provides:

> The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

Article 7 reads:

> Each high contracting party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party.

Mr. President, those provisions read startlingly like the North Atlantic Pact. Since they have pacts now with both the Soviet Empire and the United States of America, it is difficult to see how they could lose in any emergency which might occur later. They have signed up with both Russia and the United States.

In the treaty signed by Mr. Molotov, again, and Mr. Bidault, representing France, which was signed in Moscow, the two articles corresponding with the two just read taken from the British Empire and the Russian Empire treaty, are article 5 and article 6. Article 5 of the French-Russian nonaggression pact reads:

> The high contracting parties undertake not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against either of the high contracting parties.

Article 6 reads:

> The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war.

Mr. President, both these nonaggression pacts are in full force and effect. All the 95 trade treaties mentioned in the debate today are in full force and effect, meaning that the parties are continuing at all times to send all the material necessary not only to Russia to consolidate her gains in eastern Europe and in Communist China, and to make war quietly and secretly, as they have in the past in China and Indochina and the Malayan States and the rest of the Far East, but they are sending them material to make war on the United States of America, if they have that idea in their minds. The State Department and the bipartisan group in this body sold that idea, that Russia was and is our potential enemy, thoroughly to the United States Senate during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and all through the second session of the Eighty-eighth Congress.

Fifth. Reduce our strictly domestic Government budget by 20 percent and transfer the amount saved to the war chest. This would not take one penny from national defense, the stockpiling of atomic energy, veterans' aid, or interest on the public debt. It would simply reduce by 20 percent the domestic spending which is in no way connected with those items. Let us look at our budget for the current fiscal year:

National defense	$13,545,000,000
Veterans' services and benefits	6,080,000,000
Interest on public debt	5,625,000,000
Remaining	17,189,000,000
Total	42,439,000,000

We would save $3,500,000,000 by reducing the seventeen-billion item by 20 percent. It has been pointed out by the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Virginia how a saving of more than this could easily be made on our domestic spending.

The administration says the people must tighten their belts. Speaking of curbs for civilians, how about some curbs for the Government as well? If ordinary citizens must cut down on butter in favor of guns, why not render some lard out of the bureaucratic jobs also?

Another Member of this body from across the aisle, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, able chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, called attention to the fact that the administration could easily tighten its belt. In his report, the senior Senator from Arkansas warned that "this tremendous rising cost—of government—is indicative of a fixed permanent trend that cannot be ignored or remain unchallenged." And he added that this provides a "warning of compelling force against our proceeding with reckless indifference to enact more and more laws expanding present governmental services and instigating new programs creating additional governmental obligations that will add billions annually to the already swollen costs of government."

The necessity of more economy in government is greater now than it was then.

The 1951 budget still covers up much of the waste, duplication, payroll padding, and inefficiencies exposed by the Hoover Commission, Byrd committee and other survey agencies in their numerous reports. These add up to billions of dollars of possible savings. All in all there is room for economizing if the Congress has the guts to do it.

Sixth. Transfer to the war chest the one-half billion dollars available for domestic peacetime public works. Worthy as are our peacetime public works, our taxpayers cannot be expected to pay the cost or furnish the necessary manpower during the war emergency. In wartime such works are unnecessary, and in fact, undesirable. Our money and our manhours should be devoted to the war effort. This five hundred million should be transferred to the military program.

Seventh. Transfer to the war chest the one and one-fourth billion dollars available for military assistance to foreign countries. Our own expanded military program must be upon a basis of defending the nations whose integrity is important to our ultimate safety. Our military efforts, however, should be unified. Otherwise we might very well be delivering arms to areas which will fall into the hands of our enemies. Countries which we have been arming have shown little concern for our present predicament and are still sending potential war materials to Russia and her satellites.

Eighth. Remove from the State Department Dean Acheson and his satellites who were responsible for the bungling in foreign policy which brought this country to its present plight. It is imperative that we remove these men before other serious mistakes are made.

There are many well-informed people who believe that the primary aim of Stalin and his Politburo in the Kremlin is the economic destruction of the United States, that war with America is secondary and an alternative that will be avoided, if possible, and postponed as long as possible if it is unavoidable. The view in the Kremlin is that the capitalistic United States is the keystone to the entire capitalistic system, and that if that keystone can be brought down, the whole western economic system in Europe, in North and South America, and what is left of it in Asia and Africa will crash.

The spearpoint of Soviet Russian political, ideological, economic, and military strategy to attain this objective, according to well-informed people who hold this belief, is continual war alarms on the world-encircling front of American commitments, calling for ever-increasing appropriations of vast sums of money in the United States for armaments and war preparations, and in Britain, France, Greece, Turkey, Persia, and other countries dependent upon America for economic and financial aid and military support.

Stalin's orders are reported to be to bring about the collapse of America's capitalistic economy through war alarms, enormous appropriations calling for ever higher taxes, dislocation and disruption of normal business, and ever-increasing demands by other countries dependent on American financing for aid and armaments, thus building up gigantic national debts.

In Washington the administration is unwittingly playing Stalin's game today, just as it has done since the day of unconditional surrender.

In war, the side which holds the initiative to determine the time and place of action has a tremendous advantage over the foe. In the present war in Korea, the initiative is held by Soviet Russia, which can determine the time and place of action. Korea, Formosa, French Indochina, Hongkong, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, Germany—any of these might have been selected as the arena of battle. Any of these places might be chosen for the next battle in a prolonged, costly and irritating war.

The Russian holds the initiative because, in a word, at Yalta and Potsdam, Russia's initiative was confirmed, and more recently it has been strengthened in the persistent effort of Great Britain, India, and the State Department to have Soviet China recognized by the UN.

Now, another point in regard to the blunders of Acheson and his satellites:

It is announced now that President Truman is seeking a big war stockpile of strategic war materials. Had the State Department had a little foresight, this pushing of stock piling would not have waited until now. As a matter of fact, the State Department's foreign-trade policy has shut down approximately 70 percent of the American mines which were producing strategic war minerals.

On the Senate floor, on March 7 of this year, the junior Senator from Nevada read an obituary notice on five strategic metals—mercury, antimony, tungsten, manganese and chromite—essential in peacetime and doubly essential in wartime—the production of which ceased as a direct result of State Department foreign-trade policy.

The administration would like for everyone to overlook the civilian blunders by Truman's Secretary of State Dean Acheson which left the professional fighting leaders hamstrung and drained of resources when the administration reversed itself suddenly and told the military to defend an area which the White House and the State Department had formally declared would not be defended.

In the American intervention in Korea, under the circumstances it occurred, it seems to me that administration policy overrode the sound judgment of the American Chiefs of Staff. Generals, admirals, soldiers, airmen and seamen are expected to make good the blunders of statesmen.

American boys are paying the penalty in bloodshed in Korea today because of incompetence and lack of foresight on the part of our State Department. We can charge to the State Department the agreement concerning Berlin which did not provide for egress or ingress by western power personnel. We can also charge the State Department with the handing over of Manchuria to Soviet Russia. We can charge to the State Department the steps leading to the Korean situation. The people responsible for the foreign policy have been weak or worse. If we are to win this war and regain our prestige in the world, these persons must be removed.

Ninth. Establish a definite foreign policy.

(a) We should determine the areas in the world—in Europe, Africa, Asia, the South Seas, and the Western Hemisphere—which are important to our ultimate safety. We should determine the countries whose integrity is important to us. For 127 years the Monroe Doctrine has worked. This Nation decided 127 years ago that the integrity of the Western Hemisphere was important to us. Now, apparently, the integrity of other areas is important to us. Let Government officials in whom the people have confidence decide what those areas are.

(b) We should name all such areas and all countries so that everyone will know exactly what we will fight to protect. This will give us a good chance to stay out of trouble. Our own people are entitled to know what we are fighting for. The general opinion today is that Russia would not have started the Korean push if the Kremlin had known we would fight to protect the Republic of Korea.

(c) We should build a defense organization, spearheaded by an air corps and submarine fleet of such strength that the world will realize we can enforce our pronouncements.

Now, a little late, the administration approved universal military training. The junior Senator from Nevada introduced a bill calling for universal military training 2 years ago, and the bill was buried in an administration-controlled committee. Now, after a little fifth-rate country gives the United States one defeat after another, the administration wakes up to the need of the very thing they chose previously to ignore.

There has been stupidity all along.

Out in Korea young Americans, lacking adequate arms, training, and reinforcements, are being killed. And they are not being helped a bit by those who chose to ignore the bill for universal military training.

As the junior Senator from Nevada stated when introducing the bill:

> Universal training offers the only method through which we could insure a sufficient number and dispersal of trained military manpower without overburdening the country's economy through the maintenance of a huge standing Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

He also suggested that our young men should be trained for their own survival when the emergency arrives.

Tenth. Mr. President, I will close with a brief reference to the enormous amount of money we have appropriated for national defense. Where did the forty-eight and one-half billion dollars go? Since the close of World War II Congress has appropriated forty-eight and one-half billion dollars for national defense, and yet we meet ignominious defeat at the hands of little Korea. What was the forty-eight and one-half billion supposed to provide for us? Surely something better than we seem to have.

Let me read to you a brief editorial which appeared in the July 27 edition of the New York Journal-American:

> THE ADMINISTRATION'S DUTY
>
> President Truman is asking Congress to provide $10,486,976,000 in new military funds, and to meet part of the requisition by levying $5,000,000,000 in new or increased taxes.
>
> The President wants the $10,000,000,000 because, as the little war in Korea suddenly demonstrated, our national defense is inadequate, although we have expended in 4 years of peace $50,000,000,000 for military purposes.
>
> Our unreadiness to meet promptly a so-called police action in an area as limited as South Korea indicates that the administration has made no wise use of the immense funds it has already had.
>
> So the administration wants more money to do what it should have done before.

And, of course, Congress will assign the funds, if no better way can be found.

But there is a better way—or at least one that should have priority.

For how has it happened that the administration now calls for war taxes to meet its military needs?

Actually, we have continued on a war-tax basis all during the peace—or cold-war—period.

The excise war taxes have never been repealed or reduced.

The personal income and corporation taxes have remained at high levels.

Payroll taxes still flow into the Treasury.

Consequently, new war taxes must be added to the war taxes already in effect, which have been retained ever since the last war ceased.

This happens partly because of the New Deal's gross mismanagement of defense expenditures.

It happens more largely because of the New Deal's extravagant expenditures for nonmilitary purposes.

Obviously—and in view of the administration's current deficit—the primary defense need is to eliminate all unnecessary expenditures and put to defense uses the sums retrieved.

If this be done, no tax increase would be justifiable at this time, since the administration would have in hand the $5,000,000,000 which it seeks in new taxes.

If the job were well done, the administration might have even the whole $10,000,000,000 desired for military requirements—and perhaps enough besides to balance the budget.

Until the administration is willing to make some political sacrifices for the national security, its demands for sacrifices by the public are made with very ill grace.

HOW TO SAVE $8,250,000,000 FOR THE WAR CHEST

(a) Suspend ECA, a peacetime endeavor, save $3,000,000,000.

(b) Suspend domestic peacetime public works, save $500,000,000.

(c) Suspend 20 percent of civil Government spending, save $3,500,000,000.

(d) Suspend extra foreign military assistance, save $1,250,000,000.

Total savings, $8,250,000,000.

There is no valid reason for gouging the people to build up peacetime economy in Europe and finance domestic peacetime projects here while we are on a wartime basis. Economy is a much sounder method of meeting the increased military costs than burdening the American people with more taxes.

Let us put our own house in order, and properly prepare to win this and any other war forced upon us. The nine points which I have listed and discussed gives us a winning program.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask for the approval of the entire committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That entire matter is to be voted on as a whole——

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Chair will pardon me, ordinarily with an appropriation bill we vote paragraph by paragraph. We have now considered the first paragraph which relates to economic cooperation. The next paragraph relates to assistance to Korea.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the whole chapter is considered as one amendment, to be voted on as a single amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was not my understanding. I ask unanimous consent that for the purposes of amendment the entire chapter be considered as original text. If it were original text in the bill we would adopt it paragraph by paragraph. I think that is the orderly way in which to dispose of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent that the entire committee amendment be considered as the text of the bill for purposes of amendment, which means there would be a difference in degree of amendments which would be offered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Reserving the right to object, what effect would that have on the amendment which I desire to offer at this time? I should like to have permission to have it passed upon first.

Mr. HAYDEN. When that page of the bill is reached, which is page 451, the Senator can offer his amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would it be in order after the request of the Senator is agreed to?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not making such a request now. I thought it would be more orderly to proceed paragraph by paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement heretofore made, the whole chapter is open for amendment as a single paragraph.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I be recognized for 1 minute, under the unanimous-consent agreement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an amendment pending. Under the agreement, there is no provision for general remarks. The Senator will be recognized on the committee amendment itself.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which applies to page 451 of the bill, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 451, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$26,900,000"; on page 451, line 18, after "any project", insert "except for demonstration or instructional purposes"; on page 451, lines 19 and 20, strike out "(not to exceed 10 per centum)."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Was there not an amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and was it acted upon?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was rejected.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the danger which faces us has already forced us to take such unusual steps as to mobilize manpower and industry and to shed American blood in Korea. But there are other measures which we must take which would have seemed equally unusual a few months ago.

There is first the entrance into the Atlantic Pact of two former neutrals of World War II—Ireland and Spain, which are both Atlantic nations possessing strategic terrain and valuable manpower. The State Department should use its good offices to promote whatever adjustments are necessary between these nations and their neighbors so that they can help the rest of the non-Communist world to carry the load.

Looming even larger is the policy to be followed toward the two former enemies of World War II, Germany and Japan. It is no exaggeration to say that the fate of these nations is a life-and-death matter for the United States, for, if the Soviets captured Germany and Japan they would possess such a huge industrial potential that they might think they could destroy the United States.

We are deeply grateful to the nations which have realized that this fight is their fight and which have sent troops to Korea. We must also recognize that it is unfair to us and to these free nations to carry the whole load of combat alone. The former neutrals—and even the former enemies—of World War II must help in this struggle for survival of human freedom. It is only fair that they bear part of the burden since their own existence is also in danger.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I shall not want more than a quarter of a minute.

Mr. President, I want to state that I believe the last amendment the Senate adopted is one of the most important amendments which has come up during the discussion of the bill. I am 100 percent for it, and I hope that in conference it will be insisted upon by the Senate conferees and will be retained in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, by direction of the Appropriations Committee, I wish to call up two more amendments dealing with page 451 of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's amendment has already been stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say that the amendment increases the appropriation for point 4, and I hope it will be adopted. The Committee on Appropriations, so far as I recall, virtually unanimously instructed me to offer the amendment.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Tennessee has offered the amendment. I favored the amendment in the commit-

tee. I was in favor of a lower amount, but was voted down with reference to that. I am certainly glad that the committee is in favor of the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, with that statement, I leave the matter to the Senate, and ask for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 461 under the heading "Aid to Palestine Refugees." The amendment proposes on page 461, line 22, to strike out "$24,705,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$27,450,000", which is the budget estimate and the amount authorized by law. In this instance the reduction took place exactly in the same manner as heretofore recited by me with respect to the reduction in the ECA appropriation. It was an arbitrary 10-percent cut in the amount of money for which the budget had asked and for which the committee had at first voted, but subsequently reduced by 10 percent. The people affected are the Arabs who were driven out of Palestine in the course of the war. It seems to me that the cut of $2,745,000 is too drastic. In view of the pitiable condition of these people I think the Senate should restore the amount which was authorized by law and provided for in the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute with respect to contributions of armed aid in Korea by United Nations members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey that he be recognized for 1 minute? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, under date of July 27, 1950, I had a compilation prepared showing the armed aid in Korea by United Nations members. The question was discussed this afternoon in connection with an amendment which had been offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I ask that the memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Armed aid in Korea by United Nations members

	Ground forces	Air forces	Naval forces
Australia	"Ground troops"—particulars undecided	1 fighter squadron, in Japan when war began; now in action.	1 destroyer, 1 frigate—both in action.
Belgium		Air transport, quantity unknown; should be active soon.	
Bolivia	"30 officers"		
Canada		1 long-range air transport squadron and ground crews—soon.	3 destroyers, in action.
China	33,000 combat troops (not accepted)	20 C–47 transports (not accepted)	
Denmark			Perhaps 1 merchant ship (under negotiation).
France			1 sloop, 1,900 tons—in action soon.
Greece		6 transport planes	
Netherlands			1 destroyer, in action.
New Zealand	"Special combat unit," probably artillery—some delay expected.		2 frigates (resemble destroyers)—in action.
Norway			Merchant tonnage (amount unspecified; discussions going on).
Thailand	4,000 officers and men: organized unit, said to be high quality.		
Turkey	4,500 troops		
United Kingdom	A "self-contained force," said to be of brigade size (5,000 to 6,000 troops).		3 cruisers, 2 carriers, 6 destroyers and DE's—in action from the start.

RECAPITULATION: FORCES IN ACTION AND FORCES EXPECTED

Now in action	None as yet	1 fighter squadron (Australian)	3 cruisers, 2 carriers, 15 smaller combat ships.
Offered and expected soon	Perhaps 4,000 Thai troops	Air transport: 1 Canadian squadron, Belgian (amount unknown).	1 sloop (French).
Offered but not expected soon	Australian (number unknown); New Zealand special unit; 4,500 from Turkey; 5,000 to 6,000 from United Kingdom.	6 Greek transports	Norwegian merchant tonnage; amount unknown; perhaps 1 Danish merchant ship.
Offered but not accepted	33,000 Chinese Nationalist troops	20 Chinese C–47 transports	
Total in action or definitely offered and expected to serve	About 15,000 troops	1 fighter squadron. More than a squadron of air transports.	3 cruisers, 2 carriers, 15 smaller combat ships, several merchant ships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment to section XB, as amended.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in the past 20 minutes discussion has developed between the respective leaders looking toward postponing consideration of my amendment until tomorrow. If it is to go over until tomorrow, the decision to have it go over should be made now. Otherwise we shall go on for 3 hours this afternoon. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to yield the floor for that purpose. Otherwise I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Speaking in the position of the acting minority leader I should like to ask the majority leader what he proposes the Senate take up during the remainder of the afternoon if the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada with respect to postponing consideration of the amendment providing aid for Spain until tomorrow is adopted?

Mr. LUCAS. If the suggestion of the able Senator from Nevada is adopted by the Senate, I presume that other amendments could be considered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Section XB is ready for approval except for this amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps nothing would be left to do this afternoon so far as the appropriation bill is concerned. I understand only one more important amendment is to be voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would call to the attention of the majority leader and the minority leader that chapter XI of the bill has not been acted upon.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that the chapter in which the Senator from California is interested?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is chapter XI, General Provisions—Departments and Agencies.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the unanimous-consent agreement we would be here at least until 7 o'clock if we consumed 3 hours before we would be able to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. Perhaps it would take until 7:30 or later. The Senator from Nevada is eager to have debate on the amendment go over until tomorrow. It is satisfactory to me if that is the will of the Senate. In the meantime we could take up the one remaining chapter in the appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Chapter XI, on page 462, is the remaining chapter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have talked with Senators on this side of the aisle who I know are interested in the amendment with respect to aid to Spain. So far as I can determine, the suggestion of

postponing the amendment until tomorrow is agreeable to them. I should like to have the majority leader indicate how we would proceed tomorrow if that were done.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to make the suggestion, if I may. It has been announced by the Chair that the Prime Minister of Australia would appear before the Senate tomorrow at a certain hour. As I recall, it will be at 2:15 or 2:30 o'clock. Perhaps it could be arranged that the amendment I propose could come up following the appearance of the Prime Minister of Australia. Such an arrangement would be very satisfactory to me.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator mean to have the amendment taken up immediately after the Senate convenes?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. LUCAS. That would leave 2 free hours before the Prime Minister's visit. I do not know whether it would require 2 hours to finish the remainder of the appropriation bill before reaching any controversial amendments. I should not like to waste 2 hours. I wonder whether we could not use 2 hours, from 12 to 2, for debate, take time out for the reception to the Prime Minister of Australia, and finish with the amendment of the Senator from Nevada immediately following the Prime Minister's visit.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope very much we can finish consideration of the bill tomorrow. It has been before the Senate for a long time, and we have nearly finished with it. I think we ought to make some arrangement for final action upon it. I want to help the Senator from Nevada in any way I can so that we may consider his amendment. At the same time, it is very important that this bill be sent to conference.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee. We have been on the bill for a long time. The sooner we finish its consideration, the better I shall like it.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is the desire of the Senator from Nevada to have the very best attendance possible in the Senate when the matter covered by his amendment is presented. It is with that thought in mind that I believe it would be well to have it taken up after the appearance of the Prime Minister of Australia. I thought that with the Prime Minister's appearance before the Senate a good attendance would be assured, and therefore we could go ahead with the presentation of our facts on the amendment. That is the reason for my suggestion.

Mr. LUCAS. It seems to me—and I am only thinking out loud now—if we had 2 hours of debate, from 12 to 2 tomorrow, and immediately after the Prime Minister's visit we had another short debate, that we would have more Senators in attendance than if we followed the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada to begin the consideration of his amendment after the Prime Minister's visit. Senators must go to committee meetings, and probably would leave the floor. However, I am satisfied that they would remain for an hour and a half if they knew the Senator's amendment was to be voted on.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment must be voted on. The agreement is for its consideration for 3 hours today, the time to be divided between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Nevada. We want to bring the matter up as expeditiously as possible and dispose of it as promptly as possible.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In the interest of accomplishing the expedition which the majority leader suggests I should like to suggest that we consider the amendment for an hour and a half preceding the Prime Minister's visit and for an hour and a half following the Prime Minister's visit. Perhaps some other matters could be taken up immediately after the Senate convenes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the suggestion that an hour and a half before 2 o'clock, and an hour and a half after the Prime Minister finishes his address before the Senate be given to the amendment would be perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, would it be possible to agree on an hour when we could vote? Could we vote at 4 o'clock?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not believe it is going to be necessary to make an agreement such as that. I think that by not agreeing on an hour for a vote, we can save time. I do not think the debate will take 3 hours, when we get to the subject.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think it will.

Mr. McKELLAR. I entertain great hopes that we can dispose of the bill tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that his suggestion would require a modification of the present unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to know whether it is contemplated that the Senate will proceed with chapter XI, the general provisions of the bill, in the event we should reach that point in the bill before the distinguished majority leader desired to move a recess this evening.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what we were discussing when the Senator from Nebraska entered the Chamber. If we postpone consideration of the amendment relating to Spain, and agree to consider it tomorrow, we will proceed with the appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I am reluctant to go into chapter XI until there is a quroum call, at least. I am sure Senators desire to be present when chapter XI is considered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will have a quorum called.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, I should like to have a quorum called.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me see if we have a meeting of the minds on this matter. When a recess or an adjournment is taken tonight it will be taken until 12 o'clock tomorrow, and we will then proceed, after the preliminary matters which usually are taken up, to debate the amendment relating to Spain for an hour and a half. Then the Prime Minister from Australia is to be entertained before this body, and there will be an hour and a half of debate thereafter. Is that the general understanding?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not at all objecting to the provisions of the unanimous-consent request, except that I was desirous of knowing how far in the bill the distinguished majority leader expected to go before he moved a recess tonight. If it is contemplated that we are to take up the general provisions, chapter XI, I should like to have a quorum called before we enter into the agreement.

Mr. McCARRAN. Before we do that, may I have unanimous consent to offer an amendment to the third chapter of the bill, which is the chapter covering the judicary appropriation?

I hold in my hand a letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, and also a letter from Mr. Chandler, the Administrator of the courts, asking for an amendment to the bill regarding the appropriation for the Judiciary.

Some years ago by law we placed referees in bankruptcy on a salary basis. Theretofore they had been on a fee basis. For about 3 years now they have been on a salary basis. In order to furnish clerks for the referees in bankruptcy, the Chief Justice, as chairman of the Judical Conference, and the Adminstrator, urge that we go back to the figure which the Budget sent to the Congress, but which was eliminated in the House, and the Senate went along with the House action. If I may have unanimous consent to go into that, I will present it. It will take only a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the parliamentarian that it will be necesary first to modify the standing unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McCARRAN. I believe that to be true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After it is modified, it would be in order for the Senator from Nevada to make request for another unanimous-consent agreement respecting the item to which he has referred.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if I may address an observation to the Senator from Nebraska, I think it would expedite what he wants to have done now if he would agree to the unanimous-consent agreement that we postpone consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Nevada until tomorrow, and then proceed with a quorum call, and work for a while longer today. I think we could do that, if he would agree to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to the unanimous-consent agreement at all, but I should prefer to have a quorum called just before we enter into it. I do not think it will make any difference one way or the other, I am sure it will be agreed to, but I should like to have a quorum called.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

Anderson	Gurney	Malone
Benton	Hayden	Martin
Brewster	Hendrickson	Maybank
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bridges	Hill	Mundt
Butler	Holland	Murray
Byrd	Humphrey	Myers
Capehart	Ives	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kem	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Langer	Sparkman
Ellender	Leahy	Stennis
Ferguson	Lehman	Taft
Flanders	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	Lucas	Thye
Fulbright	McCarran	Tydings
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Williams
Green	Magnuson	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I suggest that the majority leader present the request for modification of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that it is now 4:30 o'clock, and that under the previous unanimous-consent agreement the debate was to continue for not longer than 3 hours on the amendment dealing with Spain, after we have disposed of all the amendments on the chapter we have been considering, I now modify the unanimous-consent request by making the following request:

I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that on tomorrow, following the convening of the Senate at 12 o'clock, we proceed to debate the amendment involving aid to Spain for 1½ hours previous to 2 o'clock; that following the address by Prime Minister Menzies of Australia we then further debate the aid-to-Spain amendment for not longer than 1½ hours, at the conclusion of which a vote be taken on the amendment; the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to ask the question: Is it the understanding of the Senator from Illinois that under his proposed modification the debate would begin at 12:30 tomorrow and extend from 12:30 to 2 o'clock?

Mr. LUCAS. Not necessarily. Any time between 12 and 2 the hour and one-half debate could take place. We will first transact morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At what time would the debate begin?

Mr. LUCAS. Following disposition of business during what we call the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At not later than 12:30.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; not later than 12:30. I should like to include also in the unanimous-consent request the same provision that was included in the agreement previously entered into, that no amendment to the aid-to-Spain amendment shall be offered which is not germane; also that I am not waiving any points of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would continue the same conditions that were stated in the current unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the distinguished majority leader. Perhaps the Senate, if it continues consideration of the bill tonight may take up chapter XI, and proceed as far as it can with the remainder of the bill. It is the purpose of the majority leader to take a recess at 6 o'clock. Assume we had gotten into chapter XII, and had not completed action on that chapter tonight. I understand it is proposed, in such event, temporarily to lay consideration of that chapter aside, and the unanimous-consent agreement would apply then to the so-called aid-to-Spain amendment, in the foreign aid portion of the bill. I ask the majority leader if it is his intention not only to vote on the aid-to-Spain amendment, but to complete the foreign aid chapter before the Senate returns to consideration of what would be the pending business, which would be amendments in chapter XI. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska is correct in his understanding of the situation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there are two amendments to the bill which are of great importance to many Members of the Senate. I wanted the understanding that should we finish action on chapter XI tonight, and the bill were to be finished, insofar as committee amendments are concerned, we could then bring up the two amendments tomorrow, after disposition of the Spanish aid amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the amendments to be offered by the Senator from Washington are amendments which are to be offered to the bill after we have completed the committee amendments to the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. After we have completed the committee amendments to the bill the amendments referred to by the Senator from Washington are in the same category as any other amendments, and certainly the Senator from Washington would not be foreclosed from offering his amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupant of the chair will state that he is advised that chapter XI of the bill has not yet been taken up. The Senator from Illinois has requested unanimous consent to modify the current unanimous-consent agreement upon which the Senate is operating, in the manner stated by him. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the chairman of the subcommittee handling chapter XI is the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. In that chapter appears section 1111, better known as the antideficiency provision. With reference to that provision, there are some Senators who purport to propose an amendment which deals with grants to the States for old-age pensions. We would not like to have the antideficiency provision apply to such grants, because after all it is the States who contribute, who are the determining factor in saying what shall be done. I wonder whether we will have sufficient time this evening, in considering chapter XI, even to discuss that particular provision.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as I understand, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee desires to proceed with chapter XI. We will probably continue until 6 o'clock, and then take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Chapter XI contains section 1111, dealing with the working funds. Section 1111 is the antideficiency provision, which is the controversial matter of the chapter. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and I wish to offer an amendment to the antideficiency provision which would take care of the old-age pensioners within the individual States, and would make the antideficiency provision inapplicable to them.

Mr. LUCAS. There is nothing to prevent the Senator from doing that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before we begin on chapter XI, I should like to state that the Senate has been on this appropriation bill for weeks, and it seems to me we should be able to finish it not later than Wednesday. Tomorrow we shall dispose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, and perhaps we can get through these two chapters. Certainly not later than Wednesday we should be able to finish this bill. I am going to try to do so and, if necessary, we shall hold a night session on Wednesday in order to complete action on the bill.

It is my understanding that by that time, the bill now being considered by the Banking and Currency Committee, the measure involving the war effort, probably will be ready to be placed before the Senate. Certainly we wish to handle that measure as quickly as possible.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator that there is such an urgency, but I wonder why the Senator is planning to have the Senate take a recess so early this afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware is trying to embarrass me, as usual, when he rises to ask a question.

I would just as soon stay here, and we are going to stay here this afternoon and proceed with chapter XI; we shall remain here until 6 o'clock or a little later,

which is about the time we have been staying in session right along.

Of course, if I were to ask the Senate to remain in session until 9 o'clock in the evening, the Senator from Delaware or some other Senator would say, "Why do you keep us here so late? I had a dinner engagement, and I should be home with my family, instead of being here." On the other hand, when I am willing to have the Senate end its session for the day at approximately 6 o'clock in the evening, I am pilloried for that.

Of course, Mr. President, that is what one gets for being majority leader. However, I can take it. I think I understand my friend the Senator from Delaware fairly well.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to discuss an amendment which I have, if I may have the floor in my own right.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, for expenses of referees, the budget estimate was in the amount of $1,035,400, and the House allowed $960,000. The amount authorized for this purpose last year was in the amount of $886,000, and the amount of increase granted by the House was for within-grade salary advancements and part-time personnel. No additional funds were allowed for additional full-time positions. The Senate committee concurred in the recommendations of the House.

I have now received evidence of the increase in bankruptcy cases. Chief Justice Vinson has written to me, requesting that the bill be amended to include the full amount of the budget estimate of $1,035,400. This would be an increase of $75,400.

Mr. President, in view of this additional evidence presented, I move that on page 103, line 11, the figure "$960,000" be stricken and the figure "$1,035,400" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that unanimous consent must be given in order to take up the amendment at this time. Does the Senator request such unanimous consent?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think it would be clearer to ask such unanimous consent after I have made the motion.

I now ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Chief Justice Vinson be read by the clerk. The reading of the letter will make this matter clearer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator just what he desires me to note.

Mr. McCARRAN. In view of the additional evidence presented and in view of the request made by the Chief Justice, I have moved that on page 103, in line 11, the figure "$960,000" be stricken out, and the figure "$1,035,400" be inserted in lieu thereof.

If the Senator from Tennessee will permit the letter from the Chief Justice to be read, it will give enlightenment to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to have that done.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read the letter from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., July 20, 1950.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: As chairman of the Judicial Conference of the United States, I feel impelled to call your attention to an item in the general appropriation bill for 1951 (H. R. 7786) as reported to the Senate from your committee. This item affects the appropriation for the expenses of the referees in bankruptcy.

You will recall that the legislation under which our present system was established was effective July 1, 1947. Inasmuch as the new bankruptcy system was to be on a self-sustaining basis and funds for its operation until such a financial condition should exist were necessary, the Congress authorized an advancement from the general funds of the Treasury in the amount of $500,000 to the expense funds of the referees. This fund contemplates expenditures incidental to providing for necessary office space, clerical and other office assistance, supplies and equipment, travel, etc.

As of June 30, 1950, there was a cash balance on hand in the expense fund of $599,986, with a remainder unpaid of the $500,000 advanced by the Treasury of $100,000. This leaves a net balance in the expense fund on the first day of the current fiscal year of $499,986. In addition to this net balance, there was a sum of $623,376 paid into the general receipts fund of the Treasury by the clerks of the various courts resulting from the clerks' fee of $3 per filing of 77,922 cases.

In the fiscal year next preceding the effective date of the act (July 1, 1947) filings numbered 13,170; in the past fiscal year there were 33,391 filings, more than two and one-half times the filings in fiscal 1947; and for fiscal 1951 it is estimated that there will be 7,000 more cases filed than in the past fiscal year, or a total of approximately 40,000 cases. If this estimate becomes a reality, there will be filed in the present fiscal year more than three times the number of cases filed in fiscal year 1947, the year next preceding the establishment of the new system. I feel that I should add that Mr. Covey, who is the Chief of the Bankruptcy Division of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts last January, estimated the filings for the past fiscal year to be 33,400; the actual number of filings was 33,391. I mention this to demonstrate the accuracy of the estimates for fiscal 1951.

The Judicial Conference of the United States estimated that the total cost for the 34 additional full-time clerks in the referees' offices needed to handle this increase in the volume of business would be $77,656, and this figure was included in the budget estimates. The House of Representatives Appropriations Committee reduced this item $75,400, and the bill came to the Senate with this reduction. If the Senate does not restore this amount, the referees will be seriously handicapped in the handling of this new business. These additional full-time employees will have a classification rating of GS 2, with an entrance salary of $2,450 per annum under the existing salary structure.

Naturally, I am interested in seeing an efficient and expeditious administration in the bankruptcy field. Not only will there be more respect for its administration if it is efficiently and expeditiously handled, but I feel certain that we will agree that benefits will accrue to the creditors by such handling of these cases.

The Referees' Salary Act was signed by the President on June 28, 1946, and became effective July 1, 1947, so I have lived with the new system during its entire operation. The judicial conference has given particular attention to its operation, and takes some satisfaction out of the fact that it is one segment of governmental operation in which the intake is greater than the outgo and at the same time there has been an efficient and expeditious handling of an enormous case load.

The receipts in the expense fund in the three fiscal years have exceeded the disbursements by $499,986.

I certainly hope that you may feel inclined toward further consideration of this item and that the sum of $75,400 will be added to this item in the bill. I feel that without this additional money, and the additional personnel to be provided thereby, the efficiency of the system will be substantially affected. I know that neither you, your committees nor the Congress would have any desire that such would be the result.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada requests unanimous consent that the amendment be now considered, being an amendment on page 103, in line 11, to strike out "$960,000" and insert "$1,035,400."

Is there objection? Without objection, the amendment is considered and agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, in connection with the amendment which has just been agreed to by the Senate, two letters from Henry P. Chandler, Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, be printed in the RECORD in furtherance of the amendment just adopted.

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

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1950.

Mr. THOMAS J. SCOTT,
Assistant Clerk of the Senate Appropriations Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: We have now received reports from all of the district courts regarding the number of new bankruptcy cases filed in May 1950. The total for the month is 3,256, which is a new high in the current trend of increased filings. It represents an increase of 423 cases over the preceding month, when 2,833 cases were filed, and an increase of 693 cases as compared with the month of May 1949, when 2,563 cases were filed.

On a percentage basis the increase over April 1950 was 14.2 percent and over May of 1949, 27 percent. During the first 11 months of the fiscal year 1949, there were 23,491 cases filed. In the corresponding period of the current fiscal year, 30,326 cases were filed, an increase of 29.1 percent.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1950.

Mr. THOMAS J. SCOTT,
Assistant Clerk of the Senate Appropriations Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: The reports received from the district courts disclose that a total of 2,833 bankruptcy cases were filed during the month of April. This is an increase of 11

percent over the filings in the month of April 1949, when 2,544 cases were filed. There were 20,928 cases filed in the first 10 months of the fiscal year 1949. During the corresponding period of the fiscal year 1950, 27,059 cases were filed, an increase of 29.3 percent.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER.

REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

Salaries paid from referees' salary fund

Offices served by single part-time referee	109
Offices served by single full-time referee	38
Offices served by two or more referees, consolidated offices (see below)	7
Total offices	154

Consolidated offices

Location	Full-time referees	Part-time referees
Birmingham	2	
Los Angeles (Dickson-Head)	2	
Los Angeles (Brink-Hunt)	2	
Chicago	4	
Boston	2	1
Detroit	2	
Cleveland	2	
Total	16	1

Total part-time positions	110
Total full-time positions	54
Total authorized positions	164

Clerical staffs of referees' offices

Salaries paid from referees' expense fund

Offices having no clerks (vacancies)	6
Offices having single part-time clerk	61
Offices having two part-time clerks	1
Offices having single full-time clerk	28
Offices having one full-time and one part-time clerk	11
Offices having two full-time clerks	23
Offices having three and four clerks	17
Consolidated offices (see below)	7
Total offices	154

Consolidated offices

Location	Number of referees	Number of clerks
Birmingham	2	11
Los Angeles (Dickson-Head)	2	10
Los Angeles (Brink-Hunt)	2	10
Chicago	4	15
Boston	3	8
Detroit	2	6
Cleveland	2	6
Total	17	66

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment to which I invite the attention of the Senator from Tennessee. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, between lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to insert:

Roads through public lands: For the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations pursuant to authority contained in section 3 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended by the act of June 24, 1930 (46 Stat. 805), the sum of $5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available for expenditure on the basis of need, as determined by the Commissioner of Public Roads upon application of the highway departments of the respective States concerned and without regard to any law for the apportionment of such funds among said States.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be taken up and considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, most respectfully, I may say to the Senator from Nevada that, as I understand, this amendment came from the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, of which he and I were members.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is a public works authorization pending before the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator, before he goes further, that the amendment I have just sent forward and which has been read, came from the Committee on Public Works and was approved, to be offered as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. The chairman of the committee is now addressing the Chair, and I yield to him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts and also to my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska, that the history of this amendment is this: The Committee on Public Works, under the sponsorship of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], authorized this as an item in the regular road bill. Later on, the Senator from Utah appeared before the Committee on Appropriations in an effort to expedite the appropriation of the money authorized under the regular road bill. The only way it could be done was to have the Committee on Appropriations refer it to the Committee on Public Works, which committee in turn would refer it back to the Committee on Appropriations. Inasmuch as the Committee on Public Works had already approved the authorization, the only thing this does is that instead of waiting, as we did on the military money for the parkway road between here and Baltimore, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] made a showing before our committee that it possibly has something to do with the war effort, if we are to have a war. It was at the instance of the Senator from Utah, who made a proper showing, and at the insistence of the Senator from Oklahoma, that the Senator from Nevada eventually proposed the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Why does this have to come up ahead of the general road bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. There is one particular reason, which I emphasize, namely, that in the State of Utah, first of all, there is what is known as Highway 6, which is a highway extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The only gap in Highway 6 that is not completed is in the State of Utah, a stretch of about 48 miles. It is essential that this gap be closed now and the road constructed, because Highway 40, carrying the greater bulk of the traffic, is about the only military road available to the military establishments around Salt Lake City and in the Utah Valley. Moreover, if Highway 40 were put out of business, it would be a difficult matter to get through Utah and to the Pacific coast. So it is essential that the 48-mile gap be completed at once.

That is only one. There are other gaps in other roads in other States. For example, the State of Oklahoma has one highway in which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is interested. My interest and the interest of the Senator from Utah is in the particular gap in Highway 6 to which I have made reference. And if this is included in this bill, being a part of the highway appropriation, which is carried in the pending bill, work can be begun on that road and completed at an early date.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the bill containing the authorization for the fiscal years 1952–53, in the amount of $550,000,000 for each year, before the Senate?

Mr. McCARRAN. That bill is to come from the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is a new authorization bill. As I understand, it is coming from the Committee on Public Works, and this additional appropriation would add about $5,000,000 to the present 1951 authorization, and the Senate would be asked then to appropriate that $5,000,000, to be expended for public roads this year, out of the 1951 appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is exactly correct. The bill for 1952–53 also contains some $13,000,000 for the parkway road. A showing was made before the committee that under the present circumstances it was essential to proceed with the parkway road between here and Baltimore. It is connected with a new area outside Fort Meade. It was done as a matter of military necessity, though that was not the only reason. For the Committee on Public Works now to report this item and have it referred to the Committee on Appropriations, would be the only possible way that it could be considered in connection with the appropriation bill in a manner parallel to that in connection with the parkway item.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Why is it not a question of including this item in an authorization bill, and allowing this amendment to come in as a supplemental appropriation this year, and then having the Appropriations Committee consider how much to appropriate for it?

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator that, in connection with the bill on which we are now working, he and I were members of the subcommittee which dealt with the highway appropriation. That highway appropriation was for the current year, on which we are now going forward, 1950–51. If we can get provision made for this item, it will come under a specific law. Some years ago Congress passed a specific law with

respect to a public highway to run exclusively through public domain, appropriations then to be made for its construction. It is under that law that this appropriation was approved by the Committee on Public Works. It is under that law that we are offering this amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, what bothers me in connection with this matter is that as I remember, we cut down by some millions of dollars the appropriation for assistance to the States which was requested by the Public Roads Commissioner, and this would add $5,000,000 and would penalize other States. Would it not penalize other States?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But it would take something away from other States, and then add $5,000,000, would it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; the Senator is in error. It does not penalize other States or take away anything from them. It comes under a special law which applies directly, specifically, and exclusively to roads running through public domain, and that only.

If the Senator will recall, Mr. MacDonald, of the Bureau of Public Roads, came before the committee and testified that this was the way to get the money for the gap in Utah and for the other gaps which exist. On his testimony, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Nevada, and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] took the matter to the Public Works Committee so that the committee might pass on the question, because that was the proper committee to deal with it. We want to go forward this year with this all-essential project so that these roads may be improved and put in condition because of the national situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator's justification for this appropriation is that it is not a part of the Hayden-Cartright bill, so-called, but is a completely separate bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. A separate law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the Senator believes the appropriation to complete the link should be made in full on this authorization, which is a separate authorization.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Nebraska for a moment, I have before me House bill 7941, a road bill which is on the calendar and which will, we hope, be considered by this body very soon. Section 10 is the section which was sponsored by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and which refers to this particular item. Section 10 reads as follows:

SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended by the act of June 24, 1930 (46 Stat. 805), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending July 30, 1951.

So, Mr. President, all we are doing by this amendment is to provide for this particular item.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that, but the Senator is asking for $5,000,000. How many different sections of road are there which are not complete? If there is a State in the Union in which I would rather see a road built than in the State of Nebraska, it is the State of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico or the State of the distinguished Senator from Utah. I understand there are some incomplete roads in Oklahoma, and I should like to help the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in that regard. What other units would be included in this $5,000,000?

Mr. CHAVEZ. According to the information furnished by the Bureau of Public Roads, which has charge of the construction, planning, surveying, and all that goes with the construction of roads, the $5,000,000 will take care of connecting the roads which are in this particular category.

Mr. WHERRY. Where are they located, other than in the States of Utah and Oklahoma?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There are some in Oklahoma, in public parks; there are some in national parks; there are some in Indian lands, and possibly some in forests. There are some in New Mexico. There are probably some in every public-land State in the Union.

Mr. WHERRY. Will $5,000,000 take care of the situation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what we have been advised.

I wish New Mexico were as lucky as is the State of Nebraska. Sixty-three percent of the entire area of my State belongs to the Federal Government and not to the State of New Mexico. That is the reason why the law was passed.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not quarreling with the basic law; but what the distinguished Senator is doing is requesting an appropriation of $5,000,000, in addition to the one for the present fiscal year. Did the question ever go before the Appropriations Committee for a hearing?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to acquaint the Senate with the parliamentary situation.

This amendment was offered on July 19 and referred to the Committee on Public Works. It was supported by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] on July 28 and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The matter comes under the purview of subsection 3 of rule XVI, which the Chair reads as follows:

All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least 1 day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received; in like manner, amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills, establishing post roads, or proposing new post roads, shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The Chair understands that this amendment was offered pursuant to subsection 3 of rule XVI and has strictly complied in all respects therewith.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair for the information, but I do not believe the Appropriations Committee ever heard testimony on the bill. It may have at a time when I was not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the rule requires that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations at least 1 day before consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the authorization perfectly, but I do not recall that the amendment ever came before the Appropriations Committee for justification. What we are doing is getting unanimous consent, after the authorization has been made, to bring the matter to the Senate floor and to appropriate $5,000,000 for building roads, without consideration by the Appropriations Committee. That is the point I am raising.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that if we were starting originally with the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Nebraska would be correct. But when the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Nevada took the matter up with the chairman of the Committee on Public Works I consulted the Parliamentarian. I said, "How can this bill be handled for an appropriation?" He informed me of the parliamentary situation by which, if the amendment were referred to a standing committee which had charge of the authorization, the committee could report it adversely or favorably. That of itself would take care of the point of order that it would be legislation on an appropriation bill. That is what the Chair has tried to explain to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McCARRAN. In no sense of the word is it legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not going to raise the point of order. But we are bypassing the Committee on Appropriations by coming straight to the floor of the Senate. I think that is the wrong way to obtain appropriations for road programs. If there is a military need, and there is a section of road which has to be constructed in order to get traffic through, if there is no other Member of the Senate who objects, I shall not offer an objection. But I think it is being brought to the floor of the Senate without having the appropriation justified in the committee. Many roads are authorized which are not built. Even though they are authorized, they still have to be justified for appropriation.

I am not going to object, Mr. President. It seems that I do most of the objecting. The Senate knows what it is doing. It is proposing to provide on the Senate floor an appropriation to the tune of $5,000,000. We are going to vote $5,000,000 worth of road construction. I be-

lieve we would be establishing a precedent. However, I shall not object.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is in error.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it is the wrong way to legislate.

Mr. McCARRAN. In my judgment the Senator is in error. This is not what the Senator claims it to be. This item is authorized by a statute which has been in existence for years.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the basic law.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the basic law in accordance with which we are offering the amendment to the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment is before the Senate. Any amendment can be offered.

Mr. WHERRY. It has not been considered by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCARRAN. It has been considered by the committee. These [indicating] are the hearings which were held on the whole chapter.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there a hearing on this $5,000,000 item for roads?

Mr. McCARRAN. It came before the Subcommittee on the Department of Commerce.

Mr. WHERRY. It did not come before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCARRAN. It came before the subcommittee. The Senator from Massachusetts was present when we went into this whole matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to state to the Senator from Nevada that he is correct in saying that this matter came before the subcommittee. I was not present. He is correct that it was heard by the subcommittee. However, I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that section 10 of the new Road Authorization Act, H. R. 7941, Calendar 2048, has not yet been considered. In section 10 of that bill the following provision appears:

> The sum of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, to remain available until expended.

Mr. McCARRAN. That $5,000,000 would not become effective until 1951–52. The bill to which the Senator refers becomes effective in 1951–52.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are two authorizations; one for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and a like sum of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

Mr. McCARRAN. That money cannot be used until it is available. This amendment would put the money into the pending appropriation bill. After the appropriation bill was passed the money would be available.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to correct the record. I did not know this item had gone to the Committee on Appropriations. I was speaking about the full committee. To my knowledge it never reached the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not wish to mislead the Senator. I do not know whether this particular item was dealt with by the full Committee on Appropriations. However, appropriations for roads came before the subcommittee on the Department of Commerce, and we dealt with it in that subcommittee. Then we reported it to the full committee and it was approved by the full committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not say that my memory is correct, but I respectfully suggest that it did not go quite that far. The matter was considered by the subcommittee, but was not approved by the subcommittee. Therefore, it did not come before the full committee for its consideration. In the subcommittee we decided to drop it. That is my memory of it. I do not say that I am correct about it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Again I do not wish to mislead the Senator. What I am trying to say is that the whole subject matter was dealt with under chapter III, and we dealt with the whole subject matter of road construction for the year 1950–51. The matter is before the Senate now. All we are trying to do now is to take that which has been approved by the Committee on Public Works and put it into the 1950–51 appropriation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The authorization bill has not yet been approved by the Senate. It has been approved by the Committee on Public Works, but not by the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. This amendment I have offered has been approved by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But not by the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is what we are trying to have done now.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what we are trying to have done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I come back to my original statement. Assume that we cut the authorization bill. The bill provides for $1,100,000,000 for 2 years. If we were to cut that amount by half or by a quarter, and appropriate this amount in full, we would be going ahead faster on this piece of road and being unfair to many States, because the contributions to those States would be reduced.

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not affect the other States at all. It is not money which is distributed among the States. It is money that goes directly under a specific law to highways which run through public domain exclusively.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Supposing Congress authorized $300,000,000—merely by way of using a figure—instead of $550,000,000. The contributions to the States would be cut by $250,000,000. At the same time we would be going ahead with the full $5,000,000 on this piece of road in the State of Utah.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I am very much interested in the colloquy on this particular amendment. The situation in Utah is one of national concern. We have only one highway running out of Utah to the West, to California and Nevada. We have another one running almost due north and south to southern Utah, southern Nevada, and southern California. In and around Odgen, Utah, we have Hill Field, army stores, naval stores, and a naval depot. We have other military stores at Tooele. We have the Geneva steel plant, which is just south of Salt Lake City. Highway No. 40, which runs west into Nevada, is the only road which has been completed all the way through. That carried the big burden during the last war, as a result of which it has been ripped to pieces. We are trying to repair it and put it back into condition. Highway No. 6 runs from Provincetown, Mass., to Long Beach, Calif., and it is an improved highway all the way except for about 47 miles in western Utah near the Nevada border. Nevada has built a road to the border. It built an improved highway to the border, and this 47 miles of road is unimproved. That road runs entirely through public domain, and it comes up under a hardship situation. In a time such as we are now facing, the road is an absolute necessity from the national point of view, not from the standpoint of Utah or for the sake of Utah. Utah can get along for a while longer, if it must, without it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the objection to bringing it up in the regular road bill? The Senate will be here next week.

Mr. WATKINS. We have had some experience during a war with getting roads built and getting other public improvement taken care of. The contractors are ready to do this piece of work, and they can undertake its construction. If it can be done now it can be done cheaper than it could be done during an emergency. Now is the time to do it, if we can get the appropriation.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Personally, I have no objection to this appropriation going through at this time, providing the Senator from Nevada will accept an amendment to the effect that if the authorization is reduced this amount, even though it would not come within the authorization bill, being an exception to it, would likewise be reduced in the same proportionate amount.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is agreeable to me. I am willing to accept such an amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator object to including such proper language within his amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. In other words, if there is to be a cut made all the way through the bill, this item shall be subjected to the same cut.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I refer to the authorization in the road bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I agree to that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill contains specific language by which the President is directed in time of emergency, notwithstanding that he already has such authority, to cut it as much as he wants to cut it in order to meet the national emergency.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am entirely content with the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a while ago I asked the distinguished Senator from Nevada to yield so that I might correct the RECORD, but after hearing the discussion I do not think I need to correct it. I believe I was right in the first place.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would, then, offer a second proviso to the Senator's amendment, which, in substance, would state that if the authorization contained in H. R. 7941, Calendar No. 2048, is reduced for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953, then the appropriation involved in the pending amendment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, will be reduced in the same percentage.

Mr. McCARRAN. I accept that, if the Senator from Utah will accept it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am willing to accept that percentage reduction if the reduction referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts takes place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair may state the situation, the Senator from Nevada has asked unanimous consent for the consideration of this item at this time Is unanimous consent granted?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am going to ask that this amendment go over until tomorrow, so that I may have a chance to study it further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator objects at this time, does he?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware objects.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I ask unanimous consent at this time to propose an amendment to chapter XI of the pending bill, and I ask that it be considered now. I do not believe there will be any objection to it whatsoever after the amendment is explained. It has to do with the antideficiency provision of section 1111 of the pending appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to the fact that under the agreement entered into a short time ago chapter XI is now the subject before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; and the reason why I suggest this amendment is that the provision which will be concerned with the suggested amendment is the important provision of chapter XI, and I thought possibly we could get unanimous consent to act on the amendment now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico asks unanimous consent that section 1111, chapter XI, page 468, be now considered. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest that unanimous consent is not necessary, if we proceed with chapter XI. There is no committee amendment before the place suggested for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the first amendment which would come up for consideration in chapter XI is on page 468 of the bill. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Under the heading "Departments and agencies," page 468, line 25, after the word "obligation", it is proposed to insert the words "or expenditure."

The amendment was agreed to.

JOINT SENATE AND HOUSE RECORDING FACILITY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair ask the Senator from Virginia whether his remarks will take some little time?

Mr. BYRD. About 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] has a conference report, and the Chair had agreed to recognize him to present it when the pending question was disposed of. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator, because I called the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] away from his office while I submitted this conference report.

I submit a conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 332) providing for the establishment of a Joint Senate and House Recording Facility, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 332) providing for the establishment of a Joint Senate and House Recording Faculty, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That (a) there is hereby established a Joint Senate and House Recording Facility (hereinafter referred to as the 'Facility').

"(b) The Facility shall assist Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in making and utilizing disk, film, and tape recordings, and shall maintain and operate upon request a supplementary public address system for the convenience of the Senate and the House (including any committee of either House of Congress, and any joint committee). The recording facilities shall be for the convenience of the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"(c) The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are hereby authorized, subject to appropriations made therefor, to appoint and fix the compensation of a Superintendent and such other employees as are deemed necessary to perform the functions of the Facility, and shall, subject to the approval of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and the House Committee on House Administration promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this joint resolution. The Coordinator and the employees of the Joint Recording Facility of Congress (appointed pursuant to the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948) shall continue in office until a Superintendent is appointed.

"(d) The Superintendent shall, subject to regulations promulgated under subsection (c), set the price of all recordings, services, and public address system rentals, and shall collect all moneys due the Facility. All purchase orders of more than $100 shall, before they are issued by the Superintendent, be approved by the Clerk of the House. The Superintendent shall maintain detailed records of all moneys collected, deposited, and expended, and shall file quarterly reports thereof with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House. Such records shall be audited annually, or at such lesser intervals as may be provided in regulations promulgated under subsection (c).

"(e) The Superintendent shall give bond to the Clerk of the House with one or more sureties. Such bond shall be approved by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, and shall be in the penal sum of $20,000, with condition for the faithful performance of the functions of the Superintendent and for the preservation and security of all property in his care.

"(f) There is hereby established within the contingent fund of the House of Representatives a revolving fund for the Facility. All balances of the Joint Recording Facility of Congress (established pursuant to the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948) on hand on the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and all moneys hereafter received from any source by the Facility established under subsection (a), shall be deposited in such revolving fund. The moneys in such revolving fund shall be available only for disbursement by the Clerk of the House for the care, maintenance, and operation of the Facility (including the purchase, rental, repair, upkeep, and insurance of such equipment and such other property as may be necessary for the operation of the Facility), upon vouchers signed by the Clerk of the House and approved by the chairman of the House Committee on House Administration; except that no such moneys shall be disbursed for the payment of salaries.

"(g) The Clerk of the House is hereby authorized to disburse from such revolving fund for the purchase of the recording equipment and other property which is now being leased by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House pursuant to an agreement dated August 1, 1947, such amount (not less than $13,000 nor more than $15,000) as the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the House Committee on House Administration may determine to be fair and equitable."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WILLIAM BENTON,
G. M. GILLETTE,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

MARY T. NORTON,
THOS. B. STANLEY,
C. W. BISHOP,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

PROPOSED GRANT OF EMERGENCY POWERS TO PRESIDENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Mr. Baruch has very admirably performed a great patriotic service in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. In all of his distinguished career, he has never received a greater tribute than the national re-

sponse to his plan for mobilization of our industrial economy.

I am inherently opposed to unnecessary governmental regimentation, which, if incompetently administered over a long period, can do much to destroy our system of free enterprise. I have, however, reached the conclusion that I will support stand-by powers to be given to the President, especially for such controls as will prevent disastrous inflation and prepare this Nation for the worst that may follow the crisis in Korea. This means I will support such legislation to be made effective upon proclamation of the President.

I do so, however, with an amendment, which I am offering today to the pending legislation, providing that such powers as are given to the President will expire on July 1, 1951. I offer this amendment because I do not believe such vast powers should be conferred on any Executive for an indefinite period without specific review by Congress. Without an expiration date, the President could veto repeal legislation. It would then require a two-thirds vote in each House to overcome such a veto.

It is by such all-inclusive powers given in time of emergency that democracies are destroyed if the powers extend beyond the period of the actual emergency. If an expiration date is provided in the legislation, it gives Congress an opportunity prior to the expiration date to reconsider the situation in the light of developments and determine whether the powers should be renewed or discontinued.

Let us not fool ourselves about this grant of power. If adopted, it will vest in the hands of the President powers more vast than any President ever had without a declaration of war. Under these powers the President can virtually take control of the domestic economy of our Nation and be an economic dictator.

One other exception I want to make is that if prices are fixed wages likewise should be fixed. All of us recall that in the last war prices were fixed without adequate wage control. Wages constitute 80 or 90 percent of the cost of most articles, and there must be adequate wage control if prices of products—industrial and agricultural—are to be controlled.

We are forced to proper controls now because blunders have precipitated this Nation into one of the most dangerous situations ever to confront us. Today we are fighting an undeclared war in Korea because the South Koreans, who were armed by us and trained by our officers, were unable to repel the North Korean invasion. The same kind of undeclared war can occur in other places throughout the world where we have undertaken to arm and train other nations who may or may not fight when D-day comes. Russia could start these undeclared wars in various parts of the world without firing a Russian gun or losing a Russian solder, compelling us under the Truman doctrine, to send troops, with the result that we may be engaged in many conflicts of such a character thousands of miles apart. It is tragic to contemplate the results of such side-line wars.

To point out the utter stupidity and the unbelievable ineptitude of our actions with respect to the Korean conflict, I cite these instances:

On June 13, 1950, just 2 weeks before the invasion of South Korea, Mr. William C. Foster, Deputy Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee and said:

> I am happy to tell the Appropriations Committee that, in my judgment, the trend of events in South Korea is more favorable than it has been at any time since the liberation of that country in 1945. The reasons for optimism are military, political, and economic. It is my considered opinion that in the face of great difficulty the Government of the Republic of Korea is now steadily gaining strength in each of these three sectors. (1) A rigorous training program has built up a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers, one that is prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean forces, and one that has cleaned out the guerrilla bands in South Korea in one area after another.

Twelve days later the North Koreans invaded South Korea and, with virtually no effort or resistance, captured a large part of the country. Had the South Koreans, who, Mr. Foster said, had a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean forces, courageously resisted, our reinforcements would have been spared the tremendous casualties which have resulted from lack of time to prepare an expeditionary force.

At the proper time it will be appropriate for Congress to investigate upon what grounds Mr. Foster, the Deputy Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, made this statement, and why the South Koreans in the first days of the invasion failed to resist.

I call attention further to the fact that since the American occupation forces were taken from Korea, there has been a substantial military mission there to train the South Korean army.

Still further, Gen. William L. Roberts, head of the United States Military Commission to Korea, told a news conference a few days ago that the South Koreans were not adequately armed because our leaders feared they would attack North Korea and thereby embarrass the United States. He said:

> The South Koreans believed the best method was to attack. To prevent them from attacking we gave them no combat air force, no tanks, and no heavy artillery.

So we have two American leaders, one, Mr. Foster, who said the South Korean army was well trained and equipped and prepared to meet any challenge; the other, the head of the United States Military Commission, who said America did not adequately equip the South Koreans because they might attack the North Koreans.

It is just such contradictions and incompetence as this that have precipitated a crisis of great magnitude. In due time those responsible will be held accountable by the verdict of American public opinion. What we have done in Korea is to demonstrate the ineffectiveness of that part of the Truman doctrine in the protection of small or isolated nations by arming those who are not prepared or willing to fight when the issue comes, and thereby accepting on the part of the United States a commitment to fight such wars wherever and whenever they may occur. I repeat, a dozen sideline wars may occur without Russia showing her hand.

Since the end of World War II we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in South Korea for relief, occupation and military training. In addition we have transferred great quantities of military equipment, which has not been evaluated. The war that Russia is conducting against America is a war of economic attrition. We have walked into her trap. We have committed ourselves to be involved in civil wars throughout the world and to exhaust our resources, regiment and tax our people while Russia can, and I believe will, remain on the outside.

The free-enterprise system cannot long operate under drastic police controls inefficiently administered. A democracy cannot remain on a war basis for a long period of time and still preserve the stimuli of free enterprise and fiscal solvency.

But today we are faced with facts. We have been driven into a situation in Korea from which we must not retreat, but in all prudence we must consider the possibility, if not the probability, that similar wars will be started elsewhere.

It is for these compelling reasons that I will vote for the Baruch proposals for stand-by power to the President, limited to July 1, 1951. This does not mean, of course, that Congress cannot renew these powers, but such dictatorial economic power over the lives of our citizens should be subject to review by Congress at stated periods.

We are in another emergency which is developing some of the aspects of hysteria, and we hear much about huge new taxes, about all-out regimentation, huge additional expenditures, but we hear little about a reduction in nondefense spending. Reduction of nondefense spending should be placed No. 1 on our mobilization program. Financial preparedness is the source of all preparedness.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment, to lie on the table and to be considered when the proposed legislation comes before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has requested unanimous consent to take up at this time for immediate consideration an amendment to section 1111 on page 468 of the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Will the Senator offer his amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Hampshire

[Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and myself I offer the amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 473, after line 23, it is proposed to insert:

(5) grants to the States under title I, IV, or X of the Social Security Act, or under any other public assistance title in such act.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this amendment would make definite and certain, in a way which I think the House language perhaps does not, that the Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance, for the blind, and for dependent children, will not be subject to any finding or determination or any action by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, but that such contributions, being fixed specifically by statute, by statutory formulas, will be paid to the States in the future just as they have been paid in the past.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In substance the amendment provides that where Federal statutes guarantee that the Federal Government will match certain funds for old-age assistance, and matters of that character, such as mothers' aid, and health matters, the antideficiency provision shall not apply?

Mr. HILL. No; it simply applies to the three categories, of old-age assistance, dependent children, and the blind. But it says where there is a statutory commitment to the States, where the amounts are fixed and determined by statutory formulas, such commitments will be met, and shall not be subject to any finding or any determination by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who was on the other end of the stick for some time in the capacity of Governor, and because of the uncertainty of the Federal appropriations, not always knowing what we should do in the States, I should say that I certainly approve of the amendment.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment and to taking it to conference. I have not gone into it yet, and will have to go into it and see what it would do, but I shall be glad to study it. The amendment is certainly very praiseworthy in its purpose. It seems to me at first blush it should be adopted. But before finally agreeing to it, I should like to look at it.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for himself and other Senators on page 473, after line 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XI—General provisions," on page 469, line 13, after the word "in", to strike out "requirements", and insert "requirements or"; and in line 14, after the word "operations", to strike out the comma and "or other developments".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 473, line 7, after "(f)", to insert "(1)"; and in line 9, after the word "apportionments", to insert "trust funds and working funds expenditures from which have no significant effect on the financial operations of the Government, working capital and revolving funds established for intragovernmental operations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 473, after line 23, to strike out:

(5) contingent expenses of the Senate or of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Alabama whether the figure "(5)" in line 24 should not be included in order to cover his amendment. That is on page 473.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The figure "(5)" is included in the amendment adopted a few minutes ago.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it is included in that amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 474, to insert:

(2) The provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to appropriations to the Senate or House of Representatives or to any Member, committee, Office (including the office of the Architect of the Capitol), officer, or employee thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 474, line 15, after the word "any", to strike out "other"; in line 17, after the word "obligations", to insert "or expenditures"; and in line 21, after the word "obligation", to insert "or the making of any expenditure".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 474, line 24, after the word "obligation", to insert "or make any expenditure".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 475, line 23, after the word "act", to insert "including the government of the District of Columbia"; and on page 476, line 1, after the word "on", to strike out "December 31, 1950" and insert "June 30, 1951".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I understand we are now considering section 1112, beginning on page 475.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. We have just adopted a committee amendment at the top of page 476 in that section.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have at the desk an amendment to that section, and I offer it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is required in order to have the amendment considered at this time.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may offer the amendment for consideration at this time.

This section deals with annual leave, and places a limitation on the amount of leave which can be accumulated. My amendment will take care of paying for annual leave when a civilian employee of the Government goes into the armed services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I have not had time to go over the amendment. However, I shall be glad to let it go into the bill at this time, and very carefully examine it and consider it in conference.

Mr. GURNEY. I may say that I have taken up the amendment with the staff of the Appropriations Committee. I am very sorry that I did not have the idea at the time when this section was being considered by the Appropriations Committee. However, at that time the Korean situation had not developed.

I should like to have the Members of the Senate now present hear the amendment stated, if that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 475, in line 25, before the word "officer", it is proposed to insert "civilian".

On page 476, before the period in line 4, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"And provided further*, That this section shall not apply with respect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United States."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator briefly explain the purpose of the amendment and what is intended to be accomplished by it?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the section as reported by the committee limits the amount of annual leave which can be accumulated. If a civilian employee of the Government leaves that service to enter the armed services, then, as I would have the section written, it would allow such a civilian employee to be paid, before he enters the armed services, for the amount of leave he has accumulated.

Mr. BRIDGES. That would be done in view of the fact that he would not be able to take the leave. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. The amendment would give such employee the money before he enters the armed services.

Mr. McKELLAR. What would be the cost of putting the amendment into effect?

Mr. GURNEY. I do not know, and I do not think anyone can tell, because I

do not believe anyone can say how many civilian employees of the Government will enter the armed services. However, I know that if a person enters any branch of the armed services, he has many extra financial obligations. If he enters the armed services, he will not have time in which to take annual leave.

I know such a person would like to leave a little money at home, and I believe that the Government wants to pay him in cash for leave he cannot take under such circumstances.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Let me ask the Senator if he has considered whether the language used in his amendment would permit a civilian employee simply to fail to take his leave during the period mentioned in the amendment—that is to say, up to the middle of next year, and perhaps go into the next year, as well—and then at the time when he entered the armed services, be purged of any obligation which would rest upon others.

It seems to me the language of the amendment is broad enough to permit that to be done. I shall not object to the amendment, but I hope it will be carefully considered in conference, and I hope there is included in the amendment language which will effectuate the purpose as outlined by the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that we shall carefully consider it in the conference.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the purpose is not to give the privilege the Senator from Oregon has mentioned, but only to permit the payment of accumulated leave in case such a person joins the armed services at any time between now and June 30, 1951.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, what is the amount of accumulated leave which such a person might have?

Mr. GURNEY. Whatever is now provided under Federal law in that respect. I believe it is either 60 or 90 days.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think the amendment is a worthy one. I think accumulated leave should be paid for under such circumstances. I think a person in that situation will need the money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota?

Without objection, the amendment is considered and agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 476, after line 20, to strike out:

SEC. 1114. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position under the United States Government which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1950: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 10 percent of all such vacancies in any agency caused by separation from such agency,

(b) to positions filled from within the agency,

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,

(d) to scientific and technical positions in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Armed Services,

(e) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service and the Veterans' Administration,

(f) to law enforcement officers,

(g) to temporary, emergency, seasonal, or cooperative positions,

(h) to commissioned, commissioned warrant, warrant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets of the Coast Guard, and the undergraduates of the United States Military and Naval Academies, or

(i) to any agency in the legislative or judicial branches of the Government, or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is at the desk an amendment which I should like to call up for consideration. The amendment is proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and 35 other Senators. I wish to call it up at this time, with the following modification: At the bottom of the first page, instead of the words "in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out on pages 444, 445, and 446," insert "in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out on pages 476 and 477."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that this is not the proper time to take up that amendment, at this point in the bill. That amendment comes in chapter X.

Mr. BYRD. However, I am offering it to this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has offered the amendment heretofore prepared to chapter X of the bill; and it is now offered as an amendment to section 1114, beginning on page 476.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, certain technical changes will be necessary in order to change the chapter numbers appearing on pages 2, 3, and 4 of the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, does this amendment take the place of the committee amendment on page 477?

Mr. BYRD. It takes the place of the part of it which would be stricken out by the committee amendment on pages 476 and 477.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is offered to take the place of the committee amendment which is designed to strike out section 1114 as it appears in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, it amends that committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly; and it does so by including the language which is proposed to be stricken out by the committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment is in order, I am sure. Although it contains legislation, yet it amends a provision which contains legislation, that provision having been placed in the bill by the House of Representatives.

I should like to have a ruling by the Chair as to whether or not the amendment is in order. I am advised by the Parliamentarian that the House provision, which is thus proposed to be stricken, is legislation, and likewise this amendment contains legislation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, of course, this amendment will take some time to dispose of. It was not known that it would be offered today. I think the amendment should go over.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no objection to having the amendment go over until tomorrow and be considered then. But I think the ruling of the Chair should be made now.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know about that, Mr. President. I have not had an opportunity to study the amendment. I may wish to offer a point of order. So I think the ruling on the amendment should go over until tomorrow. I do not propose that it be ruled upon at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair calls attention to the fact that he is one of the sponsors of this amendment, as originally offered; and he would prefer to have the ruling on it made by the Vice President.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment has been offered, and the amendment will come up at such time as the Senator may request the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BYRD. Under the unanimous-consent agreement adopted today, when will this amendment come up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment just offered by the Senator from Virginia will come up immediately after the disposal of the so-called McCarran amendment, relating to aid to Spain.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. This afternoon I asked that very question. The majority leader stated that he intended to finish the ECA chapter, not only to vote on the McCarran amendment, but also to vote on the entire chapter, before returning to the pending chapter. It so happens that the point of order which has been raised is the pending question. But certainly it would be my understanding of the request of the majority leader, before we entered into the unanimous-consent agreement, that the chapter on ECA, including the McCarran amendment, would be completed before we returned to the pending chapter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that, under the new unanimous-consent agreement entered

into today, after the disposal of the McCarran amendment, the Senate will then immediately dispose of chapter X–B, as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. That is according to the understanding of the Senator from Nebraska, who also understands that the Senate will thereafter return to the chapter now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After which time the amendment just offered by the Senator from Virginia would become the order of the business.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. So as I understand the statement of the present occupant of the Chair, what he said a moment ago was correct, except that the complete chapter on ECA would be voted on, as amended, and the Senate would then return to the point where it leaves off tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. That was not what the Chair stated. The Chair stated that we would return to chapter X–B, after completing the chapter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. X–B is the chapter on ECA, the Chair will state to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is it not chapter X–A?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it is X–B.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has not chapter X–A been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Chapter X–A has gone over for later consideration. The Chair feels it is only fair to state that his understanding is that the McCarran amendment will be voted on first, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into this afternoon, which is a modification of the earlier unanimous-consent agreement; that, following that, the entire section, chapter X–B, which deals with ECA and allied subjects, will be disposed of, and that, thereafter, the pending question will be on the proposal made by the Senator from Virginia to amend section 1114 of chapter XI of the bill.

REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the pending tax bill. I should like to call this amendment the Korean Excess-Profits Tax Amendment. The purpose of the provision which I am now offering is to help the Government of the United States pay as it goes on the very expensive adventure upon which it has been launched by the aggressive actions of the Communists in Korea. I do not need now to take the time of the Senate to explain the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the amendment, together with a copy of the statement which I am releasing to the press this evening, may be printed at length in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance; and, without objection, the amendment and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment and statement are as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new title:

"TITLE VII—EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

"SEC. 701. Reapplication of excess-profits tax.

"(a) Reapplication: Section 122 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1945 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) In general: The provisions of subchapter E of chapter 2 shall not apply to any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1945, and ending prior to January 1, 1950. The provisions of part III of such subchapter shall not apply to any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1945.'

"(b) Rate of tax: Section 710 (a) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"'(A) Sixty five percent of such part of the adjusted excess profits net income as exceeds 75 percent but is less than 90 percent of the excess profits credit determined under section 712, plus

"'Seventy-five percent of such part of the adjusted excess profits net income as exceeds 90 percent but is less than 100 percent of the excess profits credit determined under section 712, plus.

"'Ninety percent of such part of the adjusted excess profits net income as exceeds 100 percent but is less than 125 percent of the excess profits credit determined under section 712, plus

"'One hundred percent of the adjusted excess profits net income as exceeds 125 percent of the excess profits credit determined under section 712; or.'

"(c) Exemption: Section 710 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Specific Exemption.—A specific exemption of $25,000.'

"(d) Excess profits credit: Subsections (a) and (b) of section 712 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to allowance of exces profits credit) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Domestic Corporations.—In the case of a domestic corporation which was in existence before January 1, 1950, the excess profits credit for any taxable year shall be computed under section 713 or section 714, whichever amount results in the lesser tax under this subchapter for the taxable year for which the tax under this subchapter is being computed. In the case of all other domestic corporations, the excess profits credit for any taxable year shall be an amount computed under section 714.

"'(b) Foreign corporations: In the case of a foreign corporation engaged in trade or business within the United States, the first taxable year of which under this subchapter begins on any date in 1950, which was in existence on the day 36 months prior to such date and which at any time during each of the taxable years in such 36 months was engaged in trade or business within the United States, the excess-profits credit for any taxable year shall be an amount computed under section 713 or section 714, whichever amount results in the lesser tax under this subchapter for the taxable year for which the tax under this subchapter is being computed. In the case of all other foreign corporations the excess-profits credit for any taxable year shall be an amount computed under section 714.'

"(e) Definition of unused excess-profits credit: Section 710 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out the last two sentences thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'For the purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by this subchapter for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1946, there shall be no unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946. The unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947 shall be an amount which is such part of the unused excess-profits credit determined under the preceding provisions of this paragraph as the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1947, is of the total number of days in such taxable year. For the purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by this subchapter for taxable years ending after December 31, 1949, there shall be no unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year ending before July 1, 1950. The unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning in 1949 or 1950 and ending after June 30, 1950, shall be an amount which is such part of the unused excess-profits credit determined under the preceding provisions of this paragraph as the number of days in such taxable year after June 30, 1950, is of the total number of days in such taxable year.'

"(f) No carry-back to 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949: Section 710 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) No carry-back to 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949: For purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by this subchapter for taxable years ending after December 31, 1949, the term "preceding taxable year" and the term "preceding taxable years," as used in this subsection, do not include any taxable year ending prior to January 1, 1950.'

"(g) Amount of excess-profits credit: Section 713 (a) (relating to the amount of excess-profits credit) is amended by striking out '95 percent' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "75 percent."

"(h) Definition of 'base period': Section 713 (b) (1) is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Definition: As used in this section the term "base period"—

"'(A) If the corporation was in existence during the whole of the 36 months preceding the beginning of its first taxable year under this subchapter after December 31, 1949, means the period commencing with the beginning of its first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946, and ending with the close of its last taxable year beginning before January 1, 1949; and

"'(B) In the case of a corporation which was in existence during only part of the 36 months preceding the beginning of its first taxable year under this subchapter after December 31, 1949, means the 36 months preceding the beginning of its first taxable year under this subchapter.'

"(i) Taxable years beginning in 1949 or 1950 and ending prior to June 30, 1951: Section 710 (a) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(8) Taxable years beginning in 1949 and ending in 1950: In the case of a taxable year beginning in 1949 and ending in 1950, the tax shall be an amount equal to that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year after June 30, 1950, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.

"'(9) Taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949, and ending prior to June 30, 1951: In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1949, and ending prior to June 30, 1951, the tax shall be an amount equal to that portion of a tentative tax which the number of days in such taxable year after June 30, 1950, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.'

"(j) Technical amendments: The following sections of the Internal Revenue Code are restored to read as such sections read

immediately prior to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1945, to be effective as so restored, with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1949, as if section 122 (g) of the Revenue Act of 1945 had not been enacted:

"(1) Section 26 (a) (relating to the credit for income subject to the excess-profits tax);

"(2) Section 102 (d) (1) (defining terms for the purpose of the tax imposed by section 102);

"(3) Section 131 (b) (prescribing certain limitations on the foreign tax credit);

"(k) Taxable years to which amendments applicable: The amendments made to the Internal Revenue Code by this title shall be applicable with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1949.

"(l) Technical changes: The Commissioner is authorized to make such changes in the dates and the periods of time appearing in subchapter E of chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code as may be necessary to conform to the amendments made by this title."

On page 50, line 18, before the period insert the following: "reduced by the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in subsection (e)."

On page 88, strike out lines 24 and 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in section 26 (e) and the credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b)."

On page 89, strike out lines 24 and 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in section 26 (e) and the credit for dividends received provided in section 26 (b) (computed by limiting such credit to 85 percent of the net income reduced by the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 in lieu of 85 percent of the adjusted net income so reduced)."

On page 94, strike out lines 22 through 25, and on page 95, strike out lines 1 through 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) Section 204 (a) (2) (relating to definition of normal tax net income and corporation surtax net income of foreign insurance companies other than life or mutual) is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) Normal-tax and corporation surtax net income of foreign insurance companies other than life or mutual and foreign mutual marine: In the case of a foreign insurance company (other than a life or mutual insurance company) and a foreign mutual marine insurance company, and a foreign mutual fire insurance company described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the normal-tax net income shall be the net income from sources within the United States minus the credit provided in section 26 (a), the credit provided in section 26 (b), and the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in section 26 (e), and the corporation surtax net income shall be the net income from sources within the United States minus the credit provided in section 26 (b) (computed by limiting such credit to 85 percent of the net income reduced by the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 in lieu of 85 percent of the adjusted net income so reduced) minus the credit provided in section 26 (j), and minus the credit for income subject to the tax imposed by subchapter E of chapter 2 provided in section 26 (e).'"

At the end of the table of contents, on page 7, insert the following:

"TITLE VII—EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

"SEC. 701. Reapplication of excess-profits tax.

"(a) Reapplication.

"(b) Rate of tax.

"(c) Exemption.

"(d) Excess-profits credit.

"(e) Definition of unused excess-profits credit.

"(f) No carry-back to 1946, 1947, 1948, or 1949.

"(g) Amount of excess-profits credit.

"(h) Definition of base period.

"(i) Taxable years beginning in 1949 or 1950 and ending prior to June 30, 1951.

"(j) Technical amendments.

"(k) Taxable years to which amendments applicable.

"(l) Technical changes."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY UPON OFFERING THE EXCESS-PROFITS AMENDMENT

Believing that an excess-profits tax immediately imposed would be the best answer that capitalism could give to Communist propaganda. I have today introduced such an amendment to the pending tax bill which I shall urge upon the Finance Committee.

There has never been any doubt in the minds of the American public since the first excess-profits tax was imposed during the First World War that no part of the population should be permitted to reap huge profits out of war while another part was suffering and sacrificing in military uniform. The imposition of the excess-profits tax has always been resisted by those who were reluctant to give up the opportunity for great profit arising out of the business created by Government expenditures to raise, equip, and maintain the fighting force. The reaction of the public and of business leadership to the Korean crisis convinces me that this opposition has now practically disappeared. We know now that the war profiteer and the speculator must be eliminated if we are to adopt a pay-as-you-go policy for this war.

Inflation, while it will make profits for the lucky speculator and the lucky profiteer, will take more out of the pockets of all of the people than any tax. This is so because inflation vastly increases the cost of living as well as the cost of defense.

With a national debt at $257,000,000,000, we can't think of postponing the payment of Government expenditures for the Korean war to future generations; we must be willing to make the sacrifice necessary on the home front to meet the cost now.

Fortunately the rate of corporate profits has been running at an extraordinary level since the shooting of World War II stopped and corporate profits before taxes which were running around $25,000,000,000 during World War II reached a peak of 36.6 billions in 1948. The last 5 years have been the most prosperous years in our history: wages, salaries, profits, as well as prices have been up. We have been living in a luxury economy and I see no reason why we would not sacrifice some of these luxuries to pay for the war.

The excess-profits-tax rate in the amendment I have introduced is computed upon the base of 75 percent of the average profits of 1947, 1948, and 1949. A step scale is provided which is intended not only to take a fair share of the corporate net income above 75 percent of the average for these 3 years, but at the same time not to provide an inducement to waste and inefficiency.

The rate schedule is as follows: 65 percent of net income above 75 percent of the base and not above 90 percent, 75 percent of net income above 90 percent of the base and not above 100 percent, 90 percent of net income above 100 percent of the base and not above 125 percent, 100 percent of net income above 125 percent of the base.

I was of the opinion that the average profits of the 3 years 1947, 1948, and 1949 would be altogether too high a base from which to compute excess-profits tax. The base which I have selected, 75 percent of the 3 years 1947, 1948, and 1949, is roughly four times higher than the level of corporate profits before taxes prior to World War II and is practically equal to the level of profits during World War II.

Although for technical reasons the amendment applies the tax rate to the whole of the calendar year 1950, a provision has been inserted so that only 50 percent of the tax for 1950 is payable. This prorata provision is designed to make the tax effective on July 1, 1950, to all intents and purposes at the time the Korean war broke out.

The amendment is drawn upon the structure of the World War II excess-profits tax. It preserves the invested capital formula and the net income formula provided in sections 713 and 714 of the Internal Revenue Code and it also preserves the credit provisions of section 722 to take care of extraordinary individual cases to which the specific formula would not apply.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF HOUSE BILL 7273

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized and permitted to sign House bill 7273 during the recess of the Senate.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4942. An act to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys realized from leases made by the Seneca Nation of Indians of New York, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7273. An act to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7764. An act to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8139. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held in Biloxi, Miss., September 27 through September 30, 1950.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9178) to suspend restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the United States International Information and Educational Exchange Program, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

GENERAL REVISION OF NAVIGATION LAWS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise, consolidate, and codify the navigation laws relating to admeasurement, documentation, entry, clearance, coastwise trade, foreign trade, and United States fisheries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT, TEXAS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the Canadian River project in Texas (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REGULATION AND CONTROL OF AIR COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Secretary of Commerce to undertake security measures relative to the regulation and control of air commerce when authorized by the President in times of national emergency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON RATES OF RETURN FOR CERTAIN COMPANIES

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Rates of Return for 529 Identical Companies in 25 Selected Manufacturing Industries, 1940, 1947–49," prepared by the Commission, dated June 27, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FINANCIAL AID TO STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 188)

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Commission, dated July 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of K. E. Martin and sundry other citizens of Kansas City, Mo., and Olathe, Kans., praying for full armament of the United States and the establishment of price controls; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Miami, Ariz., Miners Local 586, IUMM, pledging full support to the Government in the Korean situation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Pennsylvania Junior Chamber of Commerce at State College, Pa., favoring military aid to all free people, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry officials of the Government of Guam, expressing appreciation for the passage of legislation providing a civilian government for Guam; ordered to lie on the table.

DEFENSE OF SOUTH KOREA—RESOLUTION OF FEDERATED TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY OF DULUTH, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have recently received a resolution from the Federated Trades and Labor Assembly of Duluth, Minn., expressing its support of the President's courageous action in the Korean situation. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, 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:

FEDERATED TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY,
Duluth, Minn., July 25, 1950.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Duluth Federated Trades and Labor Assembly in session July 14, 1950, passed the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved*, That the Duluth Federated Trades and Labor Assembly in meeting held on Friday, July 14, 1950, go on record as commending President Truman for the courageous stand he has taken in the defense of South Korea."

Respectfully yours,

CLARK KENNEDY,
Secretary.

TRANSPORTATION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—RESOLUTIONS OF LABOR UNIONS OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that a number of resolutions have just come to me endorsed by a number of labor unions in my State. I refer particularly to local 3842 of the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, Albert Lea, Minn.; local No. 36, Faribault, Minn.; local No. 6, Albert Lea, Minn.; local No. 55, Newport, Minn.; and local No. 9, Austin, Minn., all of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, CIO; and local 845 of the Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, A. F. of L., of Albert Lea, Minn.

These unions, Mr. President, express their support for H. R. 7983, a bill introduced by Congressman O'SULLIVAN, of Nebraska, which forbids transportation in interstate commerce of any product of a firm or individual refusing to bargain fairly and in good faith with its employees or indulging in any form of unfair labor practice.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. Res. 239. Resolution to investigate available fuel reserves and formulate a national fuel policy of the United States; with amendments; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 294. A bill for the relief of Hernando J. Abaya, his wife, and two children (Rept. No. 2186);

S. 1913. A bill for the relief of Adelaide Giovanna Summa (Rept. No. 2187);

S. 2487. A bill for the relief of Dominic Arcella (Rept. No. 2188);

S. 2506. A bill for the relief of Libuse Chalupnik Pavlish (Rept. No. 2189);

S. 2695. A bill for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou (Rept. No. 2190);

S. 2981. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Merlinet Forgnone (Rept. No. 2191);

S. 3367. A bill for the relief of the law firm of Hunt, Hill & Betts (Rept. No. 2192);

S. 3987. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code (Rept. No. 2215);

H. R. 612. A bill for the relief of Col. W. M. Chubb (Rept. No. 2193);

H. R. 1618. A bill for the relief of Kenneth J. MacKenzie (Rept. No. 2194);

H. R. 1988. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Fry (Rept. No. 2195);

H. R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion M. Martin Jones (Rept. No. 2196);

H. R. 2805. A bill for the relief of John F. Oettl (Rept. No. 2197);

H. R. 4836. A bill for the relief of Xylda L. Driver (Rept. No. 2198);

H. R. 5157. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Anthony Albanese, a minor (Rept. No. 2199);

H. R. 6657. A bill for the relief of Georges Jules Louis Sauvage (Rept. No. 2200);

H. R. 6850. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. F. A. Ferguson (Rept. No. 2201);

H. R. 7253. A bill for the relief of Charles Wilson Roland and Mirtie L. Roland (Rept. No. 2202);

H. R. 7540. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis (Rept. No. 2203);

H. R. 7869. A bill to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Newnan, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia (Rept. No. 2204); and

H. R. 8450. A bill for the relief of Raief Neahem, Iffef Neahem, and Ihsen Neahem (Rept. No. 2205).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment.

S. 3094. A bill for the relief of Miriam Rosenblum (Rept. No. 2206);

S. 3107. A bill for the relief of Boleslaw H. Drobinski, his wife, Marjorie, and his daughter, Janina (Rept. No. 2207);

S. 3426. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of an alien possessing special skill, namely, Gerhard Zahn, and his wife (Rept. No. 2208); and

S. 3724. A bill for the relief of Maria Sulikowska Forbes (Rept. No. 2209).

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

S. 665. A bill for the relief of Margaret D. Scott and Lydia M. Scott (Rept. No. 2210);

S. 2772. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Thomas N. Cole (Rept. No. 2211);

S. 3108. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges (Rept. No. 2216);

S. 3157. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carl E. Ainsworth (Rept. No. 2212); and

H. R. 4136. A bill for the relief of Helen M. Booth; (Rept. No. 2213).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 3812. A bill relating to the compensation and leave benefits of officers and employees in the custodial service of the Post Office Department transferred to the General Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 2214).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3990. A bill to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3991. A bill for the relief of Ann Lamplugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 3992. A bill to incorporate the United States Olympic Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. McCLELLAN 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. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the

Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 448, before the period in line 24, insert a comma and the following: *"Provided further,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which, in the opinion of the President, has failed, refused, or neglected to support the United Nations in the Korean War by supplying armed personnel, materials of war, or services."

Mr. McCLELLAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7786, making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, 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.)

DISPOSITION OF WATER FROM THE COLORADO RIVER—BROADCAST BY SENATOR ANDERSON

[Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast delivered by him on July 30, 1950 on the subject of the disposition of water from the Colorado River for the benefit of the people of New Mexico, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROSPERITY IN WASHINGTON STATE UNDER 17 YEARS OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him under the title "Prosperity in Washington State Under 17 Years of Democratic Government," which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW WASHINGTON HAS PROSPERED UNDER 17 YEARS OF NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION—BULLETIN OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a bulletin entitled "How Washington Has Prospered Under 17 Years of National Democratic Administration," published by the Democratic National Committee, June 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY BERNARD M. BARUCH ON MOBILIZATION PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock discussing the testimony of Bernard M. Baruch before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which appears in the Appendix.]

VISITORS FROM JAPAN—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Visitors From Japan," published in the New York Times of July 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

KANSAS CITY VOTE FRAUDS OF 1946—ARTICLE FROM THE KANSAS CITY STAR

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Vote Fraud Echo," published in the Kansas City Star July 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

KOREA'S LESSON—ARTICLE BY CLARENCE STREIT

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Korea's Lesson," by Clarence Streit, editor of the magazine Freedom and Union; which appears in the Appendix.]

TOTAL PREPAREDNESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE MEMPHIS COMMERCIAL APPEAL

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Must Have Total Preparedness," published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal July 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TRAGIC BLUNDERS OF TRUMANISM—EDITORIAL FROM THE SIOUX FALLS (S. DAK.) ARGUS-LEADER

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Tragic Blunders of Trumanism," published in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of recent date, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, supporting S. 3147, which appears in the Appendix.]

THESE ARE DAYS FOR POETRY, NOT STATISTICS—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "These Are Days for Poetry, Not Statistics," written by Barbara Ward, and published in the New York Times Sunday Magazine of July 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent statement made today before the Senate Armed Services investigating subcommittee by the able chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS, CHAIRMAN, SENATE ARMED SERVICES INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE, JULY 31, 1950

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF SUBCOMMITTEE

Members of the subcommittee, this meeting has been called for the purpose of discussing the organization and procedures of our subcommittee. Our chairman late Thursday announced the personnel to the Senate, and this is our first chance to meet. This statement represents my own thinking about our work.

Our assigned task is clearly defined in the resolution adopted unanimously by the full committee. We are asked to exercise both a continuous watchfulness and a continuous study of "all policies, programs, activities, operations, facilities, requirements, and practices" of the Department of Defense, the armed services, and other agencies dealing with the national security in general and our present preparedness effort in particular.

We are specifically directed to determine whether such policies and practices are "the most effective possible" and to determine whether the administration of such policies is "characterized by maximum efficiency."

If we carry out our assignment diligently and impartially, I am confident that the subcommittee's work can be of substantial benefit to the Armed Services Committee, to the Senate, to the agencies dealing with the national security, and to the national welfare.

Toward that end I would like to offer several suggestions which reflect my own thinking about certain guideposts of conduct which we should keep in mind as we outline our work.

I. We will not hunt headlines. We will handicap—not help—our chances for success if we exploit the sensational rather than develop the substantial. It is my thought that the committee's work will be conducted primarily in executive sessions. Our reports will be reports to the full committee; we will not report directly to the Senate or the public.

II. It is my sincere hope that politics can be left at the committee-room door. Our full committee has maintained a fine record of nonpartisanship. I hope we can emphasize unanimity so that here, at least, the Senate and public can expect to find uncolored, unemotional facts.

III. Most important, I think this subcommittee must be extremely diligent not to establish—or attempt to establish—itself as a Monday morning quarterback club, second-guessing battlefront strategy. We were not created to tell the generals and admirals how to fight the battles, but rather to make sure that they and the men fighting under them have what they need to win those battles. Battlefront strategy is not a part of our duties and so long as I am chairman we will not get into that question.

IV. Especially, I have confidence that the subcommittee will, in all its inquiries and recommendations, be frank, impartial, and straightforward—blunt but not unfair, zealous but not persecuting, helpful but not compromising.

If we adhere to these basic rules, I believe we can be successful.

We are, of course, a subcommittee of a regular standing committee of the Senate. We shall function in that capacity only without usurping duties that are not ours and without infringing upon jurisdiction we do not possess. Wherever necessary and whenever practicable, we should not hesitate to communicate information developed by our work to other Senate committees which might be interested and helpful.

Furthermore, we will not overlap the duties assigned to certain standing committees of our full committee—such as the Subcommittee on Civil Defense and the Subcommittee on Stockpiling. In all instances we should work harmoniously and with the fullest possible cooperation with all others who may be of assistance to us in our duties.

Our funds at present are limited to $25,000. With that amount, we cannot employ any large staff of investigators.

There is no reason, however, that we cannot function successfully with our present professional staff serving as the nucleus for our initial studies and with the assistance of experts from the various agencies. As our needs become apparent, we can make our needs known to the chairman of the full committee.

Of course, I believe additional clerical assistance will be needed immediately—and I hope arrangements can be made for an assignment of office space to our subcommittee.

During the past few days many Senators and Congressmen have raised the question with me about where the money appropriated for defense during the past 4 years has gone. This question, of course, is on all our minds.

In 1946 the United States completed one of the most hurried and most thorough military demobilization programs ever instituted by a major world power.

During the four fiscal years since we have spent $48,440,000,000 on the military functions of the Department of Defense. This,

of course, has been a record peacetime outlay for defense purposes.

Because this amount has been unprecedented, because the burden has been heavy and irritating, the setbacks in Korea have prompted many people to ask now, "Where did the money go?"

There is no secret about the answer. Our program of defense spending has been designed, discussed, debated, decided, and put into effect in full public view.

Most of our defense dollars have gone to maintenance costs. The cold war was primarily a maintenance operation, high lighted by the heavy costs of occupying many foreign countries.

This is supported by the breakdown of the $48,440,000,000 spent from July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1950, on the military functions of the Department of Defense.

Utilization of new obligational authority for the military functions of the Department of Defense, July 1, 1946–June 30, 1950

	Billions of dollars	Percent
Military personnel costs (pay, food, clothing, etc.)	19.86	41.0
Maintenance and operation (of aircraft, ships, installations, etc.)	12.78	26.4
Major procurement (weapons, planes, ships, etc.)	8.53	17.6
Research and development	2.25	4.6
Civilian components (National Guard and Reserves)	1.86	3.8
Service-wide administration and classified projects	1.39	2.9
Retired pay	.78	1.6
Military public works	.49	1.0
Mobilization and war readiness	.39	.8
Other	.11	.2
Total	48.44	100.0

Major procurement, July 1, 1946–June 30, 1950

Aircraft	$6,260,000,000
Ships	810,000,000
Other (weapons, combat vehicles, etc.)	1,460,000,000
Total	8,530,000,000

Service-wide administration and classified projects

Includes:

(a) Costs of Department of Defense administration at Washington, D. C., and at headquarters of major commands (Army areas, naval districts, sea frontier commands, Air Force major commands).

(b) Transportation of dependents, baggage and household effects of civilian employees upon permanent change of station.

(c) General Printing Office printing and binding.

(d) Field expenses of service-wide fiscal or finance activities such as accounting, disbursing and cost inspection.

(e) Costs of joint schools and joint planning ventures.

(f) Inter-American relations.

(g) Military missions and attachés.

(h) Classified projects (such as atomic bomb tests).

(i) Claims.

(j) Island governments.

(k) Petroleum reserves.

(l) Foreign exchange losses.

(m) Naval Home, Naval Observatory and Hydrographic Office.

Public works construction (includes military housing)

Includes all costs of land acquisition, engineering planning and design, field engineering and inspection, and construction of buildings, structures, roads and walks, utilities plants and systems, facilities, and appurtenances to real estate in the United States and overseas for which enabling legislation is required.

Mobilization and war readiness

Includes all costs of maintenance and inspection of military reserve plants; acquisition, rehabilitation, and storage of machine tools and production equipment; industry preparedness measures (phantom orders, pilot production, planning surveys, etc.) and wartime planning within the Department of Defense.

What does this breakdown indicate?

Two of each five defense dollars were spent on military personnel costs such as pay, food, clothing, and transportation.

One and one-fourth of each five defense dollars went for overhead costs, such as maintenance and operation of aircraft, ships, installations, and other necessary expenses.

This means that substantially more than half of our defense outlay, approximately $3.25 from each $5, was paid out just to keep our manpower fed, clothed, housed, and paid.

One of each five defense dollars has been spread thin across such essential activities as research and development on new weapons, maintenance of the National Guard and Reserves, administrative work and classified projects such as the atomic bomb tests, retired pay, military public works, planning for mobilization and war readiness, and other such work.

Less than one of each five defense dollars—in fact, only about 75 cents—has been used to procure weapons, ships, and planes.

These figures are rounded and approximate, but they tell the story of where the money has gone.

That is the answer to where the money has gone. We are not concerned with hindsight—we are concerned with foresight.

What's done, is done. We want to make sure that in the future enough is done, soon enough, to assure the defeat of aggression wherever it may appear.

There are many phases of the preparedness effort to which our attention might be turned beneficially—such as procurement, unification, morale and discipline, manpower utilization, research and development, training, medical services, government production, industrial mobilization, occupation policies, civilian personnel, defense of the United States, and others.

At present, it occurs to me that a helpful survey, to be undertaken promptly with the hope of an early report, could be made to determine the armed services' plan for the build-up of both manpower and matériel and their plans for fighting any other fires that may break out in the world. This would acquaint us with the scope of the mobilization effort with which we are expected to deal.

Furthermore, a survey into the many phases of this program would provide us with useful information about the state of planning for any additional fires that may break out, the pace at which military mobilization is proceeding to prepare us to fight these fires, and the bottlenecks retarding our preparedness effort. Without knowledge of these planning features of the military program, we might waste valuable time and energy groping in the dark—and I do not think this is an opportune time for our subcommittee to go on fishing trips.

In suggesting this, I am merely offering my personal opinion, but I hope we can use this as a base to formulate some tentative program at this first meeting.

There is a tremendous and important job for us to do. If we are to do it well, we should begin promptly and pursue our work diligently without let-up.

We need facts, the Congress needs facts—the people want facts. I hope that all Members of the Senate will assist us freely by supplying information and suggestions that may be helpful. Also, I hope people in the Government, members of the press, and the general public will assist us with information which would be useful in making our efforts successful.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. 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 MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Edward Weinfeld, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York; favorably;

Eugene John Pajakowski, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indiana; favorably;

Carroll O. Switzer, of Iowa, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Iowa; adversely, with the recommendation that the nomination be not confirmed; and

M. Neil Andrews, of Georgia, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Georgia; adversely, with the recommendation that the nomination be not confirmed.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Vice Adm. Edward L. Cochrane; United States Navy (retired), to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the term expiring June 30, 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations under the heading "New Reports" on the calendar.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul M. Herzog to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I take very great pleasure in voting for the confirmation of the nomination of Paul M. Herzog. He received his first important political appointment from me, during the time I was Governor of New York, when I appointed him a member of the original State labor relations board in 1937. Later, in 1940, he became chairman of the State labor relations board, and served until he was called to Washington to assume a place on the National Labor Relations Board.

He did a splendid piece of work during the long period of his service in New York State, a service which has been duplicated in quality and in excellence by his service to the Federal Government. I think he has shown great ability, high character, imagination, loyalty, and industry throughout the years of his service, and I feel that the Nation is very fortunate that President Truman

was able to persuade Chairman Herzog to accept the appointment at his hands a few days ago.

There is a further personal reason why I am so pleased and happy to have the opportunity of voting to confirm this nomination. I have known Paul Herzog ever since he was a very small child. As a matter of fact, his grandfather was the family physician to my own parents 70 or 75 years ago. I have, of course, known the family for many, many years. During all the period of my acquaintance with Paul Herzog, I have been impressed with the quality of his character, the quality of his selfless devotion to duty, and his willingness to serve his fellow citizens. It gives me very great personal and official pleasure to have the opportunity of voting for the confirmation of his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ewan Clague to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph Frederick Green to be second lieutenant in the Air Force, with date of rank June 2, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, 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 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 1, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 31 (legislative day of July 20), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

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:

Waldo E. Bailey, of Mississippi.
Cabot Coville, of California.
John B. Ocheltree, of Nevada.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 5 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

William C. George of the District of Columbia.
Edward F. Rivinus, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Robert Rossow, Jr., of Indiana.

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

Mrs. Doris H. Allen, of Kentucky.
Sanford Menter, of Texas.
LaMar D. Mulliner, of Pennsylvania.
Edwin L. Smith, of Arkansas.
Joseph A. Yager, of Ohio.

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

Belton O'Neal Bryan, of South Carolina.
Howard Trivers, of Maryland.
Coburn B. Kidd, of Oklahoma, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harvey L. Carey, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the western district of Louisiana, vice Malcolm E. Lafargue, term expired.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

William T. Clement — Merwin H. Silverthorn
John T. Walker — Ray A. Robinson

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

William J. Whaling

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

George E. Wasson — Jefferson D. Smith, Jr.
Percy F. Avant, Jr. — Frank C. Caldwell
David R. Moak — John A. Conway
Alfred G. Carlson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John K. Hogan
Thomas A. Durham, Jr.
John I. Loy

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Robert W. Hohl — David G. Swinford
Richard J. Schriver — William J. Longfellow
Robert B. Clay — Richard A. Bauer
John W. Walker — Norman G. Ewers
John E. Shields — Roger A. Morris
Roscoe R. St. John — Harold O. Jones

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 31 (legislative day of July 20), 1950:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Paul M. Herzog, of New York, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, for a term of 5 years, expiring August 27, 1955.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Ewan Clague, of Pennsylvania, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, for a term of 4 years, expiring August 20, 1954.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Joseph Frederick Green, a graduated cadet, United States Military Academy, class of 1950, for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, with date of rank from June 2, 1950.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 31, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Joe Weldon Bailey, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Sulphur Springs, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we come to Thee today especially within our hearts, with gratefulness and thanksgiving for all of the blessings Thou hast given us, blessings we have received as individuals, blessings that have been ours collectively as a Nation and as a world. We thank Thee, our Father, because we know that every good and perfect gift cometh from above; and as we stand here in this sacred place this afternoon we do pray that we as citizens may have wisdom to do and to know Thy will, and that these who are leaders of our country may likewise have wisdom that comes only as we come to Thee and welcome Thy love; and we pray for the deliberations of this day, that all thoughts said and done may be to the honor and glory of Thy great and holy name.

Bless everyone who is here, O God, today; and may, as we recognize the importance of this hour, we turn unto Thee for help and for strength. We pray in the name of the Son of God and for His sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 27, 1950, was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JULY 28, 1950.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority heretofore granted, the Clerk received today from the Secretary of the Senate the following message:

That the Senate had passed without amendment House Joint Resolution 512, entitled "Joint resolution making further temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill S. 3859 entitled "An act to authorize the President to control the anchorage and movement of foreign-flag vessels in waters of the United States when the national security of the United States is endangered, and for other purposes."

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on July 27, 1950, examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett;

H. R. 1022. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army air base, New Castle, Del.;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.;

H. R. 1626. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. H. Hill;

H. R. 1697. An act for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Kenneth Everard Hadfield;

H. R. 2196. An act to authorize the elimination of lands from the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana;

H. R. 2264. An act for the relief of C. H. Bolling;

H. R. 2462. An act for the relief of Miju Iseri Tsuda;

H. R. 2535. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall;

H. R. 2588. An act to confirm title in V. LeBlanc and C. Riccard to certain lands in West Baton Rouge Parish, La.:

H. R. 2753. An act to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527; 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries;

H. R. 2808. An act for the relief of Grace G. Walker;

H. R. 2851. An act for the relief of Carl L. Sexauer;

H. R. 3169. An act granting permanent residence to certain Spanish physicians residing in Puerto Rico;

H. R. 3284. An act to authorize grantees of recreational demonstration project lands to make land exchanges relating to such properties, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3305. An act for the relief of the estate of Jose Salgado Santos;

H. R. 3316. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Francisco J. Cordova;

H. R. 3330. An act for the relief of Therese Hohman;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of William A. Cross;

H. R. 3906. An act to amend the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act, as amended;

H. R. 3994. An act for the relief of John D. Lange;

H. R. 4041. An act for the relief of Parish Bros.;

H. R. 4141. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Shockley;

H. R. 4309. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nellie K. Marlowe;

H. R. 4343. An act for the relief of J. P. Acker;

H. R. 4364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth B. Moore; John Robert Lusk III; John R. Lusk, Sr.; Mrs. Minnie P. Pruitt; and Mrs. Billie John Bickle;

H. R. 4386. An act to amend section 2 (a) and section 7 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to make failure of registration a continuing offense, and to continue the obligation of officers, directors, and persons acting as such, to comply with the act despite dissolution of a foreign agent;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Jeannette Passayanni-Capodistria;

H. R. 5003. An act to provide for the exchange between the United States and the State of New York of certain lands and interests in lands at Manhattan Beach, Kings County, N. Y.;

H. R. 5110. An act for the relief of Janos (John) Treber and Mrs. Katalin (Katherine) Treber;

H. R. 5221. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietro;

H. R. 5252. An act for the relief of W. M. Tindal;

H. R. 5470. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Haddad;

H. R. 5526. An act to authorize the President to provide for the performance of certain functions of the President by other officers of the Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5628. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the State of Rhode Island;

H. R. 5799. An act for the relief of the Acme Finance Co.;

H. R. 5849. An act for the relief of Samuel M. Kornegay;

H. R. 5947. An act for the relief of Alfio Batelli;

H. R. 5990. An act to provide for the construction, development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland and its extension into the District of Columbia as a part of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6013. An act to amend an act fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 6018. An act for the relief of Lubomir Mikulik and Viliam Krajcirovic;

H. R. 6198. An act for the relief of the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 6247. An act authorizing transfer of land and improvements thereon by the Secretary of the Interior to New Mexico State Fair;

H. R. 6270. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Winnebago Indian Reservation, Nebr.;

H. R. 6292. An act to provide that payments to States under the Oil Land Leasing Act of 1920 shall be made biannually;

H. R. 6482. An act for the relief of Antonio Artolozaga Euscola;

H. R. 6644. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Rounds;

H. R. 6697. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Howard H. Moran;

H. R. 6699. An act to authorize the sale of certain land on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak., allotted to Susan Eagle Dog;

H. R. 6703. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Ed Howard Russell;

H. R. 6839. An act for the relief of Ralph E. Brown;

H. R. 6971. An act to authorize the transfer of funds allocated for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Highway Route No. 100 to State Parkway Route No. 4;

H. R. 6994. An act for the relief of Karen R. McAndrews;

H. R. 7016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret O'Donnell and Mrs. Arlene R. Shannon;

H. R. 7046. An act for the relief of C. W. Jacobs;

H. R. 7072. An act for the relief of Mrs. Young Ja Kim;

H. R. 7074. An act for the relief of Hiroko Fujiwara Matsuoka and Mimiyo Matsuoka;

H. R. 7078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eiko Yamada Nagatoshi, Edward Takeo Nagatoshi, and Frances Yoko Nagatoshi;

H. R. 7079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gin Shibasaki Okafuji;

H. R. 7204. An act for the relief of Maria Cristina D'Angelo;

H. R. 7219. An act to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and the improvements thereon in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7260. An act to provide for the holding of court and the furnishing of quarters at Rock Island for the United States District Court for the Southern District, Northern division, of Illinois;

H. R. 7314. An act for the relief of Yukie Nishimura Okubo;

H. R. 7339. An act to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7392. An act for the relief of Columbus Finley;

H. R. 7414. An act for the relief of Teresa Gentile and Galliano Gentile;

H. R. 7428. An act to admit Mrs. Erna Tvedt to the United States for permanent residence;

H. R. 7564. An act for the relief of Maria Margareta Ries and Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries;

H. R. 7608. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Morita;

H. R. 7629. An act for the relief of Fumiko Arakawa and her child, Rie;

H. R. 7667. An act directing the transfer to the Department of the Interior by the General Services Administration of certain property in Boise Barracks, Boise, Idaho;

H. R. 7675. An act to authorize the addition of certain land to Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the State of Tennessee;

H. R. 7706. An act for the relief of Ayako Kurihara;

H. R. 7779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stamatia Lymberopoulos and Leonidas Stavrou Limperopoulos;

H. R. 7783. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald Rafter;

H. R. 7810. An act for the relief of M. S. Davis;

H. R. 7815. An act for the relief of John Yee Horn;

H. R. 7820. An act for the relief of Keiko Uchida Doane and her minor child;

H. R. 7899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Nogami Cotter and Katsumi Cotter;

H. R. 7916. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to execute an oil and gas lease on a certain tract of land in Park County, Wyo.;

H. R. 7944. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Chandler;

H. R. 7961. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Yano;

H. R. 7970. An act for the relief of Mrs. Regina Anderson and her minor child;

H. R. 7977. An act to authorize the city of Buffalo, Wyo., to make additional uses of certain lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7982. An act to abolish the Wheeler National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the National forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8055. An act relating to the collection, payment, and dishonor of demand items, and to the revocation of credit for, and payment of, such items, by banks in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8067. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yup Boon (Joan) Kim Skanes;

H. R. 8098. An act for the relief of Teruko Ishikawa;

H. R. 8119. An act for the relief of Midori Ohta (also known as Mary Stephen);

H. R. 8125. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hisae Kawauchi Kelly;

H. R. 8155. An act for the relief of Chiyo Furumura Yoshida;

H. R. 8180. An act for the relief of Parue K. Tsugami;

H. R. 8183. An act for the relief of Asako Tsuchida;

H. R. 8287. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicate of William Gerard's script certificate No. 2, subdivision 13, to Lucy P. Crowell;

H. R. 8289. An act for the relief of Yee Balche Yee;

H. R. 8361. An act for the relief of Toshiko Murai;

H. R. 8381. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joseph G. Grant;

H. R. 8382 An act for the relief of Mrs. Misao Hatanaka Deskins;

H. R. 8451. An act for the relief of Yoshie Nozawa;

H. R. 8500. An act for the relief of Hatsuko Torikai;

H. R. 8514. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain sound recordings imported by the Department of State, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8519. An act for the relief of the estate of Archer C. Gunter;

H. R. 8581. An act for the relief of Yasuko Higuchi Thomson;

H. R. 8583. An act for the relief of Hisako Shimizu;

H. R. 8600. An act for the relief of Yuriko Aoyama;

H.R. 8604. An act to provide for the conveyance of the Percy Jones General Hospital Gull Lake Annex, Gull Lake, Mich., to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.;

H.R. 8617. An act to amend title 14, United States Code entitled "Coast Guard";

H.R. 8709. An act to change the designations of Health Officer and Assistant Health Officer of the District of Columbia, respectively, to Director of Public Health and Assistant Director of Public Health;

H.R. 8722. An act for the relief of Jun Hin Lum;

H.R. 8958. An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress;

H.J. Res. 461. Joint resolution to provide that South Parkersburg, W. Va., shall for the purposes of the seventeenth decennial census be treated as a part of Parkersburg, W. Va.; and

H.J. Res. 512. Joint resolution making further temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on July 27, 1950, he did on July 28, 1950, sign the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House:

H.R. 702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett;

H.R. 1022. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.;

H.R. 1095. An act for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.;

H.R. 1626. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. H. Hill;

H.R. 1697. An act for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler;

H.R. 1854. An act for the relief of Kenneth Everard Hadfield;

H.R. 2196. An act to authorize the elimination of lands from the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana;

H.R. 2264. An act for the relief of C. H. Bolling;

H.R. 2462. An act for the relief of Miju Iseri Tsuda;

H.R. 2535. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall;

H.R. 2588. An act to confirm title in V. LeBlanc and C. Riccard to certain lands in West Baton Rouge Parish, La.;

H.R. 2753. An act to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527; 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries;

H.R. 2808. An act for the relief of Grace G. Walker;

H.R. 2851. An act for the relief of Carl L. Sexauer;

H.R. 3169. An act granting permanent residence to certain Spanish physicians residing in Puerto Rico;

H.R. 3284. An act to authorize grantees of recreational demonstration project lands to make land exchanges relating to such properties, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3305. An act for the relief of the estate of Jose Salgado Santos;

H.R. 3316. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Francisco J. Cordova;

H.R. 3330. An act for the relief of Therese Hohman;

H.R. 3535. An act for the relief of William A. Cross;

H.R. 3906. An act to amend the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act, as amended;

H.R. 3994. An act for the relief of John D. Lange;

H.R. 4041. An act for the relief of Parish Bros.;

H.R. 4141. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Shockley;

H.R. 4309. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nellie K. Marlowe;

H.R. 4343. An act for the relief of J. P. Acker;

H.R. 4364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth B. Moore; John Robert Lusk III; John R. Lusk, Sr.; Mrs. Minnie P. Pruitt; and Mrs. Billie John Bickle;

H.R. 4366. An act to amend section 2 (a) and section 7 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to make failure of registration a continuing offense, and to continue the obligation of officers, directors, and persons acting as such, to comply with the act despite dissolution of a foreign agent;

H.R. 4601. An act for the relief of Jeannette Passayanni-Capodistria;

H.R. 5003. An act to provide for the exchange between the United States and the State of New York of certain lands and interests in lands at Manhattan Beach, Kings County, N. Y.;

H.R. 5110. An act for the relief of Janos (John) Treber and Mrs. Katalin (Katherine) Treber;

H.R. 5221. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietro;

H.R. 5252. An act for the relief of W. M. Tindal;

H.R. 5470. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Haddad;

H.R. 5526. An act to authorize the President to provide for the performance of certain functions of the President by other officers of the Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5628. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the State of Rhode Island;

H.R. 5799. An act for the relief of the Acme Finance Co.;

H.R. 5849. An act for the relief of Samuel M. Kornegay;

H.R. 5947. An act for the relief of Alfio Batelli;

H.R. 5990. An act to provide for the construction, development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland and its extension into the District of Columbia as a part of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6013. An act to amend an act fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior;

H.R. 6018. An act for the relief of Lubomir Mikulik and Viliam Krajcirovic;

H.R. 6198. An act for the relief of the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif.;

H.R. 6247. An act authorizing transfer of land and improvements thereon by the Secretary of the Interior to New Mexico State Fair;

H.R. 6270. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Winnebago Indian Reservation, Nebr.;

H.R. 6292. An act to provide that payments to States under the Oil Land Leasing Act of 1920 shall be made biannually;

H.R. 6482. An act for the relief of Antonio Artolczaga Euscola;

H.R. 6644. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Rounds;

H.R. 6697. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Howard H. Moran;

H.R. 6699. An act to authorize the sale of certain land on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak., allotted to Susan Eagle Dog;

H.R. 6703. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;

H.R. 6709. An act for the relief of Ed Howard Russell;

H.R. 6969. An act for the relief of Ralph E. Brown;

H.R. 6971. An act to authorize the transfer of funds allocated for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Highway Route No. 100 to State Parkway Route No. 4;

H.R. 6994. An act for the relief of Karen R. McAndrews;

H.R. 7016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret O'Donnell and Mrs. Arlene R. Shannon;

H.R. 7046. An act for the relief of C. W. Jacobs;

H.R. 7072. An act for the relief of Mrs. Young Ja Kim;

H.R. 7074. An act for the relief of Hiroko Fujiwara Matsuoka and Mimiyo Matsuoka;

H.R. 7078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eiko Yamada Nagatoshi, Edward Takeo Nagatoshi, and Frances Yoko Nagatoshi;

H.R. 7079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gin Shibasaki Okafuji;

H.R. 7204. An act for the relief of Maria Cristina D'Angelo;

H.R. 7219. An act to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and the improvements thereon in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 7260. An act to provide for the holding of court and the furnishing of quarters at Rock Island for the United States District Court for the Southern District, northern division, of Illinois;

H.R. 7314. An act for the relief of Yukie Nishimura Okubo;

H.R. 7339. An act to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7392. An act for the relief of Columbus Finley;

H.R. 7414. An act for the relief of Teresa Gentile and Galliano Gentile;

H.R. 7428. An act to admit Mrs. Erna Tvedt to the United States for permanent residence;

H.R. 7564. An act for the relief of Maria Margareta Ries and Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries;

H.R. 7608. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Morita;

H.R. 7629. An act for the relief of Fumiko Arakawa and her child, Rie;

H.R. 7667. An act directing the transfer to the Department of the Interior by the General Services Administration of certain property in Boise Barracks, Boise, Idaho;

H.R. 7675. An act to authorize the addition of certain land to Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the State of Tennessee;

H.R. 7706. An act for the relief of Ayako Kurihara;

H.R. 7779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stamatia Lymberopoulos and Leonidas Stavrou Limperopoulos;

H.R. 7783. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald Rafter;

H.R. 7810. An act for the relief of M. S. Davis;

H.R. 7815. An act for the relief of John Yee Horn;

H.R. 7820. An act for the relief of Keito Uchida Doane and her minor child;

H.R. 7899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Nogami Cotter and Katsumi Cotter;

H.R. 7916. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to execute an oil and gas lease on a certain tract of land in Park County, Wyo.;

H.R. 7944. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Chandler;

H.R. 7961. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Yano;

H.R. 7970. An act for the relief of Mrs. Regina Anderson and her minor child;

H.R. 7977. An act to authorize the city of Buffalo, Wyo., to make additional uses of certain lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7982. An act to abolish the Wheeler National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8055. An act relating to the collection, payment, and dishonor of demand items, and to the revocation of credit for, and payment of, such items, by banks in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8067. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yup Boon (Joan) Kim Skanes;

H. R. 8098. An act for the relief of Teruko Ishikawa;

H. R. 8119. An act for the relief of Midori Ohta (also known as Mary Stephen);

H. R. 8125. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hisae Kawauchi Kelly;

H. R. 8155. An act for the relief of Chiyo Furumura Yoshida;

H. R. 8180. An act for the relief of Parue K. Tsugami;

H. R. 8183. An act for the relief of Asako Tsuchida;

H. R. 8287. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicate of William Gerard's script certificate No. 2, subdivision 13, to Lucy P. Crowell;

H. R. 8289. An act for the relief of Yee Baiche Yee;

H. R. 8361. An act for the relief of Toshiko Murai;

H. R. 8381. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joseph G. Grant;

H. R. 8382. An act for the relief of Mrs. Misao Hatanaka Deskins;

H. R. 8451. An act for the relief of Yoshie Nozawa;

H. R. 8500. An act for the relief of Hatsuko Torikai;

H. R. 8514. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain sound recordings imported by the Department of State, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8519. An act for the relief of the estate of Archer C. Gunter;

H. R. 8581. An act for the relief of Yasuko Higuchi Thomson;

H. R. 8583. An act for the relief of Hisako Shimizu;

H. R. 8600. An act for the relief of Yuriko Aoyama;

H. R. 8604. An act to provide for the conveyance of the Percy Jones General Hospital Gull Lake Annex, Gull Lake, Mich., to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.;

H. R. 8617. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard";

H. R. 8709. An act to change the designations of Health Officer and Assistant Health Officer, of the District of Columbia, respectively, to Director of Public Health and Assistant Director of Public Health;

H. R. 8722. An act for the relief of Jun Hin Lum;

H. R. 8958. An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress;

H. J. Res. 461. Joint resolution to provide that South Parkersburg, W. Va., shall for the purposes of the seventeenth decennial census be treated as a part of Parkersburg, W. Va.; and

H. J. Res. 512. Joint resolution making further temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes.

And an enrolled bill of the Senate as follows:

S. 3859. An act to authorize the President to control the anchorage and movement of foreign-flag vessels in waters of the United States when the national security of the United States is endangered, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On July 26, 1950:

H. R. 5866. An act to adjust and define the boundary between Great Smoky Mountains National Park and the Cherokee-Pisgah-Nantahala National Forests, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7477. An act providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation.

On July 28, 1950:

H. R. 3506. An act for the relief of Louis P. Murphy, United States immigrant inspector, El Paso, Tex.; and

H. J. Res. 513. Joint resolution to authorize the burial in the National Cemetery at Nashville, Tenn., of the bodies of members of the Tennessee Air National Guard killed in a plane crash near Myrtle Beach, S. C., July 23, 1950.

On July 31, 1950:

H. R. 940. An act to authorize construction of the Eklutna project, hydroelectric generating plant and transmission facilities in connection therewith, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 512. Joint resolution making further temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes.

RESTRICTIONS ON THE AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9178) to suspend restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Line 9, after "suspended" insert "until July 31, 1954."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this amendment?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under the House bill there was no limit. Under the Senate amendment it provides that the suspension shall exist until the date stated in the amendment, in 1954. As a matter of fact, the whole subject has got to be considered in July 1951, the date of the expiration of the Draft Act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is agreeable to Members on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. VINSON. It is.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia, at the time the bill was before the House the gentleman assured the House this question would come under scrutiny by the Congress in July 1951.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman reiterates that as being his position in spite of the fact that the proposed amendment places the time limit in 1954?

Mr. VINSON. The act expires on July 1, 1951, and notwithstanding this amendment this whole subject must be reconsidered at that time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If this expires in 1951, why do you have the date 1954?

Mr. VINSON. I am agreeing to the Senate amendment because it has been put in there by the Senate. It does not make any difference whether it is in or out. It is just a question of going ahead and agreeing to the amendment. It is all right. There would not be any harm if it were not in there at all and it cannot make any difference one way or the other.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is going to see that the whole business is reviewed next year?

Mr. VINSON. We have to review it under the law anyway.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7764) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "and directed."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "and directed."

Page 2, line 7, preceding "Sums", insert: "Construction authorized by this section shall be chargeable against tonnages authorized by existing law."

Page 2, line 13, after "appropriated", insert: "not to exceed."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain these amendments?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, one Senate amendment strikes out the words "and directed." When the House passed the bill we used the language: "The President is authorized and directed." The Senate did not like the word "direct." The words "authorization" and "authorize" and "direct" are practically the same thing. So we ask that the amendment of the Senate be agreed to. The other amendment relates to tonnage on the books. This tonnage is charged against the tonnage that was authorized in 1938. Instead of additional tonnage

it is just charged against the tonnage of 1938. There is still left on the books about a million or two tons of naval construction; that is merely just charged against it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And there is no new construction authorized at all?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes; there is a good deal of new construction.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I mean, additional construction to what has already been authorized.

Mr. VINSON. This is authorizing two-hundred-and-some-odd ships, and this amendment was not to make it against the tonnage authorized, but against the tonnage previously authorized.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that is agreeable to both sides of the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES MARINE BAND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8139) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held in Biloxi, Miss., September 27 through September 30, 1950, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Marine Corps" and insert "Navy."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Marine Band" and insert "Navy Band."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Navy Band at the annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held in Biloxi, Miss., September 27 through September 30, 1950."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the Senate amendments?

Mr. VINSON. As the bill passed the House, it authorized the Marine Band to go to this reunion, and this substitutes the Navy Band.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I certainly have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR GUAM

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7273) to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments there, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "and" where it appears the second time insert "its relations with the Federal Government."

Page 2, line 6, after "the" where it appears the first time insert "general administrative."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "207" and insert "206."

Page 3, line 11, after "States" insert ": *Provided*, That in the case of any person born before the date of enactment of this section, he has taken no affirmative steps to preserve or acquire foreign nationality."

Page 4, line 8, strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)."

Page 6, line 5, strike out "sex,".

Page 6, line 6, strike out all after "denied" down to and including "authority" in line 11.

Page 7, lines 1 and 2, strike out ", in a school approved by the Governor of Guam."

Page 7, line 3, strike out "political or."

Page 7, line 3, strike out all after "test" down to and including "Guam" in line 5.

Page 7, line 6, after "shall" insert "ever."

Page 7, after line 7, insert: "(t) No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the government of Guam or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office of trust or profit under the government of Guam."

Page 7, lines 17 and 18, strike out ", unless sooner removed by the President for cause."

Page 8, line 25, strike out "or ordinance."

Page 9, lines 7 and 8, strike out "Lieutenant Governor for" and insert "secretary of."

Page 9, lines 20 and 21, strike out ", unless sooner removed by the President for cause."

Page 10, lines 3 and 4, strike out "Lieutenant Governor" and insert "secretary."

Page 10, line 9, strike out "house of council" and insert "legislature."

Page 10, line 10, strike out all after "and" down to and including "ancestry." in line 14 and insert "instrumentalities. In making appointments and promotions, preference shall be given to qualified persons of Guamanian ancestry."

Page 10, line 17, after "ancestry." insert "The legislature shall establish a merit system and, as far as practicable, appointments and promotions shall be made in accordance with such merit system."

Page 11, strike out lines 4 to 7, inclusive.

Page 11, line 8, strike out "e" and insert "(d)."

Page 11, line 13, strike out all after "10." down to and including "house." in line 16 and insert "The legislative power of Guam, except as otherwise provided in this act, shall be vested in a legislature which shall consist of a single house of not to exceed 21 members to be elected at large. General elections to the legislature shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, biennially in even-numbered years."

Page 11, line 21, strike out "shall be constituted and."

Page 12, line 4, strike out "and" where it appears the first time and insert "sales,".

Page 12, line 4, strike out "fees" and insert "fees,".

Page 12, line 6, after "be", insert "uniformly."

Page 12, line 18, after "exempt", insert "as to principal and interest,".

Page 12, line 24, after "choose", insert "from its members."

Page 14, line 11, strike out all after "18." down to and including "following." in line 13 and insert "Regular sessions of the legislature shall be held annually for a period or periods not to exceed in the aggregate 60 calendar days, as the legislature may determine. Such sessions shall convene in Agana on the second Monday in January."

Page 15, lines 10 and 11, strike out "two-thirds of each house (if there be two houses) or."

Page 15, line 12, strike out "(if there be only one house)."

Page 17, strike out all after line 8 over to and including line 9 on page 19 and insert:

"SEC. 22. (a) There is hereby created a court of record to be designated the "District Court of Guam", and the judicial authority of Guam shall be vested in the District Court of Guam and in such court or courts as may have been or may hereafter be established by the laws of Guam. The District Court of Guam shall have, in all causes arising under the laws of the United States, the jurisdiction of a district court of the United States as such court is defined in section 451 of title 28, United States Code, and shall have original jurisdiction in all other causes in Guam, jurisdiction over which has not been transferred by the legislature to other court or courts established by it, and shall have such appellate jurisdiction as the legislature may determine. The jurisdiction of and the procedure in the courts of Guam other than the District Court of Guam shall be prescribed by the laws of Guam.

"(b) The rules heretofore or hereafter promulgated and made effective by the Supreme Court of the United States pursuant to section 2072 of title 28, United States Code, in civil cases; section 2073 of title 28, United States Code, in admiralty cases; sections 3771 and 3772 of title 18, United States Code, in criminal cases; and section 30 of the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898, as amended (title 11, U. S. C., sec. 53), in bankruptcy cases; shall apply to the District Court of Guam and to appeals therefrom.

"SEC. 23. (a) The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit shall have jurisdiction of appeals from all final decisions of the District Court of Guam in all cases involving the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States or any authority exercised thereunder, in all habeas corpus proceedings, and in all other civil cases where the value in controversy exceeds $5,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

"(b) Any party may appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from an interlocutory or final judgment, or order of the District Court of Guam, holding an act of Congress unconstitutional in any civil action, suit, or proceeding to which the United States or any of its agencies or any officer or employee thereof, as such officer or employee, is a party. A party who has received notice of appeal under this section shall take any subsequent appeal or cross appeal to the Supreme Court. All appeals or cross appeals taken to other courts prior to such notice shall be treated as taken directly to the Supreme Court.

"SEC. 24. (a) The President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a judge for the District Court of Guam who shall hold office for the term of 4 years and until his successor is chosen and qualified unless sooner removed by the President for cause. The judge shall receive a salary payable by the United States which shall be the same as the salary of the Governor of Guam as provided by section 26 (a) of this act, and shall be entitled to the benefits of retirement provided in section 373 of title 28, United States Code. The Chief Justice of the United States may, with the consent of the judge so assigned, assign any United States circuit or district judge to serve as a judge in the District Court of Guam whenever it is made to appear that such an assignment is necessary for the proper dispatch of the business of the court.

"(b) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,

a United States attorney and United States marshal for Guam to whose offices the provisions of chapters 31 and 33 of title 28, United States Code, respectively, shall apply.

"(c) The provisions of chapters 21, 41, 43, 49, and 57 of title 28, United States Code, shall apply to the District Court of Guam."

Page 20, line 8, strike out "of $16,000" and insert "at the rate provided for governors of Territories and possessions in the Executive Pay Act of 1949, but not to exceed $13,125."

Page 20, line 12, strike out "$16,000" and insert "the equivalent of the compensation for a civilian governor."

Page 20, strike out lines 13, 14, and 15 and insert "(b) The secretary of Guam shall receive an annual salary to be paid by the United States at a rate established in accordance with the standards provided in the Classification Act of 1949."

Page 21, line 13, after "States", insert "at established rentals."

Page 22, line 14, after "property", insert ", real and personal,".

Page 22, line 22, after "property", insert ", real and personal,".

Page 23, line 5, after "property", insert ", real and personal,".

Page 23, lines 15 and 16, strike out "advantageous to the Government of the United States" and insert "in the public interest."

Page 23, line 16, after "property", insert ", real and personal,".

Page 24, line 6, strike out "collected in" and insert "derived from."

Page 25, line 4, strike out "The" and insert "Upon the 21st day of July 1950, the anniversary of the liberation of the island of Guam by the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II, the."

Page 25, line 5, strike out "immediately upon enactment."

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands a question? As I understand, this is a bill which gives a civilian form of government to American Guam which has been under a military administration for about 50 years?

Mr. PETERSON. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And wherein the President by Executive order last September established a civilian governor, who has been in charge since that date, pending the enactment of this bill?

Mr. PETERSON. That is correct. The amendments are more or less procedural. In other words, as to the governor's salary, the Senate bill is less than the House bill, and it provides for a secretary of Guam instead of a lieutenant governor, and instead of a supreme court it provides for a district court, doing away with two judges. As far as the bill is concerned, the Senate bill is more economical than the House bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman on that. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE OF ESCORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to escort our distinguished guests into the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess at this time subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

RECEPTION OF MEMBERS OF THE JAPANESE DIET

During the recess the following proceedings occurred:

The members of the Japanese Diet entered the Hall of the House of Representatives at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m., and were escorted by the committee appointed for that purpose to the places reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, it is my high privilege and great pleasure to welcome on this floor today and in the gallery distinguished citizens from Japan.

To say that they are welcome here in the United States of America and that we are glad to have them is putting it only mildly. We are glad that you are here representing the country you do.

For many, many years peace and amity reigned between the United States and Japan. In recent years that has been disturbed. We trust that your visit here is an evidence that your government is a friendly one. It gives us the opportunity of showing you that in the future we want to be your friends. We want to live in peace with you, that you and we in a democratic way may carry on and make the world in which we live a better place.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with our distinguished Speaker in this cordial welcome to our distinguished guests from across the sea. We are living in a turbulent period, a period when all that is dear and precious to mankind is at stake. In these critical days, we are delighted to have this genuine gesture of friendship, and we welcome you to a country which is ready and anxious to establish firmly the bonds of friendship.

The United States at the present moment is trying to aid in the rebuilding and rehabilitation of your native land. We want to make Japan one of the great countries of the world, a country that will join with us and the other forces that will fight for freedom and for better days for peoples everywhere.

It is in this spirit we welcome you here today. We believe the generous gesture of your visit to us will bear good fruit in the days that are to come. We want you to realize that the people of the United States have no desire either for domination of other countries or of empire. We are only trying to build a more peaceful world, a world where we may achieve a better life for the average man and woman, whether they live in the United States, Japan, or any other country.

The people of the world are begging for peace. They seek peace, but at the same time, they want freedom and opportunity. People who believe in peace and freedom must be rallied together in one great common cause.

We hope that this visit will cement better relations between two great peoples, two peoples, who, working in full cooperation, can rescue the world from war and destruction.

I repeat, I am happy to join with our distinguished Speaker and to welcome you to the United States. I hope your visit will be happy and profitable. I am sure that it will help to give you a better understanding of what can come from people who live in freedom, where private initiative has the opportunity to work its wondrous results. We want you to take back to Japan the most kindly feelings toward the people of the United States. I believe the peoples of our two great countries working together can be a positive force—a positive force for better things for all the people of the world.

Let us work together. With full confidence and trust in each other, we can rescue mankind from the threat of those who would put out the lights of freedom and usher in an era of oppression and perhaps slavery.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the spokesman for the members of the Japanese Diet to come to the Speaker's rostrum, that he may be presented.

Delegate Kitamura stood at the Speaker's rostrum, to the right of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair takes great pleasure in presenting to the Members of the House of Representatives a leader of the Democratic Party in the Japanese Diet, Member for Nagasaki, and former Minister of Finance, Delegate Tokutaro Kitamura, representing the members of the Diet of Japan.

Delegate KITAMURA. On behalf of the Japanese delegates who have been permitted to come into this great place, I should like to be allowed to express several things in my reply.

I wish to express our very deepest gratitude for this great honor which has been extended to us, to be permitted to come here, and especially to be permitted to come to this great place of honor here on the stand to express our message of gratitude. This is something which words cannot express.

As a representative of the Japanese people, I should like to express our deepest regret for the tragic trouble that we have caused to the people of the United States, the peoples of the European nations, the people of of China, and also the people of the Australian nation, representatives of whom I believe are in the gallery today. [Applause.]

The third point to which I should like to refer is the very deep gratitude the Japanese people have for the material assistance in the form of food and other aid which has been given to Japan for her rehabilitation after the war. This is a gesture which indicates the great forgiveness which the United States has, and gives to your aid a moral and spiritual significance by which we, the Japanese people, are deeply moved and for which we are deeply grateful. [Applause.]

Unfortunately, a very serious situation has arisen in the Far East in this

most historic moment. I wish to express also our very deepest appreciation for the quick and effective action that the United States has taken in line with the action taken by the United Nations to forestall the aggressors against peace, the aggressors that are threatening the freedom, the justice, and the liberty of nations in the Far East and elsewhere in the world.

We realize that the precious blood of the sons of America is now being shed to protect the freedom of the world and the Far East, and if we might be permitted, as Japanese, to bow our heads in deepest and humble gratitude and appreciation for this great sacrifice that the United States is making, it will be indeed an honor and a privilege for us.

Although Japan is not yet a free member of the family of nations, still we, the Japanese people, would like to do everything in our own present power to support the action now being taken to protect the Far East. Following the devastation of the war, Japan is now trying to rehabilitate herself and is doing everything that she possibly can to bring order out of great confusion, a confusion which is typified by the loss of 4,000,000 homes. Every effort that she can possibly put forth is being exerted to bring herself up economically out of the destruction that has taken place in Japan.

We had thought that the first step that we must take was an economic and material rehabilitation in our nation, but we have discovered that the far greater and far more basic rehabilitation is the establishment of a true moral order in the Far East and in our nation. Only on the basis of this moral order can a true economic order be established. [Applause.]

It was with this in mind that many of the leaders representing all phases of life in Japan went to the assembly at Caux, Switzerland, and discovered there that the four basic standards set forth by the program for moral rearmament can be the real basis on which a true rehabilitation and reconstruction can be carried out in our nation. [Applause.]

Especially in view of the great forces of communism that are now penetrating the Far East, we, the Japanese people, feel extremely responsible for finding a true answer to that great ideology, an answer that will be a better ideology, an answer that will give a true constructive basis on which inspired democracy can be established in the Far East. This is the great question and the great subject to which we, the Japanese people, must find the answer and carry it out. [Applause.]

The 80,000,000 citizens of Japan are now trying to work themselves into a truly democratic and truly peaceful nation for readjustment and freedom in the world. To bring this about in a real sense in our nation is the best way in which we can express specifically our deep gratitude to the United States for the assistance she has given us. [Applause.]

In closing I should like once again to express my very deepest gratitude for this great honor and most historic opportunity that has been accorded me to address the Members of the House of Representatives and to express my gratitude to you and to the Speaker of this House. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m., the members of the Japanese Diet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

THIRTY-FIRST REPORT TO CONGRESS ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 666)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

This is the Thirty-first Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations, for the period ending March 31, 1950, furnished in accordance with section 5, subsection (b) of the act of March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 32; 22 U. S. C., sec. 414 (b)).

The Government of Chile, in February 1950, arranged to pay the entire balance on its lend-lease accounts, thus providing for settlement in full of its lend-lease obligations. Efforts have been continued to complete the negotiation of settlements with the few countries which have not entered into final agreements for lend-lease, and to dispose of various claims, accounts, and other residual problems.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 28, 1950.*

SENECA NATION OF INDIANS OF NEW YORK

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4942) to regulate the collection and disbursement of moneys realized from leases made by the Seneca Nation of Indians of New York, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "leases", insert ": *Provided further,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize the city of Salamanaca to grant new leases, or to modify, change, or alter existing leases, except with the consent of the Seneca Nation and upon terms agreeable to the Seneca Nation, such consent and such agreement to be obtained from such officer or agency of the Seneca Nation as may be duly authorized by the Seneca Nation to give such consent or arrive at such agreement".

Page 2, after line 3, insert:

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be construed as waiving the rights or title of the Seneca Nation to the lands referred to in the first section of this act, nor shall such rights or title be abridged except as may be hereafter provided by the United States in full consideration of the rights of the Seneca Nation."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "2" and insert "3."

Page 2, line 9, after "basis.", insert "The council of the Seneca Nation shall keep complete and detailed record of all payments and disbursements from the sum so set aside, and shall make such records available for inspection by members of the Seneca Nation at all reasonable times."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "3" and insert "4."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "he" and insert "the treasurer of the Seneca Nation."

Page 2, line 17, after "Act", insert ", and shall transmit a copy of this report to the council of the Seneca Nation and shall make a copy available for inspection by members of the Seneca Nation at all reasonable times."

Page 2, line 18, strike out "4" and insert "5."

Page 3, strike out lines 5 to 9, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to give to the State of New York or to any authorized agency thereof or to the proper officials of the several tribes copies of official records required by the State, or by any authorized agency thereof or by the officials of the several tribes, to carry out the purposes of this act or other purposes which, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, are in the interests of the welfare of the Indians of New York State: *Provided,* That copies as are given to the State of New York or to any authorized agency thereof shall be available for inspection at all reasonable times by duly authorized representatives of such tribes or of the Six Nations of New York."

Page 3, line 10, strike out "6" and insert "7."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Friday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS DURING RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings that took place during the recess be made a part of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

IMPORTATION OF DRIED EGGS FROM CHINA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the State Department is an "Alice in Wonderland" sort of institution inhabited by, among others, our foreign-trade policy makers. In this land of make believe, the fantastic is never unusual or an accident. But, just recently, they have achieved a new high in ridiculousness. At a time when the American people are threatened with a 20-percent increase in their already staggering tax load to pay for heavy governmental expenditures for mobilization—we find

these happy policy makers actually giving the Chinese Communists "cut rates" on tariff duties to be paid on products they are dumping on our American market. This is even more fantastic when we realize that, in the view of our Government, the Chinese Communists do not even legally exist.

There have been repeated protests on the importation of dried eggs from Communist China, but the administration refuses to act. The rate of imports has greatly increased since the first of the year, and established an all-time record in the month of May. This at a time when the Department of Agriculture was accumulating nearly 110,000,000 pounds of dried eggs, equivalent to nearly 300,000,000 dozen shell eggs, under a price-support program. In the first 5 months of this year we have imported dried eggs from Communist China equivalent to nearly five and one-fourth million dozen shell eggs.

The duty on dried eggs was set in 1931 at 27 cents a pound following a comprehensive study by the Tariff Commission. In late 1947, the State Department negotiated a new treaty with the Chinese Nationalist Government under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in which the duty was reduced to 17 cents a pound on dried eggs. This spring the Chinese Nationalist Government notified our State Department that it was withdrawing from the trade agreement as of May 5, 1950.

We do not now have a trade agreement with either the Chinese Nationalists or the Chinese Reds. In fact, we do not recognize the Communists as a government, but apparently they are nice people to do business with. The State Department contends they can do nothing to stop the imports of these dried eggs. Further, that before they can put the duty back to the old level of 27 cents a pound it is necessary to consult with 58 other nations—none of whom sell us dried eggs. Then the President, by proclamation, may restore the previous cut.

Facing, as we are, extremely critical times, I believe that we should put a stop to this type of muddle-headed thinking. The cleaning up of a few messes—of which the "case of the dried Red eggs" is a typical example—would, I am sure, be greatly appreciated by that "forgotten man," the American taxpayer.

DOMESTIC MINING INDUSTRY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit a copy of a telegram which I dispatched to Hon. Oscar L. Chapman on Friday of last week, the contents of which are as follows:

Hon. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.:

Have just been informed that you have summoned a meeting of the National Minerals Advisory Council scheduled to meet Thursday, August 3, to discuss mineral situation and advise the President of the urgent need for strategic and critical metals and minerals. I heartily approve of this move whereby many errors of the last war may be eliminated. Inasmuch as industry leaders and Members of the Senate and Congress are interested in production of raw materials, would suggest at some point during the advisory committee meeting invitations be extended to myself and other key Members from the Western States to meet with your representatives and members of the National Minerals Advisory Council so that not only the administration will benefit by the advice of these men, but the Members of Congress as well. We are the ones who have to supply the administration with the necessary authority to carry out such plans as may be determined, and we should be fully informed.

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman from Nevada.

I should like to add that this body here in Congress has repeatedly turned down legislation dealing with our domestic mining industry, and it is my hope that this meeting with the advisory committee, if granted, will help open the eyes of Congress to the urgency of the immediate consideration of our domestic mining industry in relation to national defense.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3644) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, which passed the other body unanimously, grants to the War Claims Commission power to subpena witnesses and documents in connection with hearings held by the Commission. The House last Thursday passed on the Consent Calendar the bill H. R. 7802, which deals with the same subject. If my unanimous-consent request is granted, it is my intention to offer an amendment striking everything after the enacting clause in the bill S. 3644 and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill that passed the House.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and there is no objection to the bill to which the gentleman has just made reference, may I say that the House bill was reported out of our committee unanimously. It is legislation that is highly necessary, and should have the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is this bill?

Mr. BECKWORTH. This bill simply gives the War Claims Commission the power to subpena certain data with reference to claims of people whose cases it is considering at this time. The House bill was passed the House, and this is merely a substitution of the House bill for the Senate bill.

Mr. CLEMENTE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, 80th Cong., approved July 3, 1948), as amended be further amended by redesignating subsection "(d)" thereof as subsection "(g)," and by adding to section 2 three new subsections "(d)," "(e)," and "(f)" to read as follows:

"(d) For the purpose of any hearing or examination under this act, the Commission and those employees designated by the Commission shall have the power to issue subpenas for, and compel the attendance of, witnesses to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place where such hearing, examination, or investigation is being held. The production of a person's documents at any place other than his place of business shall not be required, however, in any case in which, prior to the return date specified in the subpena with respect thereto, such person either has furnished the issuer of the subpena with a copy of such documents (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy) or has entered into a stipulation with the issuer of the subpena as to the information contained in such documents.

"(e) The Commission may, in case of a failure to comply with any such subpena, employ the aid of any district court, for the district in which such person is found, resides, or transacts business, in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. Such court may, in case of a refusal to obey the subpena issued to such person, issue an order requiring that person to appear there to produce records, if so ordered, or to give evidence concerning the matter in question. Any failure to obey such order of the court shall be punishable by such court as a contempt thereof. Witnesses subpenaed under subsection 2 (d) or (e) shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are allowed and paid witnesses in United States district courts.

"(f) The Commission may authorize and empower any of its employees to administer to, or take from, any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit when such instrument is required in the performance of the functions or activities of the Commission."

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 3644 and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 7802 as passed, as follows:

"That section 2 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, 80th Cong., approved July 3, 1948), as amended, is hereby amended by redesignating subsection '(d)' thereof as subsection '(e)', and by inserting immediately after subsection (c) thereof the following subsection:

"'(d) (1) For the purpose of any hearing, examination, or investigation under this act, the Commission and those employees designated by the Commission shall have the power to issue subpenas requiring persons to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place where such hearing, examination, or investigation is being held. The Commission or any employee so designated shall, upon application of a claimant, issue to such claimant subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of documents, or both, required by such claimant in hearings upon his claim: *Provided*, That the claimant making such application pay the witness fees and mileage of any witness or witnesses subpenaed upon his request. The production of a person's documents at any place other than his place of business shall not be required, however, in any case in which, prior to the return date specified in the subpena with respect thereto, such person either has furnished the issuer of the

subpena with a copy of such documents (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy) or has entered into a stipulation with the issuer of the subpena as to the information contained in such documents.

"'(2) The Commission may, in case of a failure or refusal on the part of any person to comply with any such subpena, invoke the aid of any United States district court within the jurisdiction of which the hearing, examination, or investigation is being conducted, or such person resides or transacts business. Such court may issue an order requiring such person to appear at the designated place of hearing, examination, or investigation, there to give or produce testimony or documentary evidence concerning the matter in question. Any failure to obey such order of the court shall be punishable by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district wherein such person resides or transacts business or wherever such person may be found.

"'(3) Witnesses subpenaed under this subsection (d) shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are allowed and paid witnesses in United States district courts.

"'(4) Any member of the Commission, and any employee of the Commission authorized by the Commission to do so, may administer to, or take from, any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit when such action is necessary or appropriate in the performance of the functions or activities of the Commission.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby a similar House bill (H. R. 7802) was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Mr. McKenna appearing in the Washington Sunday Star in regard to communism.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Truman's Task."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORSKI, Mr. DEANE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. MARCANTONIO, and Mr. COLMER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a message from the Legislature of Puerto Rico.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a joint statement by 15 Members of the House of Representatives on the current situation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Commander Harold Russell, of the AMVETS.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a short editorial.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS) was given permission to extend her remarks and include newspaper clippings.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial by Arthur Krock.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. Cliff Woodrum.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to include a letter in the remarks he expects to make later today in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a bill introduced by him today to outlaw subversive activities in the United States.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9109) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress; the Agricultural Act of 1949; 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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 9109, with Mr. ROONEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday, July 27, the Clerk had read section 1 of the bill.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of California: Strike out all of section 1 and renumber the remaining sections accordingly.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, in view of the importance of this amendment, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to remove from the bill that provision which would make the proclamation of cotton quotas practically certain for the next 2 years. This is the amendment about which many of the Members, especially those from Western States, have received telegrams requesting support of it. While this bill does not make any direct provision for the distribution of cotton acreage between the States, this section 1, which my amendment would eliminate, would have the practical effect of slowing down the movement of cotton acreage from the Southeastern States to the Southwestern and Western States. It will be noted from the population figures released by the Census Bureau recently that the population of California has increased about 50 percent in the last 10 years, and other Western States also increased by a large percentage. Most of those new people in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and west Texas, came from Oklahoma, east Texas, Arkansas, and other Southern and Southeastern States. Many of those people who have moved out West were cotton farmers. But, when they moved, they could not bring their cotton allotments with them because the Federal law provides that the cotton allotment goes to the farm and not to the farmer. As a result, the western cotton States have wound up with a great many cotton farmers whose cotton allotments are still in Oklahoma, Arkansas, or some other cotton-growing States.

The present law provides that cotton quotas are not to be proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture when the supply of cotton falls below normal. With the very short cotton crop which is now being produced it now appears certain that the supply of cotton will be below normal at the end of the current crop year, and therefore no quotas will be invoked next year. But now that the cotton supply has reached normal and the West is to be free to plant the cotton it needs to support its people, what have our southern friends done in the pending bill? Why, they are attempting to change the definition of the term "normal supply of cotton" to keep the West, and even their own farmers under restricted cotton plantings when it would not be done under the present law.

In other words, the definition of "normal supply of cotton" was fine until it has given the West a chance to expand its cotton acreage. Now our southern friends want to change it. They want to remove the "plus 30 percent" from the definition of "normal supply," and that is what section 1 of the pending bill would do.

If my amendment prevails so that the present law is left undisturbed, it would mean that some of the Nation's cotton acreage can move to the West to take care of the people who have moved out there.

I remember very well the dozens of Congressmen from the South who appeared before the Committee on Agriculture a few months ago pleading with us to do something about the county to farm allotments on cotton. They told us in effect that many of their cotton farmers were about ready to lynch them because of the gross inequities of the then existing cotton allotment law as it pertained to the distribution of the county allotment to the farms. It will be remembered that the Cooley resolution rectified that situation for this year only. The pending bill would rectify that county to farm allotment situation on a permanent basis. Therefore, I say to you gentlemen from the South that if you leave in the pending bill this section 1 which my amendment would eliminate, you are going to kill this whole bill and bring down on your necks that swarm of hornets which you must have thought you were in a few months ago when we passed the Cooley resolution in an effort to get them off temporarily. I say this because the effect of section 1 of the pending bill would be to make that unfortunate situation almost certain to prevail for the next 2 years by changing the statistics upon which the quota proclamation is based while if my amendment is adopted it would leave the present law on cotton quotas undisturbed and the natural law of supply and demand would be permitted to work thereby allowing these new people in the West to raise some cotton to meet the demands of the wartime economy. There are members of another body in the Congress who are in key positions to kill the bill and who have openly declared that if this section 1, which my amendment would eliminate, remains in this bill, the bill will never become law. I hope you gentlemen from the South will please bear in mind that the influence in a particular committee of another body of Congress has recently shifted because of the recent election in Oklahoma, and therefore, if a certain individual in the other body says section 1 of this bill must come out if it is to become law, then it is a pretty safe bet that it must come out. That makes the issue on my amendment very simple. No amendment, no bill, no bill, no relief for the thousands of your cotton farmer constituents who will be on your neck demanding to know why you did not vote to give them relief from the county to farm-allotment situation about which they complained so vigorously to you a few months ago and which the Cooley resolution relieved for this year only.

The choice is up to you, my friends. For the sake of your constituents and mine I beg you to vote "aye" on my amendment to strike section 1 from this bill. Thank you.

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

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Can the gentleman tell me if the Department of Agriculture has recommended this legislation?

Mr. WHITE of California. I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I suggest he refer that to the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from California has seen fit to make this a sectional matter and intimates that someone is trying to take some cotton away from California or, rather, to prevent California from receiving the cotton which it should have. As he states, this amendment that was put in the bill was recommended among others by the Missouri Cotton Producers Association. Missouri, for the benefit of those who may not be acquainted with that section of the State which produces cotton, does produce it in rather large quantities. We have high yields there. We also have a large acreage which is adaptable to the growing of cotton; and if we are to be turned loose again in another race, Missouri can take care of itself, and we can increase in proportion along with any other section of the country.

My support of this bill is brought about because I would say that unless we do give the Secretary authority to proclaim marketing quotas during 1951 and 1952 we are going to bring about a condition that will make the confusion that we had in the latter part of last year and the early part of this one seem very mild.

Unless section 1 remains in the bill, we are going to bring about the abandonment of the PMA organizations with the records that they have, and we would not have any measurement of the crop during that year. We recognized last year that with the acreage turned loose that we could not use 1949 figures as a basis for either allotments or yields or any other statistics in our cotton program. Unless we do grant authority to the Secretary to impose controls during next year, I am afraid we are going to have a recurrence of that situation.

The gentleman speaks about the fact that this bill would not pass the other body unless we took this amendment out and adopted his amendment. I do not feel that the Members of the House care to be intimidated by statements which are made by Members of the other body in an effort to bring about a bill that they would like to have. I think that we want to pass the bill here which we feel will bring about the greatest amount of benefit not only to the people in the cotton-producing sections, but throughout the Nation. I have heard some Members in their conversations say that they were not wanting to pass any cotton bill to help all of the cotton farmers. This bill would not do that alone. I think that this bill as it is written now is not going to bring about any increase in the national cotton acreage; it is not going to cost the Government any more money. We are merely trying to allocate this acreage on a fair and equitable basis and to preserve the program which we have had and which has not cost the taxpayers any money. Fortunately, as has been pointed out many times on the floor, this cotton program has taken care of itself; and although it has taken us a long time to work it out, it has not cost what other programs have.

Let me say in closing that the reason I am opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is the fact that we would, by his amendment, take off all the controls and, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] said here the other day, the race would be on and we would have a duplication of what happened in 1937 when we had some 30,000,000 acres of cotton planted.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we would have the same situation that occurred in 1937. I do not think any of us, whether we are in the cotton business or any other business, would want to see that happen again.

Under the provisions of this bill as presently written the Secretary of Agriculture, if there is a demand for more cotton, would have authority to allocate or make larger national allotments to take care of all of the cotton that is needed. As I read the bill, it does not impose any limitation on the number of acres that he could allocate, or limit him in setting up marketing quotas to meet any demands we may have.

For the reasons given, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] to strike out section 1.

Mr. Chairman, stripped of its verbiage, the argument of the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] on behalf of his amendment to strike out section 1 means that if followed to its logical conclusion, if it has any logical conclusion, the cotton program would be utterly destroyed.

He states that his purpose is to continue the California trend and to provide that cotton may be grown in California instead of in the South and the Southeast. He is rather frank about the matter. He says that he wants to return to the law of supply and demand. There is nothing about supply and demand in section 1, or in the amendment, for under the amendment the remaining sections of the bill continue.

What the gentleman wants to do is absolutely unsound. He wants the Government, the taxpayers of the United States, to continue a reasonable support price with an unlimited production. In order to provide for that unlimited production, not satisfied with the generous treatment accorded the far West including the State of California in the existing law, he now asks that all curbs

against production be eliminated, for the next 2 years.

I lay down as fundamental the fact that if we are to repeal existing law for marketing quotas and return to supply and demand we return to 5-cent cotton that we had in the early 1930's. Price supports are dependent upon one thing and one thing alone and that is there must be control of production. Advocating continuation of price supports, the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] would destroy that upon which they are based; to wit, marketing quotas. That argument is unsound.

Whether he knows it or not, under the guise of providing for a temporary expansion in California, he is rendering a disservice to the Cotton Belt and to the cotton growers of this country because I repeat and emphasize that there can be no reasonable price supports unless there is authority for marketing quotas.

Authority for quota is one thing. The exercise of that authority is another. But authority is absolutely fundamental if the price-support program is to continue to function.

It must be kept in mind that by eliminating section 1 the other provisions of this bill remain. They are intended to continue the allotments among the States on the basis of 1950 and they are intended to prevent inequities between one country and another and between one farmer and another which obtains by providing amendments that will enable the State committees and that will enable the county committees to adjust these inequities.

Moreover, this bill is important because it extends for 2 years the Soil Conservation Benefits Act that has been greatly beneficial to the farmers of the Nation, including the cotton growers. It expires with the current year. So, I say with respect to the pending amendment under the guise of helping that section of our country that was aided more than any other by taking acreage from Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and other States, and by the use of gadgets giving it to California and other western States, because of the cotton trend there, that a distinct disservice is being rendered to agriculture in general and to the Cotton Belt in particular, because we would destroy at one fell swoop that which is necessary to agriculture, which provides for price supports, and this would allow unlimited production, letting down the bars. That happened in 1949, and we had a production that was almost unprecedented. We had it in 1937 because of the declaring of the Adjustment Act void, and we had a production of 19,000,000 bales, with an unjustifiable and unprecedented surplus.

Cotton growers are interested in a program that is fair to them, to the consumers, and to the public. The most beneficial provision of the program has been reasonable price supports. The Public Treasury, therefore, is to be considered. The Cotton Belt is glad that under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and under the support of prices with Government loans thus far the Treasury has made on cotton a profit of something like $200,000,000. The cotton growers thus prospered without burdening the Treasury. It is essential for this program to be maintained. The adoption of the pending amendment would strike at the very vitals of that which is fundamental to a sound program. It would provide unlimited production. This can only mean the end of reasonable price supports.

Section 1 contemplates mandatory marketing quotas for the years 1951 and 1952, but under the terms of the pending bill and the existing law, if more cotton is needed, the quotas can be adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture. The allotments among the States will remain, but will be adjusted proportionately up or down with respect to quotas.

There have been injustices and inequities. It is the fault largely of the State and county committees. The fault has been in administration. Among the purposes of the bill is to provide for the elimination of discriminations.

The apportionment among the States will remain. Provision is made, however, for adjustments within the States, within the counties, and among growers. The allotment for 1950 is the basis except in Texas, and there is a clarifying amendment to make that which was intended to be the basis in 1950 the basis for 1951.

Under the terms of the bill, beginning with 1953 allotments will be determined upon the basis of history.

Both dangers and difficulties would arise if there is no authority for marketing quotas in 1951 and 1952. I urge that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes, if necessary, to answer questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I heard the remarks of the gentleman who just preceded me. Again I want to say that anytime that we put a statute on the books of this Legislature or any other Legislature interfering with the free competitive economy of agriculture or business, then we have set up a situation that in itself demands that we be lashed round and round a vicious circle of occasional argument and temporary expediency. Now it is not a question of party politics at all.

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

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman is opposed to any kind of controls on agriculture, why did he come before the House committee and urge the passage of Public Law 272 last year?

Mr. WERDEL. Well, now, I do not take it that in my remarks so far I have said that I am opposed to controls on agriculture. What I said is that if in the confines of the Committee on Agriculture they conceive a law and put it on the statute books that interferes with the economy of this country, by putting every type of problem into that law that will satisfy the members of the Agriculture Committee year after year, and come out here with a bill, then they have created a situation that of itself demands that we will be lashed round and round a circle of occasional argument and temporary expediency. As long as the basic law is on the books, this Congress and every succeeding Congress is going to be required to consider something equitable by way of amendment to the law on the books.

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

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The provision now in the bill provides for the full production of domestic needs, plus estimated export needs.

Mr. WERDEL. Right.

Mr. COOLEY. If that is authorized, before we can have any control, the sum and substance of what the gentleman is advocating is to permit California to grow all the cotton it wants to produce and sell it to the Government.

Mr. WERDEL. No.

Mr. COOLEY. Why should we produce any more than our needs for domestic and export uses?

Mr. WERDEL. With Government support, we should not.

Mr. COOLEY. Then, without Government support, the gentleman knows, and I know that last year's cotton would have been selling for about 8 cents a pound. In 1937 the cotton farmers almost went into bankruptcy because of the 19,000,000-bale crop.

Mr. WERDEL. A year ago in the first session of this Congress we were considering the equities of the cotton-growing areas of this country. The people from the West, the people from those States who created, financed, built, and prepared during a war, in free, competitive enterprise, cotton gins, cotton compresses, and the oil production plants, came here knowing that there was a statute on the books from 1938 that cut them back so that the men working in that industry in their States could not possibly succeed if they were cut back to the point where they were when the act was effective and prior to forced competition in the industry. They came out here, and after consultation in Memphis, agreed to accept a figure that would permit that industry still to exist in those States, believing at the same time that there would be no mandatory controls if the supply did not exceed domestic consumption plus exports plus 30 percent; in other words, with that 30 percent margin there was a possibility for all of this equipment, all of this development, to work in the field of cotton and in the interest not only of the community but of the Nation.

In reviewing the figures of what happened during competitive enterprise during the 5 years preceding 1945 as compared with the 1930 figures of production in 11 Cotton States, there were 7,000,000 acres of cotton that went out of production in those States. They went out of production because they could make more money in something else during those years.

If this amendment is not adopted, the ratio as it now exists between States and

set up in the act last year will be projected in future acreage. I say again the war effort demands that we again do what we had to do in the last war effort, produce the most cotton that we can produce on the least amount of acres. In other words, this bill says that so far as this war effort is concerned, for every acre of the 300,000 forced out of production last year in California by virtue of the amended act, for every acre that will grow cotton again in the war effort of 1951 and 1952, we will have to produce 27 acres of what was proved to be marginal land in the last war effort. That is what this language means, that so far as our Nation is concerned, to me the situation demands that it be taken out of H. R. 7309. The statement that this Congress is going to find itself in a condition where it is going to have to consider this subject again next year or 2 years from now is entirely beside the point, because there never will be a year when the equities of this subject will not have to be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and this Congress as long as the basic act is on the books.

I am speaking in the interest of my State, to be sure. I am speaking in the interest of the men who were here this year when this bill was being considered and who went home and then found this language put into a newly drafted bill, and reported out of committee without any notice to them or to me or to anyone else I know of. That bill is now being considered on the floor of this House setting the pattern, if you please, for mandatory controls in cotton for 1951 and 1952—setting the pattern for mandatory controls at all times, not only in cotton but in all the basic agricultural commodities. The pattern is now here. I submit to you if you read the new language which provides that controls are mandatory, whenever the available cotton exceeds domestic consumption plus exports, then you know if we ever have a surplus at any particular time in any particular production year, that there must be controls year after year. So when this bill is passed, there is nothing but mandatory controls for cotton for 2 years and the pattern is here for all of our basic commodities in the future.

Let us keep this in mind, too. When I said the language of this act requires 27 acres of marginal land in the South to be produced in the war effort to one in the States that have proven that they can better produce cotton in the immediate past, there is no discretion in the Secretary of Agriculture in this regard. That is a mandate. I pointed out last Thursday in general debate that some of these States which are supporting this provision had produced only half of the ground and are making three times the money out of the cotton industry that they did in 1930.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if you get mandatory controls in this legislation I just wonder how many of your farmers in the cotton States are interested in such controls. Are the farmers of the cotton States, as the Secretary of Agriculture states, if they can plant 2 acres or 22 acres of cotton, do they want the Secretary of Agriculture to tell them they can get 20 cents per pound or are they willing to take 30 cents per pound if they can get that price for cotton? Your interest is in subsidies and controls.

I sometimes think you have these controls to the point where the people in this country are subject only to the rules and regulations laid down by the Secretary of Agriculture. I have been thinking this morning also of the fact that we are in a war and sometimes I wonder whether we know just where we are going, and what the next step is in the process of winning this war.

I remember during the last World War you built two great pipelines, the Big Inch and the Little Inch, to furnish oil from the Texas oil fields, and bring it up into the State of Pennsylvania and the eastern seaboard in order that we might get gasoline and oil to produce the things that were necessary and also to be able to run your automobiles. The Government, at great expense, built those two big pipelines. After the war they had no further use for them because they found they could get oil from the Texas fields by boat cheaper than they could get it through these oil lines. Then the War Assets Administration sold the Big Inch and the Little Inch to the Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. They made a contract that if at any time an emergency existed the Secretary of War could take back these Big Inch lines under certain conditions, if they met those conditions. They had a 20-year recapture clause whereby they could take them over for a 5-year period with two renewals, or take it for a second 5-year period. It requires a study to be made of these contracts in order that the Secretary of War, if he wishes to take these lines over in case of emergency at any time, there is a 90-day clause whereby it is necessary for them to have proper information in order to do that. It seems to me that since the President of the United States has started us into this third world war, we ought to refer this matter to the proper committee of the House in order that the 90-day period would not have to delay the process in case of an emergency.

I hope that the proper committee of the Government will make a study of the capture clause that there is in this Big Inch and Little Inch line contract, and then, if the Secretary of War finds it is expedient to do so, he may take over those lines. That is the principal reason I wanted to get this before the House now, so that that study might begin, and time will not have to be wasted in case of dire need.

Now, let us get back to this cotton and peanut regulation. I do not know who is to gain by this regulation except the southern cotton farmers, at the expense of the American taxpayers. If you will look at your financial statement and find out that you went into the red about three and a half billon last year and that you will go into the red many billions more this year, and talk about prosecuting the war successfully, I wonder how far you can go by creating a deficit each and every year and getting this country into greater financial difficulties, so that eventually we may find ourselves in such financial difficulty that we will go bankrupt. You are headed for it sure as the world. Be American—be wise and economize.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee to be used by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the emergency which faces our country at this time, I feel it is incumbent upon me to state that it is the duty of this Congress now to enact legislation to meet the crisis which confronts us.

I believe we should do the following:

First. Restore regulation W to the Government to limit consumer credit and installment buying. It is my understanding that consumer credit buying has reached the astounding total of $19,000,000,000 at the present time.

Second. Enact tax legislation to carry on the full cost of the conflict in Korea, and to insure our own national security.

Third. Enact legislation to tax all profits over and above ordinary peacetime profits on all industries engaged in the war effort. This will take the profits out of war and insure more funds to pay for the cost of the conflict and help to balance the budget.

Fourth. Prices on all commodities should be rolled back to June 25, the day before the Korean conflict started.

Fifth. Nonessential Government expenditures must be reduced.

It is up to this Congress, Mr. Chairman, to do something about high prices, hoarding, and irresponsible profiteering. These practices are dangerous to our own security; they hinder our war effort; they create undue burdens on our economy and lead to inflation. They are unpatriotic and dangerous, and they fall hardest on the people who can least afford to pay the ultimate costs.

There is no economic basis for price rises, hoarding, and war profiteering. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has stated that prices have risen 10 percent in its index of 28 key commodities since June 25. These include such articles as rubber, tin, wool, wheat, copper, zinc, lead, bread, cotton, and so forth. Cotton has jumped 5 or 6 cents a pound; and woolen and worsted fabrics have increased from 12½ to 17½ cents a yard for men's and women's clothing; coffee from

4 cents to 5 cents a pound; cotton has increased 4 to 5 cents per yard; wool has increased 5 cents a pound; wheat is up 2¾ cents per bushel; lard is up 60 cents a hundred; rubber is up 17 percent; print cloth is up 15 percent; and bread, as a personal illustration, is in certain sections of the State of Montana, up 3 cents a loaf. In the past month the price of hogs has risen 20 percent, resin 14 percent, cocoa 13 percent, coffee 12 percent, tin 10 percent, and pepper 18 percent. These figures which I have compiled over the week end are out of date already, but they do give us a picture of what has happened in just 1 month and should serve as a warning of what will happen if we do not take remedial action now.

All the estimates of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicates that there is no shortage of foodstuffs in this country. Food production today is about the same as it was in 1949. Stocks of food are substantial; average consumption is high; meat will be as plentiful as last year; wheat and corn will be plentiful, and fruits are abundant. Profits are at a record high, as the following figures which I will insert at this point will show, when we go back into the House:

	First 6 months of—	
	1949	1950
Republic Steel	$24, 500, 000	$37, 700, 000
General Electric	46, 500, 000	77, 400, 000
United Fruit	24, 200, 000	34, 200, 000
Atlantic Refining Co	12, 500, 000	17, 600, 000
Johns-Manville	5, 700, 000	10, 100, 000
Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass	9, 100, 000	15, 000, 000
Admiral Television	3, 100, 000	8, 500, 000

The above figures, and they represent only a few of the many corporations whose profits have increased tremendously, speak for themselves.

President Truman has acted with speed and courage to provide the increased military needs of the times. He has offered an anti-inflationary program which I do not think goes far enough. While wages have not gone up, as yet they are bound to unless prices are controlled. The cost of our military program plus the additional expenditures which will be needed for our increased program will amount to approximately $30,000,000,000 this fiscal year. This means an increase of $15,000,000,000 over the present military budget and an increase of the total budget by one-third; $60,000,000,000 will be needed this year compared with the present $45,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1951.

If we are courageous enough to tax ourselves sufficiently to meet our needs the less it will be necessary to set up controls, because taxation, if gone into honestly and deeply enough will make controls unnecessary. If prices continue to rise, it will be hard to bring them down; and the longer this situation continues, the more difficult it will be to find a solution. Voluntary controls and appeals to patriotism will in themselves not work; they have never stopped inflation before; there is no reason to believe they will now. This is no ordinary political year; we cannot continue either business or politics as usual. The American people are awake to the dangers of the times and they are looking to us for leadership.

Our future as a free nation may well be at stake. Are we prepared to face up to our responsibilities, pay the costs, and take the consequences?

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent, I am inserting at this point in my remarks, copies of letters and telegrams from people in Montana relative to the present price rise and hoarding situation in that State. I am also inserting a short news item from today's Washington News.

HELENA, MONT., *July 27, 1950.*

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: The price of bread went up 3 cents overnight in this locality, and an investigation proves that there is no reason for such a pride boost—someone is just taking advantage of the situation.

We, the undersigned, protest this 15-percent raise in bread, and urgently petition your honor to do something about it to stop such sudden inflation of essential items, such as bread, the staff of life.

The reason for this price boost was given in the local newspaper, clipping of which is enclosed, and you can read between the lines that this baker, who declined to be quoted by name, has just a selfish, greedy interest at heart.

PETER AND JOSEPHINE M. JASMIN.
FRANK AND MARY ZORICH.
ANN CRIMMINS.
MARY STOKAN.
ANNA AND MARY DRAGOYE.
MARY G. BISCIGLIA.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *July 28, 1950.*

Mr. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: A group of us housewives feel that something should be done about the way many civilians are buying up things they don't need. You can't buy a bed sheet in this town, together with a shortage of other things, even foodstuffs. We know there is no real shortage but there are too many people who don't realize this crisis is a responsibility of every American as well as the boys fighting on the front lines.

We want an all-out effort such as the Baruch plan. We think a full-scale mobilization for this war is necessary. While there is a crisis there should be ceilings on everything, but when it's over, they should be removed. We don't want a socialized economy permanently, but if it's necessary temporarily, we are for it, and we think it's necessary now.

Yours sincerely,
Mrs. DELLA LEE TAYLOR.

MISSOULA, MONT., *July 26, 1950.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: My reason for writing you is to see if you can do anything about the increase in price of certain foods. Bread has gone up from 19 to 22 cents a loaf. When I called a bakery about it, I was told that flour had gone up $1.50 per 100 pounds, that lard and milk also had raised. If this were necessary, I would be the last to protest, but from the reports coming from Washington, this is not necessary. Someone is making a big profit and I wish it could be stopped. If you can do anything about this, I am sure many would appreciate it.

I am sincerely glad of the primary election returns and feel sure we shall have you in Congress again. We appreciate your efforts for Montana, and also for the veterans' cause.

Very truly,
Mrs. L. C. GOFORTH.

HELENA, MONT., *July 25, 1950.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: This letter is to advise you today the wholesale bakeries in Helena raised their price of bakery goods and the retail merchants followed suit. All bakery goods took a jump, but an example is 1 pound of bread (white) 15 cents raised to 17 cents and 1½ pound was 20 cents and now 23 cents. The wholesalers advised they raised 1 cent per pound so the retailers followed suit by 2 cents or better. I do believe some action is necessary to stop this kind of doing because this is definitely what the President recently asked people not to do. They should realize that this will just bring back price controls and rationing which they all were against, so maybe you might be able to put some good sense into their minds if you can.

Sincerely yours,
W. E. REYNOLDS.

HELENA, MONT., *July 27, 1950.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Representative of Montana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is an article clipped from our local newspaper which shows just one of the reasons my husband and myself would like to see price control go into effect immediately, and prices, primarily food, revert back to those of about 2 months ago.

Our highest meat bill for 1 month for a family of four in this past year was $20, and that in Christmas month. This month our meat bill is already $26.65 and the month not yet over. This includes a menu of hamburger twice a week and hot dogs once a week. The grocery bill got so out of hand we had the grocer close our books for this month on July 24. Will have to make up for those extra days in the month of August.

So many of the raises seem to revert back to the farmers, which is fine for them, but puts the average white-collar worker on the spot. We need other things as well as food. We may eat to live but don't live just to eat.

Since price control seems to be the only answer, this letter is just to let you know our family is for it.

Sincerely,
Mrs. ANTHONY M. VERZUH.

BREAD PRICE ADVANCES HERE WITH OTHER PRODUCTS ALSO HIGHER

Bread and other bakery products took a sharp advance here today, the 1½-pound loaf that formerly sold for 20 cents jumping to 23 cents on retail counters, grocers reported today. The 1-pound loaf formerly selling for 15 cents will now be 17 cents.

Doughnuts and sweet rolls went up 5 cents each a half dozen. A package of doughnuts now costs 25 cents instead of 20 cents and sweet rolls will retail for 30 cents instead of 25 cents.

A baker, who declined to be quoted by name, said, "we're entitled to a raise."

MISSOULA, MONT., *July 25, 1950.*

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: Bread is up 3 cents per loaf (1½ pounds) this morning was 19 cents now 22 cents=15⅘ percent. Looks like the retailer is the first hoarder and forcing the consumer to do likewise. Wheat is not up, flour is not up, labor has not suddenly brought on this condition.

How about this?

Yours truly,
FRANK L. BUSCH, Sr.

MISSOULA, MONT., *July 28, 1950.*

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I am writing this letter to express the opinions of myself and

my family concerning an important, current issue. That issue is whether or not this country should adopt price control and rationing.

I don't think it can be disputed that we are in one hell of a fight and that if we come out of this Korea thing without many losses and much damage we will be very lucky. I think we should face the fact that we are in a battle for our existence, or are at least entering into the preliminaries of such a battle. All of my remarks are based on that premise. Let us assume that is true, at least for the sake of argument. Then is it not necessary for us to gird ourselves for such a battle? I think one of the most important things the country can do to keep itself in shape for a fight is to keep its economy healthy. This cannot be done if we allow inflation to go unchecked. No one of consequence benefits from inflation—many are hurt—a few profiteers make a profit. I hardly need express these things to you, for you are more aware of them than I am. I will, however, point out one instance, which I believe to be typical of thousands, or millions. My father died 5 years ago. At the time of his death he was adequately insured so that my mother need have no worry concerning her own welfare. But since then the value of the dollar has been reduced to somewhere near half of its value then. My mother is getting on in years. It is too late for her to strike out in a new profession. She is dependent upon that insurance, yet each day it becomes less and less useful to her.

The Korean War and the wars that are likely to ensue will put much worse inflationary pressures on the economy. What will happen to widows, all types of Government workers, white collar employees? And what will happen to labor? These groups can only lose by inflation.

Even assuming that the war of itself will not strain the economy, there are secondary reactions that will strain it. Thousands of merchants all over our country for some reason place the gain of dollars ahead of all other pursuits of life and hence use a situation like we are in today to their own advantage and raise prices on their goods, whether warranted or not, knowing full well that the public will buy, or, rather, knowing full well that the public will hoard. No doubt this is reprehensible on the parts of both merchant and buying public, and it is a voluntary thing. But voluntary measures will not prevent it.

Prices on many items have begun to go up right here in Missoula. In the last few weeks I have seen and heard many ads using the war-scare psychology to stimulate buying. They are heard over the radio and they are seen in the paper. I select one and enclose it as a typical example of what is taking place here.

The value of our dollar has declined far enough. I personally don't want to see it go any further.

Many people believe that rationing and price control mean dictatorship. Perhaps in a certain sense they do. But these are emergency times, and to my way of thinking it is far better to have a regulated control lawfully enacted by a democratic Congress than an unregulated economic havoc.

Well, I think I have made my sentiments and those of my family and friends clear enough to you. I hope you will forgive this long exposition of my thoughts, but I feel very strongly on the subject.

Yours truly,

BRUCE R. TOOLE.

MISSOULA, MONT., *July 27, 1950.*

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: I am an instructor at Montana State University, living in the university's housing project, among many students.

There is one thing that we all have in common, and that is making our incomes meet the rising costs of living, particularly food prices.

Two items, in particular, that we all use to help balance the food budget are bread and hamburger. Two days ago bread went up 3 cents a loaf, and hamburger has increased 12 cents per pound in the past month. Why wait longer for price control?

Yours very truly,

DAVID P. COLE.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *July 27, 1950.*

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

We are all for increased taxes. But can't something be done about price increases. Meats and bread already advanced noticeably in last few days.

ETHELYN C. HARRISON.

BUTTE, MONT., *July 24, 1950.*

Mr. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Representative, Montana State,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: It is very essential to us that you do not ignore this letter. You have been to Butte, so you know how large our Federal housing project is. It is in behalf of all these folks and little children living in the project that I am writing this letter.

The war scare here is just awful. Sheets and sugar have practically disappeared. One store today was selling sheets at the staggering price of $4.25 each sheet. These sheets are actually worth about $2.79 each.

Bread, coffee, sugar, lard, meat, and cotton goods have gone up as much as 5 to 10 percent in the last week. The crowning point was today when bread and other bakery goods went up in price to the tune of 5 percent.

To us here in the project, these profiteers are helping Russia in their war effort. They are doing (along with the hoarders) exactly what Russia wants them to do.

Hoarding and higher prices go hand-in-hand and something will have to be done. We claim your immediate attention to these matters. It looks to us like price control is needed right now.

We sincerely hope you can do something about this dreadful war scare.

Thanking you for your attention, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Everett F. Beacher (two children), Mrs. D. J. Larkin (two children), Mrs. L. McClung (two children), Mrs. A. McCloskey (two children), Mrs. G. Blewett (four children), Mrs. Ted May (four children), Mrs. D. Badovincc (five children), Mrs. F. Resch (three children), Mrs. Vesta Lawney (one child), Henry Gardner (two children), Mrs. Jack Schulte (two children), Mrs. Rance Edden (two children), Mrs. Griffin L. Smith, Mrs. Gene Dufresne, Mrs. Adelia Hackman, Mrs. Mary Delaney (one girl), E. A. Sheehan (four girls), Mrs. Robert Leeson (three children), Mrs. W. V. Lanning (one boy), Mrs. Antonielti (four children), Mrs. William Honka (three girls), Mrs. Charles Hollahan (two girls), Miss Evelyn Sampson, Mrs. Virgil L. Hills (one child), Mrs. Olivia Menard (four children), Sang Howard, Mrs. Sang Howard (one child), Mrs. Dale Kittel (two children), Mrs. Albert Cutler (six children), Mrs. Florence Campbell (two children), Mrs. A. Albright (two children), Mrs. John T. O'Donnell (one child), Mrs. Herbert J. Malone (two children), Mrs. H. L. Edwards (two children).

The signatures on this letter represent about 250 families living in Silver Bow homes, with an average of three children to each family.

Sincerely,

MRS. JACK SHULTE.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *July 25, 1950.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Profiteering bakeries in Bozeman raised bread prices 3 cents per loaf today. Apparently we need controls at once.

L. R. DAEMS.

GREAT FALLS MILL AND SMELTERMEN'S UNION NO. 16,
Great Falls, Mont., July 12, 1950.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: The members of the Great Falls Mine, Mill, and Smelterworkers are very concerned over the recent increase in the cost of living and what may happen in the future due to the war hysteria caused by the conflict in Korea.

As you probably know, price boosts have already been reported in a wide variety of foodstuffs, especially meats.

They are also worried on what may happen to rent control, especially if this war should expand.

Now, this practice of appealing to businessmen and retailers to hold the line on prices is just another way of fooling the buying public.

Therefore, we believe and recommend to you that you immediately do all in your power to invoke price control over foodstuff and rents, until this conflict is over.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM H. GRAHAM,
Financial Secretary.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM,
Missoula, July 18, 1950.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: I want to urge that you support the placing of controls on prices, wages, profits, and other elements of the economy. We are definitely in a wartime period and the necessary wartime controls should be imposed. I hope you will urge the President that profiteering and gouging on the pretense of scarcity already have started and we cannot act too soon to protect the ordinary citizen.

Thanks and best regards.

Cordially yours,

JAMES L. C. FORD.

[From the Washington Daily News of July 31, 1950]

MILK GOES UP

Milk went up 1 cent a quart in Indianapolis today, and butter and other dairy products followed suit. Washington's milk price went up a half-cent.

The Royal Typewriter Co.'s standard models will rise about 7 percent tomorrow. A 7 percent boost in the wholesale price of Procter & Gamble's Crisco and household soaps was expected to reach corner markets this week.

Effective tomorrow, the Brown Shoe Co. is raising its prices an average of 15 to 25 cents a pair.

STEAK UP A DIME

Round steak went up an average of about 10 cents a pound across the nation from June 23 to today. But there were wide fluctuations. One Indianapolis shop said its price remained unchanged at 99 cents a pound,

while one Cleveland butcher increased the price from 69 cents to $1.09.

Bread was up 1 cent a loaf in most cities, including Washington, and sugar was up one-half to one cent a pound.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, an agricultural problem would be a very simple one if people were not involved. I wonder if those of us here realize the problem that some of us have in connection with the people. I think if we would fully realize the problem that we have in supporting the people and the types of enterprise they are engaged in that we would be in a better position to deal with the problems.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE]. California is not totally dependent upon cotton as far as its economy is concerned. There are many things that may be grown in California. There are many things that we in the House are going to pass in the form of legislation to help develop that western country, and we are going to be glad to do that sort of thing. It will enlarge our taxable base. We are going to be happy to put into effect reclamation projects which will bring into production land that is vitally needed for the welfare of that entire country. We are going to do that, but, at the same time, we do not want to put an unfair burden upon other sections of the country. There are many people whose only possible business or opportunity is the growing of cotton. They are getting an income from cotton because there is a support price on it. That is the only reason for a support price in a free enterprise system. If it were not in effect, certainly the price of cotton would be so low that the folks in California and the other States who want to expand, would not engage in the growing of cotton. That is the whole reason for it.

In Minnesota we have a problem, for example, in connection with dairy production. Dairy production is going away from our area, and being drawn from it unfairly I think to places where consumers are being compelled to pay more for dairy products with the restrictions that are put into effect. That is free enterprise in reverse. I know what this means to our people, I know what it means to the small family sized farms, I know what it means when an industry in which they have been engaged for many years is shifted away from them. If this continues we will have people in our State who are going to have a most difficult time making a living. Why? Because the trade areas are restricted by charging the consumers more in a particular area. That means, as far as they are concerned, that certain unfair competition has been developed. Why? Because of marketing agreements that support prices in those areas that made production profitable by discriminating against areas of more efficient production.

We in Minnesota do not have an allotment system that will keep that sort of thing from happening. So it is going to create a hardship. It is going to create a hardship for these people in areas where they cannot be expected to grow much cotton.

I am opposed to the White amendment for the reason stated.

I am interested in farmer control of any agricultural program. I think a farmer-administered agricultural program is the backbone of our agricultural economy. I wish some of the people in the cotton areas were more inclined to have farm control of their programs. Many of the counties turn over the administration of these programs to so-called executive secretaries, some person who has a brilliant clerical or political mind but who has not the practical conception of farming who can sit in an office and give all the answers to the farmers. In my opinion, the farmer ought to have more to say about his program in a particular area. There would be a better understanding of the whole problem. The people in my area would be much happier over an agricultural program if they could be assured of it being administered by the farmers themselves. We are interested in the welfare of the people all over the country. When one segment of our agricultural society, when one segment of our agricultural economy, goes to pieces, it affects the whole country agriculturally. We cannot afford to have that sort of thing happen. We must have a strong agriculture. The stronger agriculture is in Minnesota, the stronger agriculture will be in the country as a whole. Minnesota is not going to grow a bale of cotton. The stronger the agricultural economy is, whether it be in Georgia, Mississippi, or California, the better off we will be in Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, the committee respectfully urges you to vote down the pending amendment. The purpose of the amendment, if it was adopted, is to make it possible to have no controls whatever on cotton next year. As I told you last Friday, we had that exeperience once when the Supreme Court, in 1936, knocked out the old Triple-A Act, and in 1937 they produced 19,000,000 bales of cotton. If you think your Government can stand that next year, then you might support the amendment, but I think it might endanger the whole price-support program. If we should produce something like 19,000,000 or 20,000,000 bales of cotton it would mean that 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 bales would probably have to go under the loan, which means that the Commodity Credit Corporation would probably have to come back over here and ask authority to loan another billion or two billion, and I think that would be most unfortunate.

Now, I am discouraged sometimes. It seems to me that a trade is a trade. Last year there was a division among the representatives in Congress of the States as to how much cotton each one should have, and as chairman of the subcommittee I went to the cotton growers of all the States. I said, "We are having a controversy. Why do you growers not get together and reach some agreement?" The cotton growers from every cotton-growing State met and they themselves made an agreement as to how this acreage would be distributed, and we put it in the law and it is there now.

The statement was made here just now on behalf of one of the gentlemen from California that during the war they built some gins and some compresses for their cotton production, and now they cannot get the cotton. Well, now, let us see. In 1943, California produced only 291,000 acres of cotton; in 1944 only 303,000, and in 1945, 319,000. You understand, 319,000 is the highest acreage they planted during the war, and they say they built gins and compresses during that period. But, what have we done for California? We told California we were not going to put the general rule on them. The general rule is that every State gets its cotton quota on the basis it planted to cotton in the 4 years, 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948. That is the way every one of these States took theirs; every one of them. In the case of Arkansas, Arkansas does not favor this amendment. In the case of Missouri, Missouri does not favor this amendment. In the case of those States we said, "You have had a sudden increase lately on cotton, and we will give you special credit for that increase. Instead of putting you on the 4-year rule we will let you use either the last year, 1948, or the 2 years, 1947 and 1948.' Now, if you do not think our committee has done fairly to California, you vote for this amendment.

Here is what we did for California: In 1945 they had only 319,000 acres in cotton; in 1946, 359,000 acres; in 1947, 536,000 acres; and in 1948 they jumped up to 810,000. Now their 4-year average is only 506,000 acres, and then they would be cut from that. But do you know what we gave them this year and what they will have next year? Six hundred and forty-two thousand acres in cotton, which is more cotton than they have grown in any 1 of the 4 years except the last year, 1948. We have given them, if you please, more than three-fourths of the highest year. As I said, their 4-year average would have been 506,000, and under the general rule they probably would have gotten about 450,000, but at their request, agreed upon not only by us but by the cotton representatives of the United States, meeting at my request as chairman of the subcommittee, they deliberated, and they figured it out, and they came back and laid it on the table of the subcommittee, and they said, "Here is the agreement of California, of New Mexico, of Arizona, of Georgia, of Missisippi, of Missouri," and by all the others. "Here is what we have agreed upon, and we ask you to put it into the law." And we put it into the law. They have it this year, they will get it next year, and all of this, it seems to me, gentlemen, amounts to this: I do not want to be unfair to anybody; but if an agreement is an agreement, if they have gotten all this extra cotton this year, shall

we now agree that since they have gotten that much are we going to have no controls next year at all so that they can plant more acreage and get more cotton acreage in the years to come? I think it would be unfortunate, to be perfectly frank with you. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE of California) there were—ayes 20, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

1. Subsection (c) (1) is amended by changing item (A) to read as follows: "the additional acreage added in each State acreage allotment base in 1950 for minimum small farm allotments adjusted upward or downward by the percentage by which the 1951 national acreage allotment is above or below the 1950 national acreage allotment."

2. Subsection (d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The national acreage allotment for cotton for 1952 shall be apportioned to States on the basis of (1) the acreage planted to cotton (including the acreage regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) during the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1950, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions during such period, plus (2) the additional acreage added in each State acreage allotment base in 1950 for minimum small farm allotments adjusted upward or downward by the percentage by which the 1952 national acreage allotment is above or below the 1950 national acreage allotment."

3. Subsection (e) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) (1) The State acreage allotment for cotton for 1951 shall be apportioned to counties on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton (including, in any State which received its 1950 acreage allotment base under subsection (c) (1) of this section, the acreage regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) during the same period of years used for such apportionment for 1950, plus the acreage added in each county in 1950 for minimum small-farm allotments adjusted upward or downward by the percentage by which the 1951 State acreage allotment is above or below the 1950 State acreage allotment: *Provided*, That the 1951 allotment for any State which received a 1950 State acreage allotment in excess of 3,000,000 acres shall be apportioned to counties on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton (including the acreage regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) during the years 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948: *Provided further*, That the State committee shall reserve an adequate acreage not exceeding 10 percent of the State acreage allotment which shall be used (A) for adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage, for abnormal conditions adversely affecting plantings, for incomplete or inaccurate basic county cotton data, and, upon proper showing by the county committee, for inequitable county allotments; and (B) for new farms, small farms, for farms adversely affected by abnormal conditions affecting plantings, and for adjustments by the county committee in other farm acreage allotments in counties in which the 15-percent reserve is insufficient to provide equitable farm allotments.

"(2) The State acreage allotments for cotton for 1952 shall be apportioned to counties on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton (including the acreage regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) during the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1950, plus the additional acreage added in each county in 1950 for minimum small-farm allotments adjusted upward or downward by the percentage by which the 1952 State acreage allotment is above or below the 1950 State acreage allotment: *Provided*, That the State committee shall reserve an adequate acreage not exceeding 10 percent of the State acreage allotment which shall be used (A) for adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage, for abnormal conditions adversely affecting plantings, for incomplete or inaccurate basic county cotton data, and, upon proper showing by the county committee for inequitable county allotments; and (B) for new farms, small farms, for farms adversely affected by abnormal conditions affecting plantings, and for adjustments by the county committee in other farm-acreage allotments in counties in which the 15-percent reserve is insufficient to provide equitable farm allotments.

"(3) The State acreage allotment for cotton for 1953 and subsequent years shall be apportioned to counties on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton (including the acreage regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) during the same years as are used in apportioning the national acreage allotment to the States under subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That the State committee shall reserve an adequate acreage not exceeding 10 percent of the State acreage allotment which shall be used (A) for adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage, for abnormal conditions adversely affecting plantings, for incomplete or inaccurate basic county cotton data, and, upon proper showing by the county committee, for inequitable county allotments; and (B) for new farms, small farms, for farms adversely affected by abnormal conditions affecting plantings, and for adjustments by the county committee in other farm-acreage allotments in counties in which the 15 percent reserve is insufficient to provide equitable farm allotments."

4. Subsection (f) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) (1) The county acreage allotment, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection, shall be apportioned in 1951 and 1952 to farms on which cotton has been planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) in any one of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the acreage allotments established for such farms (without deduction for acreage surrendered in 1950) for the immediately preceding year, with such adjustments as the county committee deems necessary for errors in basic farm data: *Provided*, That if the allotment base for any farm for the 1951 crop is less than the larger of 65 percent of the average acreage planted to cotton (including the acreage regarded as planted to cottor under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) on the farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948, or 45 percent of the highest acreage planted to cotton (including the acreage regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) on the farm in any one of such 3 years, the county committee, upon application in writing by the owner or operator of the farm within such reasonable period of time as the Secretary may prescribe, shall increase the allotment base for such farm to the larger of such acreage as determined by the county committee upon a proper showing of the facts, but such allotment base shall not be increased by reason of this proviso to an acreage in excess of 40 percent of the acreage on the farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"(2) The county acreage allotment, less the acreage reserved under paragraph (3) of this subsection, shall be apportioned in 1953 and subsequent years to farms on which cotton has been planted in any one of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, on the basis of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm in such 3-year period.

"(3) The county committee shall reserve an adequate acreage not exceeding 15 percent of the county allotment which shall be used for (A) making such adjustments in the farm-acreage allotments established under paragraph (1) or (2) as may be necessary to provide allotments which the county committee determines are fair and equitable in relation to land, labor, and equipment available for the production of cotton, crop-rotation practices, and abnormal conditions of production; and (B) establishing allotments for farms on which cotton was not planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) during any of the three calendar years immediately preceding the year for which the allotment is made, on the basis of land, labor, and equipment available for the production of cotton and crop-rotation practices: *Provided*, That not less than 20 percent of the acreage reserved under this subsection shall, to the extent required, be allotted upon such basis as the Secretary deems fair and reasonable to farms, if any, receiving allotments of not exceeding 10 acres under other provisions of this subsection.

"(4) Any part of the acreage allotted to individual farms in any county under the provisions of this subsection which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotments to such farms and may be reapportioned, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, to other farms in the same county, including small farms, receiving allotments which the county committee determines are inadequate and not representative in view of the past production of cotton on the farms and to new farms in such county. Any transfer of acreage in 1950 shall not operate to reduce the allotment base for any subsequent year for the farm from which such acreage is transferred, unless cotton was not planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) on such farm in 1947, 1948, or 1950. 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 any acreage so released and not reapportioned by the county committee in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, shall be added to the State reserve under subsection (e) of this section and be available for the purposes specified therein.

"(5) Any unused acreage in the State reserve shall be apportioned to counties on the same basis used in establishing basic county allotments. Any acreage so apportioned and any unused acreage in the county reserve shall be allotted to farms on the basis of the factors specified in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (f) of this section.

"(6) No farm-acreage allotment established under the provisions of this section for any year shall exceed an acreage in excess of 45 percent of the acreage on the farm which was tilled annually or in regular rotation, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the county committee may, by the use of the county reserve, increase any farm-acreage allotment up to 50 percent of such acreage: *Provided further*, That any part of the county acreage allotment not apportioned by reason of the limitation in this paragraph shall be added to the State reserve under subsection (e) of this section and be available for the purposes specified therein."

5. Subsection (g) is amended as follows:

"(g) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section and section 347—

"(1) State, county, and farm-acreage allotments and yields for cotton shall be estab-

lished in conformity with Public Law 28, Eighty-first Congress;

"(2) for any farm on which the acreage planted to cotton in any year is less than the farm-acreage allotment for such year by not more than the larger of 10 percent of the allotment or 1 acre, an acreage equal to the farm-acreage allotment shall be deemed to be the acreage planted to cotton on such farm, and the additional acreage added to the cotton-acreage history for the farm shall be added to the cotton-acreage history for the county and State;

"(3) the additional acreage planted to cotton pursuant to paragraph (5) of subsection (f) of this section as amended prior to the enactment of this act shall not be taken into account in establishing future State and county allotments;

"(4) for the purposes of computing future county allotments in any State which received a 1950 State acreage allotment in excess of 3,000,000 acres, the 1950 cotton acreage history for the county shall be deemed to be the larger of the 1950 county acreage allotment or the acreage which would have been allotted to the county in 1950 if the State acreage allotment, without deduction for a State reserve, had been apportioned to the counties on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton (including the acreage regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) during the years 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948;

"(5) in any State in which more than one-half of the cotton allotments established for the 1950 crop, for farms on which cotton was planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) in 1946, 1947, or 1948, were 5 acres or less, the county committee may, with the approval of the State committee, adjust downward any farm acreage allotment base for the 1951 or 1952 crop so that such farm acreage allotment base shall not be less than the average acreage planted to cotton (including the acreage regarded as planted to cotton under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) on the farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948."

SEC. 3. Section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"LONG STAPLE COTTON

"SEC. 347. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, the provisions of this part shall not apply to extra long staple cotton which is produced from pure-strain varieties of the Barbadense species, or any hybrid thereof, or other similar types of extra long staple cotton designated by the Secretary having characteristics needed for various end uses for which American upland cotton is not suitable, and grown in irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States designated by the Secretary or other areas designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of such varieties or types.

"(b) Whenever during any calendar year, not later than October 15, the Secretary determines that the total supply of cotton described in subsection (a) for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply thereof for such marketing year by more than 8 percent, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the crop of such cotton produced in the next calendar year: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exempt from such quota any variety or type of such cotton if he determines that the total supply of such variety or type does not exceed the demand therefor, but such exemption shall apply only to such cotton which is produced in irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States designated by the Secretary or other areas designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of such varieties or types. The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of the national marketing quota in terms of the quantity of cotton described in subsection (a) adequate to make available a normal supply of such cotton, taking into account (1) the estimated carryover at the beginning of the marketing year which begins in the next calendar year, (2) the estimated production during the next calendar year of any varieties or types exempted pursuant to this subsection, and (3) the estimated imports during such marketing year. The national marketing quota for cotton described in subsection (a) for any year shall not be less than the smaller of 30,000 bales or a number of bales equal to 30 percent of the estimated domestic consumption plus exports of such cotton for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such quota is proclaimed, less the estimated production from exempt varieties and types of such cotton to be produced from the crop for which the quota is proclaimed.

"(c) All provisions of this act, except section 342, subsections (c), (e), (1), (h), (k), and (l) of section 344, and the provisions relating to minimum small farm allotments, shall, insofar as applicable, apply to marketing quotas and acreage allotments authorized by this section: *Provided*, That the applicable penalty rate for such cotton under section 346 shall be 50 percent of the parity price for American-Egyptian cotton as of the date specified therein. The national acreage allotment for 1951 shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the acreage planted to such cotton in the State during the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1950, with adjustments for trends in acreage and for abnormal weather conditions during such period. The State acreage allotment for 1951 shall be apportioned to counties on the same basis as is required for such apportionment in 1952. Farm acreage allotments for 1951 and subsequent years shall be established in accordance with the provisions of subsection (f) of section 344.

"(d) Unless marketing quotas are in effect under subsection (b) of this section, the penalty provisions of section 346 shall not apply to any cotton the staple of which is 1½ inches or more in length.

"(e) The exemptions authorized by subsections (a), (b), and (d) of this section shall not apply unless the cotton is ginned on a roller-type gin."

SEC. 4. The Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended, effective with respect to the 1950 and subsequent crops of cotton, as follows:

1. Add a new subsection (f) at the end of section 101 of such act, reading as follows:

"(f) The provisions of this act relating to price support for cotton shall apply severally to (1) American upland cotton and (2) extra long staple cotton described in section 347 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and ginned on a roller-type gin, except that the parity price for American-Egyptian cotton shall be used in determining the support level for all cotton described in such section 347 (a). Disapproval by producers of any quota proclaimed under such section 347 shall place into effect the provisions of section 101 (d) (3) of this act with respect to all extra long staple cotton described in subsection (a) of such section 347, regardless of whether certain types or varieties of such cotton were exempt from the quota."

2. Add, in the last sentence of section 403 of such act, following the words "the standard grade", the words "of American upland cotton" and add a new sentence at the end of section 403 reading as follows: "For extra long staple cotton as defined in section 347 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the standard grade for parity and price support shall be grade No. 2 of 1½-inch staple length."

3. Add a new section 420 to such act, reading as follows:

"SEC. 420. Any price support program in effect on cottonseed or any of its products shall likewise be extended to the same seed and products of the cottons defined under section 347 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

SEC. 5. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by inserting a colon in lieu of the period at the end of the third sentence and adding the following: "*Provided*, That the Corporation shall not sell any cotton at less than 5 percent above the current support price for the quality of such cotton, plus an amount each month for carrying charges, computed from January 1 of the calendar year in which the current marketing year begins to the date of sale, equal to the average monthly carrying charges incurred by the Corporation for carrying cotton during the preceding marketing year and interest at the rate currently charged by the Commodity Credit Corporation on cotton loans. The Secretary shall determine and announce within 15 days after the beginning of each marketing year the average monthly carrying charges incurred during the preceding year."

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the 1951 wheat acreage allotment for any county shall not be reduced below the 1950 allotment for such county by more than 5 percent in excess of the percentage by which the national wheat acreage allotment for the 1951 crop is reduced below the 1950 national acreage allotment. For the purposes of this section, the additional acreage allotted pursuant to Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress, and in conformity with regulations of the Secretary promulgated thereunder, shall be regarded as a part of the county and national wheat acreage allotments. The allotment for any county shall be increased to the extent required to provide such minimum county allotment and such acreage required shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment proclaimed for the 1951 crop.

SEC. 7. The second sentence of paragraph (2) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, is amended to read as follows: "The rate of the penalty shall be 50 percent of the support price per bushel of the commodity for such marketing year."

SEC. 8. Section 8 (a), as amended, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, is amended (a) by striking out "January 1, 1951" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1953", and (b) by striking out "December 31, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1952."

SEC. 9. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

1. Subsection (c) of section 358 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The national acreage allotment for 1951 and for any subsequent year shall be apportioned among the States on the basis of the acreage allotted to each State as its share of the 1950 national acreage allotment established under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by Public Law 272, Eighty-first Congress: *Provided*, That the State acreage allotment so established for any State shall not be less than the acreage allotment which would be established if the national acreage allotment were apportioned among the States on the basis of the average acreage harvested for nuts in the State in the 5 years, 1945–49, inclusive: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary determines that the supply of any type of peanuts will be insufficient to meet the estimated demand for cleaning and shelling purposes at prices at which the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell for such purpose peanuts owned or controlled by it, the State allotments for those States producing such type of peanuts shall be increased to the extent determined by the Secretary to be required to meet such demand, but the allotment for any State may not be increased under this proviso above the 1950 acreage allotment for

such State, and such additional acreage shall be apportioned among the farms in such States producing such type of peanuts: *Provided further*, That the additional acreage required to provide the increases in allotments authorized under the foregoing provisos of this subsection shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota, but the increase in acreage allotted shall not be considered in the establishment of future National and State acreage allotments and marketing quotas: *And provided further*, That the national acreage allotment for the crop year 1951 shall not exceed 2,000,000 acres."

2. Add a new subsection (e) at the end of section 358 of such act reading as follows:

"(e) Any part of the acreage allotted to individual farms in any county under the provisions of this section which will not be planted to peanuts and which is voluntarily surrendered to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotments to such farms and may be reapportioned by the county committee to other farms in the same county to the extent necessary to provide such farms with fair and reasonable allotments on the basis of land, labor, equipment, crop rotation practices, and the soil and other physical factors affecting the production of peanuts."

3. Amend subsection (g) of section 359 of such act by striking out after the word "That" where it first appears in the proviso in such section the following words: "for the 1950 crop."

SEC. 10. The provisions of sections 1, 2, 3, and 9 of this act shall become effective with respect to the 1951 cotton and peanut crops and nothing therein shall be deemed to modify or amend existing law relating to acreage allotments and marketing quotas for the 1950 cotton and peanut crops: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3 of this act shall be effective for the 1950 crop for the purposes of section 4 of this act. All other provisions of this act shall become effective upon enactment.

Mr. COOLEY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and that amendments be in order at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COMBS: Amend section (e) (1), (2), and (3) of the bill by adding the following to page 4, line 6, page 5, line 2, and page 5, line 21: *"Provided further*, That the State committee may set aside not more than 1 percent of the State acreage allotment to be apportioned to counties on the basis of requirements for the county committee to adjust cotton acreage allotments for farms operated by persons who were regularly engaged in the production of cotton as owner-operators, tenant-operators, share-tenants, or members of families so engaged during the 3-year period immediately prior to 1942 on the basis of land, labor, and equipment available for the production of cotton, crop-rotation practices, and the cotton allotments for other similar farms in the community."

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

Mr. COMBS. I yield for a question.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman object to confining his amendment to his own State?

Mr. COMBS. I would, of course, have no objection to confining it to my own State. The purpose of my amendment is to meet a situation which perhaps does not exist anywhere else, but I did not want to offer it as a State or sectional amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept this amendment. I want to call attention briefly to what it will do, and the situation which it is designed to meet. It does not affect in any way the total cotton acreage provided under this bill. It would not affect in any way any policy contained in the bill. What it does is to give a broader discretion to the State and county committees to make allotments of acreage to meet a peculiar situation which exists in some sections particularly in the eastern part of my own State and in my own congressional district.

I want to explain to you what that situation is. The east Texas region is a region of small farms. The people there have farmed cotton since before the Civil War. In recent years they have been getting away from cotton farming to a more diversified form of agriculture which we are glad to see. But during the war period, beginning in about 1940 or 1941, a large number of the boys from the farms went either into the armed services or the farmers went into the war plants of the region and the cotton acreage was reduced in many counties as much as 75 percent to 90 percent. Since the war the boys have returned from the armed services and from the shipyards and war plants and have been getting married and buying farms and settling down. What has happened is this: One of these soldier boys wants to farm a little cotton. They have to have a cash crop to get started with diversified agriculture. But they cannot get an acre of cotton allotment for the simple reason that they were not engaged in cotton farming in 1946, 1947, 1948, and so on. Then again we will have the situation where tenants have been displaced by reductions in cotton acreages. They have never done anything but farm cotton and the law does not let them have any acreage. This is intended simply to set up an acreage allotment which the county and State committee can use to meet these cases which are deserving and need to be met. Under the present law the situation is too rigid and too restricted.

I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

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

Mr. COMBS. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Is it the intention of the gentleman's amendment that the 1 percent should come out of the 10 percent of the State reserves or that it shall be in addition to the 10 percent State reserve? That is not made clear by the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. COMBS. I do not care which it comes out of, just as long as we get it, sir.

Mr. PACE. But we need to know.

Mr. COMBS. May I ask the committee this question. Which do you think it should come out of? I want to get this allocable acreage allotment so that it can be used in making these adjustments. That is all I want to do.

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

Mr. COMBS. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman of course realizes you have a 10-percent reservation of acreage at the State level.

Mr. COMBS. I understand that.

Mr. COOLEY. And you have a 15 percent reservation at the county level.

Mr. COMBS. Yes, sir; but it has not been used down there to meet this situation.

Mr. COOLEY. It has not been used because the State committees and the county committees have not exercised the discretion which Congress intended that they should exercise in making these adjustments.

Mr. COMBS. I know that that is the chairman's view, and I know that he knows this bill. The committees down there tell me that they are not allowed any leeway. I do not know who is right. But if you put this into the law, it tells them to do so and that is the point I make.

Mr. COOLEY. The law now being considered provides that the reservation shall be made at the State level and at the county level for the purposes enumerated in the law.

Mr. COMBS. Yes, Mr. Chairman, but I want to point out that they still have to go back to 1947 and 1948 on this acreage proposition. It is not mandatory, as I understand.

Mr. BECKWORTH. And it is not in the bill, either.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will look at the proviso on page 5, line 9, he will note the following language:

Provided, That the State committee shall reserve an adequate acreage not exceeding 10 percent of the State acreage allotment which shall be used—

And so forth.

Mr. COMBS. The point is, Mr. Chairman, that this little region I am talking about of a few counties, including the districts of my colleagues, the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. PATMAN, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. BECKWORTH], as well as my own district in eastern Texas, have been getting the go-around, and we have been trying for 2 years to get this matter corrected. It has not been done.

I hope as a matter of fairness that this amendment will be adopted. It does not affect the bill in any other way and it will put the needed discretion in the hands of these people to meet the situation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, it is incompatible with the very philosophy of this law and all of the other control programs, for the reason that the gentleman is advocating by his amendment giving special consideration to individuals who have, on former occasions, been engaged in the production of cotton.

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

Mr. COOLEY. In just 1 minute; as soon as I finish my sentence. Whereas, under the control program, acreages allotted are allotted on the basis of the history of the farm rather than the history of the farmer, and the acreage is allotted to the owner of the farm rather than to the tenant on the farm.

Mr. COMBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. COMBS. Let me point out that it does just exactly that with respect to this small group of people. Here is a bunch of ex-soldiers going out buying new farmland and they have to have some cotton acreage and they cannot get it under your bill.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely wrong. Last year in Texas when you had an opportunity to have reserved 10 percent of the acreage at the State level, my recollection is that they reserved only about 3 percent. This bill provides that the State and the county shall reserve this acreage for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

Mr. COMBS. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. COMBS. I have just finished a tour of my district. I had a little business down there. I talked to those farmers and to those committeemen, and they tell me they cannot do anything. Perhaps under the law they could. I want a measure that they say will do the job.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman did not want it in there any more than the committee wanted it in, because we put the word in there that makes it mandatory, that they shall reserve the acreage.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. You say it makes it mandatory that they shall reserve the acreage. Is it not a fact that they may not reserve any percent under it or that only 1 percent or 2 percent will be reserved, depending on what they say is adequate?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is exactly true.

Mr. COOLEY. Now, let me answer that. People came before our committee and complained that we had left too much authority in the bureaucrats in Washington; that we should decentralize this program and vest it in the committeemen back in the counties and the States. Is the gentleman advocating that we vest this authority here in Washington?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I will tell you what the gentleman is advocating.

Mr. COOLEY. I wish you would.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman has a county, for example, that had 600 applicants, and we got 400 acres; seven-tenths of an acre each. It threw out 350 people. The gentleman is advocating that the Congress assume the responsibility right here and now, as this amendment would do, in order to prevent that, irrespective of what anybody might say.

Mr. COOLEY. Very well. Then you are advocating, in effect, that we take the authority of this law and vest it in the Capital City of Washington and in the hands of bureaucrats far removed from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Let the author of the amendment comment on that, because it does not do that.

Mr. COOLEY. I am asking you to answer it.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I have read the amendment, quite a while ago, and in my opinion it does not do that.

Mr. COOLEY. It is exactly what I thought the author of the amendment said.

Mr. COMBS. It puts it in the State and county committees and not in Washington.

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly where it is in this bill. We direct in this bill that they shall reserve acreage in adequate quantities to take care of the situation.

Mr. COMBS. It has not resulted that way in the past.

Mr. COOLEY. No, it has not, and your trouble is back in Texas. I do not think you should advocate vesting authority in Washington. Do you advocate that?

Mr. COMBS. No, sir. My amendment puts it in Texas, and if your bill already does it the amendment cannot hurt anything.

Mr. COOLEY. Very well. Then, I say further, that it is contrary to the philosophy of this bill, and it would be a desperately bad precedent for us to set. If we are going to provide this acreage to be allotted to tenant farmers who can work on your farm this year and on some other farm next year and move about with the acreage in his own pocket, then we are putting a premium on the tenant who might be induced to move from place to place, even from one county or State to another county or State.

Mr. COMBS. It will give the tenant a little freedom; is that it?

Mr. COOLEY. It will give him too much freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is entirely possible that the gentleman's amendment would be a limitation on the present law; that is, on this bill.

This bill provides that as much as 10 percent at the State level can be reserved for that purpose, and as much as 15 percent at the county level; whereas, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted it will limit that particular type of farmer to 1 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COMBS. If the gentleman will yield, my amendment does not limit a thing in the bill; it adds something to it.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] asked you a moment ago the question whether it was to be taken from 10 percent or added to the 10 percent; and you asked the committee to answer.

Mr. COMBS. The committee members have been telling us it would be 1 percent of the State allotment.

Mr. COOLEY. It would be taken from the 10 percent. Mr. Chairman, it does not make any difference where it is taken from; in my judgment it would set a bad precedent.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. For the information of the committee it could be done under existing law; it would be possible to make these allocations although, admittedly, the power has not been exercised. I will read from existing law, that is, Public Law No. 272, which reads:

> The State committee may reserve not to exceed 10 percent of its State allotment.

Section 3 reads:

> The county committee may reserve not in excess of 15 percent of the county allotment which, in addition to the acreage made available under the proviso in subsection (e) shall be used for establishing allotments of all farms on which cotton was not planted (or recorded as planted under Public Law 12, 79th Cong.) during any of the three calendar years immediately preceding the year for which the allotment is made, on the basis of land, labor, and equipment available for the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, and soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton and making adjustments of the farm acreage allotments established under paragraphs 1 and 2 of this subsection so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation to the factors set forth in this paragraph and abnormal conditions of production on such farms.

The law says it can be done. While it is true some of these committees did not use this power, it is perfectly clear they have the power to do it and have had it all along; so it will not hurt anything to have this amendment in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understood the chairman of the committee correctly a while ago, the State may reserve up to 10 percent of the total State allotment for adjustment purposes.

Mr. COOLEY. Between the counties.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then when it gets down to the county, the county authority may reserve up to 15 percent. That is what the bill provides at the present time.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman's amendment, as I understand it, makes it mandatory for 1 percent to be dealt with in what manner?

Mr. COMBS. It is to be withheld for allocation to this type of farm tenant.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That would be 1 percent of the total State allotment?

Mr. COMBS. Not exceeding 1 percent of the total State allotment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman intend that to come out of the 10 percent which the bill now carries?

Mr. COMBS. The gentleman will notice that the same proviso is added in three sections of the bill. I do not have the amendment before me. It would depend on how the whole thing was interpreted.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] points out, the present law states that they may do it, and this bill provides that they shall withhold not less than 10 percent at the State level or 15 percent at the county level.

Mr. COMBS. What my amendment would do would be that the States set aside this acreage for this particular year; whether it is out of the 10 percent or the 15 percent would make no difference.

Mr. COOLEY. Would the gentleman mind answering this question: Is it the purpose of the gentleman's amendment to provide acreage allotment to tenants who have not formerly owned real property on which cotton has been grown?

Mr. COMBS. It applies to the man who goes out and buys a new farm.

Mr. COOLEY. Does it apply to the man who formerly owned his farm and had grown cotton on it but disposed of the farm and has bought another on which cotton has not been grown?

Mr. COMBS. No; he could be taken care of. The man I am interested in taking care of particularly is the soldier who has gone out and bought a new farm.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman is trying to provide this acreage to take care of new growers, then certainly it is not necessary, in view of the fact that both the 10-percent acreage which is to be reserved at the State level and the 15-percent acreage which is reserved at the county level can be used so as to provide allotments for new growers. While no specified part of such reserved acreage is set apart solely for new growers, certainly substantially more than that which would be made available by the gentleman's amendment might be used to accomplish the purpose sought by the amendment which the gentleman has offered. Frankly, I am glad to know that the gentleman has now made it clear that he intends for his amendment to affect only new growers who have acquired land upon which cotton has not formerly been produced. There has always been a new-grower provision in the cotton program. I certainly have no objection to providing adequately for new growers of cotton and other commodities, but I do object to changing the philosophy of these control laws by making the acreage allotments to individuals rather than on the definite factors now contained in these control programs. We cannot make acreage allotments to individuals who do not own farm land. We cannot make individual allotments to certain classes or groups of individuals to the exclusion of other groups or individuals and thereby abandon the fundamental philosophy upon which these programs have been operated. The law as it is now written is perfectly plain. The gentleman's amendment will result in confusion and ambiguity, and should therefore, in my opinion, be defeated.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment in order to clarify the issues here.

Let me say, first, that the State of Texas receives 37 percent of all cotton allotted in the United States. This year that State has 7,600,000 acres allotted to it. Under the bill as drawn the State committee of Texas may reserve 10 percent or 760,000 acres. To do what?

If you will turn to page 3, line 19, you will find that among the uses the State committee shall make of the 760,000 acres is stated in the first line of page 1. It is for new farms. That is what the gentleman from Texas is striking at. He says he wants some acreage allotted to farmers, to people in Texas, who have not planted cotton since 1941.

A new farm under the law now is a farm on which cotton has not been planted in the last 3 years. Therefore, what the gentleman is striking at is this: He wants acreage available for new farmers. Under the bill the State of Texas has the right to reserve 760,000 acres and if it wants to it can use every acre of it to do what the gentleman from Texas proposes to do by his amendment.

But that is not all. Over on page 7, each of his counties may reserve not 10 percent but 15 percent. If a county is allotted 20,000 acres of cotton the county committee can reserve 3,000 acres of it. To do what? They can use every acre of the 3,000 for the new farms that the gentleman is so much concerned about, except the 20 percent set aside for farms under 10 acres.

Mr. Chairman, when we have these acreage controls, when you give to one you must take from somebody else. I do not know who the gentleman from Texas proposes to take it from. I know this, and I want it understood all day long because this question is coming up, coming up and coming up, that under the present bill we are giving to the State of Texas, the State of Missouri, the State of Arkansas, and every other State all of the cotton land they are entitled to. We have not had a single complaint from any State. We are giving them all the land they are entitled to and we are telling the people of Texas, we are telling the people of Arkansas, we are telling the people of Missouri: "Here it is. You take it. You can hold 10 percent at the State level, you can hold back 15 percent at the county level, you can give it to new farms, you can increase the allotment of small farms, you can take care of cases where a man has a big acreage on his farm but only a small cotton allotment; you can use it for certain other adjustments."

They can take it down there at the home level. The gentleman from Texas has now gone one step forward.. His amendment says that a State committee may reserve 1 percent. There is nothing mandatory about it, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], who used that word. He has not added to the authority, he has not added to what the State committee may do. He says the State committee may reserve 1 percent for new farms which shall be confined, however, to one group of new farms. A man who planted cotton the last time in 1942 cannot get any of it. A man who planted cotton the last time in 1944 cannot get any of it. A man who planted cotton the last time in 1943 cannot get any of it. It is only for those fellows who have not planted any cotton since 1941. He has picked his crowd, he has selected his few, and the gentleman admits it is only adaptable to his district and the district represented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]. The State committee now has all of this discretion and much more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, practically every time an effort is made to try to safeguard the rights of a group of people that are being left out, irrespective of the cause—and no one is imputing to somebody the desire to do wrong by somebody—but practically every time an effort is made to safeguard for sure, as this amendment does, their rights, we hear vigorous arguments against such moves. I start with Van Zandt County, previously mentioned, where they have 600 so-called new farmers who applied for acreage, and 400 acres to distribute among the 600. And what is a new farmer? You know, the important thing is not the new farm, but the farmer himself. Why, a man could have grown cotton for 40 years on a given piece of land here, could have a family of five children right in the house, lose his place this very year, go out to another farm that did not have cotton on it in 1946, 1947, and 1948, go to his county committee this past spring and say, "I would like to get a cotton acreage allotment," and he might be told, "Sorry, Mr. Jones, although you farmed cotton for 40 years, you are a new farmer, and we can only give you, as in the case of Van Zandt County, one acre, or seven-tenths of one acre, or some sum, however small perhaps none. That means that he cannot continue farming cotton; his acreage is too small.

If any of you want to look at the RECORD as it actually is, I refer to you to the RECORD of Wednesday, July 26, and I can show you State by State, almost without any exception, where that very same thing that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS], described as having taken place has taken place in other States. Almost without exception it has occurred in every cotton State.

Now, what is significant about this little fellow? It does not help him to say that the fault was with the State committee; it does not help him to say that was the fault of the Department of Agriculture office in Washington; it does not help him to say your county committee did not reserve enough. That does not put a stitch of clothes on his back or a morsel of food in his stomach. As I conceive it, the duty of a Repre-

sentative here is to try to help those who need help; I have in the RECORD right before me this kind of disparity. It shows in some States the average producer has an allotment of 110 acres, on an average, in a county, whereas in some States you have an allotment of the average producer, on an average, of a little less than 3 acres. Gentlemen, I think that anybody knows that there is too much spread there. We have in our own State—and nobody is blaming anybody, we are simply trying to get it corrected—allotments where the average producer receives an allotment of over 100 acres, whereas in some of the counties the average allotment will run not more than 8 or 10 acres, or perhaps less. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS], as you all know, has been preeminently fair on all matters that he has worked on. He is a former county agent. He was reared on the farm and he has been close to the farm. He knows what this problem is, and he is trying as best he can to correct it, to bring about that which is justice.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. What does the gentleman recommend that we should do for the people that he speaks for?

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman offered an emendment, although the time for debate was brief in late August a year ago, saying that any genuine cotton farmer recognized by his county committee as being a cotton farmer should be given a minimum of 5 acres of cotton. That is what I recommended a year ago. That is what the gentleman recommended before the subcommittee, and that is what the gentleman favors now.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if cotton were grown in an area where there was very limited gin capacity and cottonseed oil capacity and cotton compressor capacity your acreage miseries would be less than they are under present conditions. That is why you have this controversy up here at the moment.

As I understand the bill, it eliminates the crop year 1949 as being included in the base period because of course that year you had more acreage, very big acreage, and very big production, probably 60 or 70 percent more than the present estimated crop, so your base period is 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1950 instead of 1949.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] has offered this amendment. He says that the State committee may reserve not to exceed 1 percent. There is nothing mandatory in that. That would give Texas about 76,000 acres on the basis of 7,600,000 acres that they might reserve up to 1 percent. Your bill provides here that the State committee shall reserve an adequate acreage not exceeding 10 percent. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] said, it might be one-half of 1 percent or it might be 10 percent. There is nothing mandatory in there, as I see it. There is provision in there for adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage, and for abnormal conditions adversely affecting plantings, and the county committee could reserve allotments up to 15 percent, but it is not mandatory.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. The gentleman said there was nothing mandatory about that. I hope he will bear in mind that it is mandatory that an adequate acreage be reserved. That is what the bill says.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is to be determined by the local committee, so it might be 1 percent or 15 percent, based on the showing.

Mr. WHITE of California. Yes; but it is mandatory that it be adequate.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The local county committee deals with new farms, small farms, for farms adversely affected by abnormal conditions affecting plantings, and for adjustments by the county committee in other farm-acreage allotments in counties in which the 15-percent reserve is insufficient to provide equitable farm allotments.

I am convinced that this acreage fight will be up every year. Where wheat gets to a point where you have to deal with similar controls you will have your wheat acreage fight between your States. You will have your corn acreage fight between your States. You will have it on every crop except those crops which have an interdependence between the field area and the processing plant. If you had limited cottonseed oil, compressor, and gin capacity, you would not have to deal with this because each gin, each compressor, and so forth, would have its particular acreage around it. The industry would meet together and say, "Gin No. 1, there shall be so much acreage in your community," and that would just settle the issue. Here you have a commodity which is not interdependent on some particular gin, because you have so many gins as related to the reduced capacity that you are now producing. Therefore, you have excess processing equipment. Therefore, the acreage fight must come down to the individual farmers and their Representatives sitting here in Congress. I can sympathize with you. I am not arguing either side. I am just trying to acquaint myself with what you are up against.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. The committee has contended all along that the State and county committees could meet the problem I have in mind, but the committees tell me they cannot. I want to be frank to say that I went to the authorites this time who are administering the law and they helped write this provision and they say it will do the job. That is the reason I want it in the law. It does not change the law in any way.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think either the State committees or the county committees will ever administer this in anything like an equitable or satisfactory manner to the individual growers involved. I think it is utterly impossible for human beings to do such a thing. Therefore I see no chance of your ever being satisfied.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman from Texas, who offered the amendment, whether his amendment provides that the State committee may or must reserve 1 percent for the purposes detailed.

Mr. COMBS. I believe it reads "shall reserve not exceeding 1 percent", if I remember the amendment correctly. I had only one copy of it which is at the Clerk's desk. The gentleman may read the amendment if he wishes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman's amendment reads as follows:

Provided, That the State committee may set aside not more than 1 percent.

I appreciate the problem which confronts the gentleman. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I want to say that we, too, have been confronted with this problem and the many, many, many other problems that a law of this kind naturally brings about. I think it should be pointed out for the benefit of the gentleman's constituents that the law as it now exists provides that the State committee in Texas can reserve 10 percent or ten times as much as the gentleman's amendment provides.

Mr. COMBS. In my judgment this problem down in Texas is occasioned by the fact that these little farmers, they are little farmers, have had nobody to speak for them. They cannot go down to the central State agency and make a fight for the acreage. They are getting it in the neck because they have had nobody speaking for them. My amendment simply tells the committee to treat them justly and gives them the authority to do it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, it does not tell the committee to do it.

Mr. COMBS. Oh, yes, it does.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman's amendment does not provide that anybody shall speak for them. I read the amendment and I cannot see that it designates anyone to speak for them. It simply limits the discretion which is placed in the State committee by the present law.

Mr. COMBS. I asked those men: What will it require so that you can do the job? And they helped write that.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Who were those men who wrote it?

Mr. COMBS. Never mind. But officials administering the program were consulted.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the RECORD ought to show whether any members of the Texas State committee or just who down there wrote this amendment.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. REGAN. With reference to the 10-percent provision, we had the experience last year that the State committee did not exercise their prerogatives as provided in the law and they took something less than 3 percent which threw many of our counties out of gear. Some counties got more of an allotment than they needed or used or required, and other counties received much less. It seems to me, as far as the State of Texas is concerned that if we say here that the State committees may reserve an adequate acreage equal to, but not exceeding 10 percent, that we can get the acreage that I would like to get in the right counties down there.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is what the bill does.

Mr. REGAN. What we are concerned about is to see that the State committee allocates the acreage to certain counties that are entitled to and should be allowed to plant their fair share.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But this bill provides that the State committee shall reserve up to 10 percent and use it to meet the inequities that arise. This bill is a home-rule bill and provides for adequate discretionary powers to meet any emergency or inequity that might arise.

Mr. REGAN. Not that we wish to call attention to the fact that the State of Texas is a big State, but it is; and there seems to be many counties of the State that the State committee has not become acquainted with. But if it says "equal to but not exceeding 10 percent," I believe those counties would be taken care of.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am just as sympathetic with your problem as any Member in this House. The 27 members of the Committee on Agriculture have been studying this thing for a long, long time.

Mr. REGAN. I thoroughly realize that.

Mr. ABERNETHY. We have called in people from all over the Cotton Belt and from the Department, and in our considered judgment the provisions incorporated in the bill as now before the House are much better than the amendment that is now pending.

Mr. REGAN. The amendment may be entirely correct but what I am concerned with more particularly is in west Texas, where since the war much new land has been put into cultivation, and we thought last year the law would protect and take care of some of those new farms, but when the State committee, not being familiar with west Texas, decided that 3 percent would be the maximum they would use under this 10 percent, we were seriously affected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, coming from Minnesota, I am not too conversant with the cotton problem, except insofar as I have heard it discussed on the floor of this House. I have heard a lot about the little fellow during my 2 years in this House, but the thing I want to clarify in my mind, and which prompts me to support the Combs amendment is this fact: that in the State of Minnesota and in the Northern States, where we have other agricultural problems, there has been a great trend in the last few years toward large corporation farms. I am tempted to believe that in many of these county organizations or State organizations it is the larger units that prevail in the allocation of this cotton acreage. It is for that reason that I want to support this amendment.

For instance, in Montana, where the Campbell interests represent the large grain growers, they naturally control the disposition of legislation of this kind. I want to say that the little fellow who has just returned from the service should have an opportunity to eke out an existence, and I think he has a right to an existence and I think he ought to be protected. Up to this moment in the discussion of this farm problem, particularly with reference to cotton, it appears the only way you are going to give that little fellow some protection and the right to existence is a designation by law that he shall have the right of recourse in the production of cotton, rather than let the large group make the designation and have the power of authorization. That is the reason I am going to support the Combs amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COMBS) there were—ayes 50, noes 25.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALBERT: After the word "allotment" where it appears on page 3, line 21, and page 4, line 18, and page 5, line 11, insert the following: "Fifteen percent of the State's 1948 acreage was in excess of 1,000,000 acres and less than half of its 1943 allotment."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore in the pending measure a provision applicable only to Oklahoma in the present law. Under this amendment, the Oklahoma State committee may withhold a 15-percent rather than a 10-percent reserve.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. PACE. In the interest of time I may say to the gentleman that this provision is in the present act and the committee has no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: Page 11, after line 16, insert a new paragraph reading as follows:

"(6) In apportioning the county allotment among the farms within the county, the Secretary, through the local committees, shall take into consideration different conditions within separate administrative areas within a county if any exist, including types, kinds, and productivity of the soil so as to prevent discrimination among the administrative areas of the county."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the present law provides that in its administration the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, may establish administrative areas within the county. There was some question in the committee as to whether or not this discretionary authority should be continued. The committee finally decided to take it out. After further considering the matter I think now it is the sense of the committee that the discretionary authority ought to be restored to the Secretary.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman is correct; it is in the present law. The committee has no objection to continuing it in the law as proposed by this amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GATHINGS: Page 9, line 16, after the word "acreage:", insert the following: "*Provided further,* That if the national acreage allotment is more than 21,000,000 acres, the farm acreage allotment limitations in this paragraph shall be increased by the same percentage that the national acreage allotment is in excess of 21,000,000 acres: And"

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, subsection (6) of page 9 sets out limitations to the effect that no cotton farmer could plant more than 45 percent of the tilled acreage on his farm. In certain instances this percentage could be raised to 50 percent but such 5 percent additional acreage would come out of the county reserve. This bill was drafted as a reduction program to cut cotton acreage.

Due to the invasion of South Korea the picture has changed. It cannot be determined at this date what acreage would be needed to produce an adequate supply of cotton in 1951. It is probable that a considerable increase over the 1950 national allotment would be asked by the officials of the Government to meet the demands of the preparedness months that lie ahead. Twenty-one million acres was provided as the 1950 national acreage allotment. Should it be necessary in connection with the defense program to go to 22,000,000 acres, 23,000,000 acres or say 25,000,000 acres the proportionate percent increase over the 45 and 50 percent will be the same. This is to make it equitable across the board so that each county will be given the same consideration should the acreage allotment go above the 21,000,000 acres that was allotted in 1950. This amendment would

treat all alike and permit the high-factor counties to share in any increase in acreage asked by the Government.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. So that there will not be any misunderstanding, may I say to the gentleman that I favor his amendment and I hope the other members of the California delegation, and those from the West, will likewise favor it because we have a situation similar to that of the gentleman from Arkansas who proposes this amendment. It would help us as well as him and do justice to all, I may say.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. May I say to the gentleman that I shall support his amendment. I had a similar amendment I would have offered had he not offered his.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman. This amendment was presented to the Committee on Agriculture this morning and received unanimous approval with the exception of one member who opposed the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Cotton Subcommittee of the Agricultural Committee held a meeting this morning and felt that in view of the present circumstances they should approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas. I want it understood that when I speak I do not represent the committee as a whole. I am merely presenting my own personal views.

I would not want to let this matter pass without calling the attention of the committee to the fact that this amendment does allow an allocation of cotton acreage sufficient in some cases to require the producer to plant cotton after cotton. I for one, and again I express merely my individual views, do not believe we can in good conscience tell the taxpayers of America that we are urging a sound farm program when we authorize allotments that will require a farmer to plant cotton this year and to plant cotton next year on the same land.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman will recall that this morning we had the officials of the Department of Agriculture before us and inquired whether or not they favored this provision. They stated it might be necessary in order to get the needs for the defense program filled.

Mr. POAGE. No, I am afraid I do not recall just that, although I do recall that the official said they had no objection to this amendment and that undoubtedly some experiment stations would say that some land was strong enough to justify planting cotton after cotton. I have heard that claim all my life. I have lived in the black lands of Texas practically all of my life and I have heard that that soil would never wear out. That has been the experience in every part of the Cotton Belt. In every part of the Cotton Belt it has been stated that the land would not wear out, but it has worn out. I grant that the gentleman from Arkansas comes from one of the richest sections in the world and it will probably be longer wearing out there than the red hills of Georgia, or the sandy lands of east Texas, but it will wear out nevertheless. Land simply will not stand a continual repetition of planting cotton year after year.

I think that our first duty is to promulgate a program that is sound from the standpoint of soil conservation. To my mind a program cannot be sound that requires a farmer to plant cotton after cotton. For that reason I must object to this amendment, I must therefore oppose it. I recall that in the legislation we passed last spring, Public Law 471, we provided that no one should be allowed to build up his cotton acreage where he would plant cotton after cotton. We put a limitation of 40 percent on the amount that anybody could get under the terms of that bill. This bill has a limitation of 45 percent, which, frankly, was a compromise, and I think a rather fair one. However, in this amendment, we are going too far and, in my opinion, we will see the day when those who put this thing over, if we do put it over, will be upbraided and you will have to answer the charge of depleting the soil resources of America in order to reap quick profits for a limited area of this country. There is not anything involved here except the question of somebody being able to grow more than half their land in cotton.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, certainly there is merit in the policy declared by the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. POAGE], and it is the general policy of the committee to recognize proper soil conservation and rotation practices. At the same time, the committee agrees that this amendment should be approved, for this reason: No one knows what the war might bring on. The Secretary may want twenty-five or twenty-six million acres of cotton next year. If that should be his request, he must have producers in a position to produce that much cotton. We therefore think we need to provide against the contingency if the Secretary should ask for substantial increases in cotton acreage, and therefore this amendment should be approved. If it was general language to go on every year, I am quite sure the committee would never have approved it, but the committee does not believe that this could happen for more than 2 or 3 years out of a stretch of 10 or more. Therefore the amendment has the approval of the committee and we request its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of California: Page 11, after line 16, add a new subsection 6 reading as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, farms in California entitled to an allotment base of 5 acres of cotton or less shall have such base treated as a minimum allotment."

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was agreed to by the Cotton Subcommittee this morning and I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] to confirm that for the benefit of the committee at this time.

Mr. PACE. I will be glad to state that the gentleman from California seems to feel that in the 5-acre or less allotment he has a problem that is peculiar to his State, and the subcommittee does not interpose any objection to the amendment in order that that situation might be met in that State.

Mr. WHITE of California. Before we vote, may I use a little more of my time here to direct a question to the gentleman from Georgia to provide something for the RECORD here. I hold in my hand a newspaper item from my home town, and it refers to the legislation we have under consideration at this time. It says:

Another provision of the proposed legislation would reduce the small farm from 15 acres to 10 acres.

I ask the gentleman from Georgia whether or not that statement is correct.

Mr. PACE. In response to the gentleman may I say there is no such provision in the bill. There is a provision in the bill that provides that for farms of 10 acres or less the county committee must use at least 20 percent of the county reserve for the purpose of building them up toward 10 acres, but all of the other provisions of the bill continue for both the State committee and the county committee. They may make allocations up to any amount within the limits of the reserve for the purpose of increasing the acreage of the small farms and it is lodged in their discretion whether a farm of 20 or 25 or 30 acres shall be regarded as a small farm. The 10-acre provision that the gentleman refers to relates only to the 20-percent reserve.

Mr. WHITE of California. The gentleman feels, I am sure, that this bill is better for the small farmer than is the present legislation because of the fact that these reserve requirements are mandatory whereas before they were permissive; is that not correct?

Mr. PACE. They are mandatory to the extent that the bill directs the county committee to make reservations of an adequate acreage not exceeding the limitation fixed for these purposes.

Mr. WHITE of California. And the gentleman feels that this bill is better for the small farmers than the present law, and for that reason?

Mr. PACE. I believe it is.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising now is

to find out what the amendment is. If I understand it correctly, it is to preclude acreage in California from being less than 5 acres. You say there is some peculiar situation existing in California that does not exist in the other States. I should like to know why the State of California should have a favor extended here that is not extended to the other States in the Cotton Belt.

Mr. WHITE of California. I offered this amendment because out in California we have a number of very large cotton farms, as the gentleman knows, and we can afford to take care of the few people who produce 5 acres and less much more easily than other States in the Nation. For instance, take Virginia and North Carolina. Over there most of their farmers have less than 5 acres. If we would put such a provision into effect there, it would wreak havoc among those people who have 6 and 7 acres.

I hope the gentleman will follow us on that. We have given it a lot of thought. The subcommittee has agreed to let us handle the matter in this way on a special basis for California.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman's amendment is asking that in California you be given a minimum; that is, the minimum that California could receive would be 5 acres.

Mr. WHITE of California. Yes; but that does not take anything from any other State. I hope the gentleman realizes that. That is merely dividing up the pie in California after it gets there.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I assure the gentleman this deals only with the operations of acreage within the State of California, as handled by the State and county committees.

Mr. TACKETT. Suppose you do the same thing for Arkansas. If you do that for Arkansas, it will not apply to anybody except Arkansas. But it could mess up the whole cotton program, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. PACE. Let me get the gentleman straight. As I have tried to state several times, we give the gentleman's State just as we give my own State all the cotton they are entitled to. So far as we are concerned, we then leave it for home administration. We have just adopted the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, who in effect says, "Either I don't think my State committee has any authority or I don't think my State committee will do this, therefore, I ask that this amendment be adopted."

In this case we have general provisions with reference to 5 acres or less. The gentleman from California comes in and says, "Well, that does not fit my picture. I am afraid it will not be handled in this way." So we tell the gentleman, just as we tell the gentleman from Arkansas if he has a peculiar problem in Arkansas, and wants to offer an amendment relating to Arkansas, that we have no objection to that. We look to the gentleman and his associates here as Representatives of the people of Arkansas, because when we give Arkansas its two-million-some-odd-thousand acres it becomes an Arkansas problem. We think that you as their Representatives truly reflect the best interests of the people there.

Mr. TACKETT. I am not going to oppose this amendment since I find that other States will not be affected, but we do have a peculiar situation in Arkansas. It is, just as some of the gentlemen from Texas mentioned a while ago, that we have thousands of little farms in Arkansas that are not allowed any cotton. These farmers were off in the war. They are little fellows. The fellows on the big plantations were exempted. These little fellows came back to find that the plantation owners had not lost any of their cotton allotments. You start off in 1945, 1946 and 1947 with your allotments. Those little fellows out there that went into the Army did not get out until 1945 and did not have the money to go back on the farm. That is a peculiar situation existing all over the United States, and there is nothing we can do about it.

Mr. PACE. But we have vested in the State and county committees of Arkansas special authority to handle that problem.

Mr. TACKETT. We gave it to them at the last session and they were unable to do anything about it.

Mr. PACE. Get yourselves new committees.

Mr. TACKETT. I do not know about that, but there are plenty of cotton-farming veterans down there that I can stand here and name to you, that I know personally, who do not have one speck of cotton. Somebody let them down. I do not know who did it.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Who makes up the local committee?

Mr. TACKETT. I am not going into that. It is a long-drawn-out affair, and we could argue here all day as to what makes up the various State committees.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The answer is that the committee is elected by the farmers in the gentleman's district.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes; the county committees, but sometimes I am a little doubtful about the method of selecting the State committees.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course if the large-acreage fellows dominate who shall be on the committee, I do not think they are going to cut their acreage.

Mr. TACKETT. You know who dominates.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: Page 3, line 13, beginning on line 13 strike out all of line 13 and following, down to and including the figures "1948," line 19.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if I may have your attention, I think you will desire to favorably consider the amendment which I have offered. Unlike some of the amendments which have been offered, this is not complicated or difficult of understanding. Anyone can easily understand the amendment which I offer. Let me read it to you again. And if you have a copy of the bill, will you please follow me.

On page 3, line 13, the committee bill reads:

Provided, That the 1951 allotment for any State which received a 1950 State acreage allotment in excess of 3,000,000 acres shall be apportioned to counties—

On a 4-year basis.

That is what the committee recommends and that is what my amendment would strike out. Now do you understand? There is only one State in the Union which has a 3,000,000-acre cotton allotment. Do you understand further that this proposed provision in the law would apply only to one State—Texas. Do you understand that this provision, then, is the Texas bill incorporated in the regular bill which applies to the other 47 States of the Union? I would like to make my position clear. A principle as fundamental as the government itself is involved here. If you vote for that principle of good government and fair play you will, in my judgment, vote for the amendment which I have offered to let Texas proceed like every other State in the Union. That is all that is involved in my amendment.

Under the broad terms of the present law provision is made that some States will operate on a 1-year history basis, some on a 2-year basis and some on a 4-year basis. Under the broad terms of the law the different States find their place in that pattern, and no one can complain. No State is singled out in the existing law for favor or for discrimination. But, gentlemen, Mr. POAGE, my able and good friend, and there can be no better Member of the House, was unhappy with this provision in the existing law because it militated against his portion of the State, and it would appear—though I do not charge it—that the committee turned to my friend, Mr. POAGE, and said, "Write your own ticket for Texas in the pending bill and just so long as it does not affect any other State you may have what you want."

That is what I am complaining about. Texas is receiving different treatment from any other State in the Union. Texas came under the 2-year base period. Arkansas came under the 2-year base. The State of Missouri, farther east, came under the 2-year base. New Mexico came under the 2-year base, and California came under the 2-year base. Some States came under the 4-year base. While I prefer the 2-year base for Texas, I say, let Texas stand on the 1-year, 2-year, or 4-year base as such may result from the broad provisons of existing law, and let Texas ask for nothing more than she is entitled to under the broad principles of the general law applicable to the other States of the Union.

You know, Texas joined the Union in 1845, and I hope my Texas friends will pardon me when I say I do not think

we should be so arrogant as to claim that we should have a Texas cotton bill without regard or respect to the other States of the Union. But this proposed provision in the law, which I seek to strike out, this Texas gadget, if I may call it that, actually means a private bill for Texas, Texas being the only State with a 3,000,000-acre allotment. Texas alone among the States would no longer be under the general law.

If the proposal is good in a 3,000,000-acre State, why is it not good in a 1-million-acre State or a 100,000-acre State? I am shocked and amazed that my proud State should be placed in the position of asking for the violation of a principle that is so fundamental to good government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Let me probe a little further. I think you will see that the Texas bill has no place in a general law, applicable to the other States of the Union. Will anybody rise on this floor and challenge the principle which I have laid down and which I think you would like to support? No. No man will challenge it.

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

Mr. MAHON. Let me proceed for just a few moments, and then I will be glad to yield.

Those who will oppose this principle will not dare assert it on the floor. But they will say, "Now, now, Mr. MAHON, did not your district get an allotment this year of more than 2,000,000 acres? Did not your district get more cotton than any State in the Union with the exception of Texas?" Yes. That is true. The district that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] represents got about 100,000 acres. My district got 2,300,000 acres simply because in many respects it is the greatest cotton-producing area in the world. We got this acreage on the basis of plantings in 1947 and 1948. Other areas would have received allotments of similar amounts had they planted a similar number of acres in 1947–48. Those who by discrimination would seek to take away the west Texas cotton allotment might argue. "Yes, there is a rich man in town. There are more poor people in town, so let us confiscate the belongings of the rich man." Is that the principle to which we have fallen? My district had the biggest cut in acreage this year of any district in the United States, the biggest cut below previous plantings. We were cut perhaps 400,000 acres below what we planted in 1947 and 1948—the biggest cut of any area.

I see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] on the floor. Should I, with envious and covetous eyes, look at the peanut district, which the gentleman from Georgia represents, and say, "You have a vast peanut acreage. I do not have any peanut acreage. Look at Mr. PACE, is it fair for him to have a large peanut acreage? Let me have some of those acres and level up the program." Shall I look to the lush rice fields of east Texas and say: "I have no rice allotment. Therefore, give an equal rice allotment to our west Texas people." Shall I look to the rich wheat fields of Kansas and say, "The wheat allotment is small in my congressional district, so on the basis of prejudice and ill-founded logic, let us take the wheat from Kansas and Mr. HOPE and put it in the district I represent."

Such an unfair and illogical request on my part would be ridiculous. Yet that is the type of logic which will probably be urged against my amendment. I am not alone in my opposition to the attempt to write a private cotton bill for Texas. Officials of the Production and Marketing Administration in Texas and officials of the Production and Marketing Administration in Washington recognize that the so-called private bill for Texas is indefensible and no official of whom I have heard has recommended the proposed language which I seek to strike out.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman seems to be trying to leave the House under the impression that we have given to the great State of Texas something which the great State of Texas does not deserve, and that we are discriminating in favor of the State of Texas. The gentleman does not want to leave that impression, does he?

Mr. MAHON. I leave the impression that the language which I seek to strike out does not apply to any State in the Union except Texas; therefore, it just applies to Texas. Cut it out and let us rise or fall with the rest of the people of the Nation. Why discriminate?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman states that he wants Texas to come uniformly under the law, but what he actually means is that his district got a favorable cotton acreage allotment last year and he wants to hold to it next year.

Mr. MAHON. I say, take my acreage away from me if you will, but just let my State operate on a 1-, 2-, or 4-year basis just as any other State or any other district under rules of law applicable to all States. Cut out this obnoxious and vicious language which says that the State of Texas should operate under another principle. If my district must lose acreage, let it lose on the basis of a fair law and not on the basis of discrimination. In justice that is all I could ask.

Mr. COOLEY. All right; but this obnoxious, vicious, and repugnant language actually takes away from the gentleman's district certain acreage that he has received.

Mr. MAHON. It takes away 300,000 acres, three times as much as Mr. BECKWORTH has; and Mr. BECKWORTH is going to get less acreage next year if the pending bill becomes the law.

Mr. COOLEY. While it may take something away from the gentleman's district it gives it to others, does it not?

Mr. MAHON. Unfortunately 11 or 12 districts in Texas will have smaller acreage allotments in 1951 than they had in 1950, if the pending bill becomes the law.

Mr. COOLEY. Whatever it takes away from the gentleman's district it certainly gives to other districts in the State of Texas; is that right?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; in a measure it is given to the rest, it is given to other districts. But there is no justification for devising a provision applicable to only one State in the Union just to take away from counties and cotton farmers that to which they are entitled under the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Have we descended to such a low level as to say in this legislation that might makes right? I am only asking that you give us the same treatment under the law of the land that you give every other State.

Mr. COOLEY. Forsooth, the gentleman doth have an interest in this proposition.

Mr. MAHON. I have an interest in it, but the principle is greater than GEORGE MAHON or HAROLD COOLEY; it is as great as the principle involved in our great democracy itself.

Mr. COOLEY. Our committee meets in wide-open sessions; there is certainly no logrolling there. The gentleman, I am sure, knows that the great State of Texas is well represented on that committee with two distinguished Members of the Texas delegation sitting on the committee. Would the gentleman be willing for the great State of Texas to settle its own problems by a majority vote on this matter?

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman wants to suggest any such change in our form of government as that, then let him go right over to the Library of Congress and destroy the original of the Constitution which reposes there.

Mr. COOLEY. Would the gentleman leave it up to his delegation?

Mr. MAHON. Is it proper to say: "Now, now, we have the advantage of you; we are going to kick over all principles of proper legislative procedure and take away your cotton acreage." It is amazing that such an attempt should be made.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman not heckle me?

Mr. COOLEY. I am not trying to heckle the gentleman. The gentleman says Texas was treated differently.

Mr. MAHON. I am not yielding. I know when you point out a weakness in a man's position he tries to defend himself. I think I have pointed out the indefensible position which the committee takes. Of course, I know the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] under ordinary circumstances

would not dream of supporting the language which I seek to strike out.

Again, I renew my appeal that my amendment be adopted and that the special discriminatory language on page 3 which applies only to Texas be stricken from the bill.

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

Mr. MAHON. Not at this time.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman want an answer or is he simply making a speech for the RECORD?

Mr. MAHON. I am making a speech for the House. The gentleman can get time in his own right if he wishes to speak, and he will no doubt wish to do so. The simple proposition is that Texas should be on the same basis as all other States, taking her chance under the broad terms of the general law of being on the 1-, 2-, or 4-year basis.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment and I ask unanmous consent to speak for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, there is an issue here that certainly I do not desire to have any part in. It is a Texas issue. But I regret the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] finds it necessary to be critical of the House Committee on Agriculture. The gentleman knows that his district received about 350,000 acres of cotton this year that the committee had not intended.

I want to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that his State is well represented on the Committee on Agriculture. It is a matter of keen regret to me that he finds it necessary to come here and indirectly attack the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

I want to say further that I regret the gentleman made the statement a moment ago against the whole committee, that it had thrown fair play out of the window. For the purpose of the RECORD, and in order to make this a Texas matter, I am going to make the unusual request that every Member of the House, when this amendment comes to a vote, except the Texas delegation keep their seats and let the Texas Members vote on it. Whatever the Texas delegation does it will be the pleasure of this committee to go along with. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has done wrong, let us see whether or not his action is in accord with the overwhelming majority of the Texas delegation.

I am going to keep my seat, and I am going to let you gentleman from Texas settle this question.

What is the situation? The gentleman has a congressional district that has lots of cotton. There are 21 congressional districts in Texas; it is a great State. This year, and I think everybody needs to understand this, leaving out the State of Texas, the congressional district represented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] received more cotton acreage than any State in the Union. May I repeat that? Outside of the State of Texas the congressional district served by the gentleman from Texas received more acreage than any other State in the Union, including the State of Mississippi and the State of Arkansas.

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

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. So what?

Mr. PACE. Well, I am going to explain the situation that arose.

Mr. MAHON. Do not other States rank above me in peanuts and in other crops? We always had the largest amount.

Mr. PACE. As I said before, I am going to get out of this fight but I think the House is entitled to know the facts. As I stated earlier in the afternoon, we asked the representatives of all cotton growers of the United States to get together and try to settle this division of how much cotton acreage each State would get. They got together. Texas was represented; my State, Arkansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and all the others. They reached an agreement to take care of three or four States, mainly in the West, California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Arkansas. We were assured at the time that Texas would not come under what was known as the California gadget; that is, our committee was. After the bill had been prepared and the figures were run up, Texas did not come under that gadget. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] had nothing to do with this. I know he did not, and I want in make that crystal clear. But, somebody changed the figures of the State of Texas and brought that State under the California gadget. By doing that they shifted acreage throughout the State of Texas to one or two other areas. It was contrary to the intent of the committee and through that manipulation, with which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] had nothing to do and did not even know about until after it happened, the gentleman's district received about 350,000 acres of cotton land in the high plains of Texas which the committee intended should have gone to the other cotton farmers of Texas. In addition, the law provides for credits for war crops, for which the State of Texas was entitled to 1,400,000 acres. By throwing Texas under the California gadget, it meant that the farmer who had earned credits for war crops did not receive cotton acreage for it, but other farmers who did not earn it, did receive it, which I think was most unjustifiable.

That is all I intend to say on this question. I had not intended to say a word, but after the gentleman criticized the committee, I felt called upon to make this statement.

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

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Any statement made by the gentleman from Texas charging the committee with unfairness was not intended. I did mean to say that the provision was unfair, in my judgment. Let me say further that I conferred with the officials of PMA in Washington and Texas, and they told me that they told the committee they did not claim that Texas would be under the gadget principle, and if the gentleman would have anything in writing here showing it would be under the 2- or 4-year basis, it would be interesting. Missouri, Arkansas, Arizona, and California came under the 2-year program. Why change the law and say that Texas shall not have the privilege? Can the gentleman defend that? How can you change the law for just one State?

Mr. PACE. The pending bill merely declares the law as originally intended by the committee in the law passed last year.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Georgia has expressed the situation better than most of us could. Certainly he has explained it far better than I might. The gentleman from Georgia cannot be charged with having a personal interest in this matter. Of course, every one of us from the State of Texas will either gain or lose depending upon the formula that is adopted in the State of Texas.

There was a formula placed in effect in my State this year that had the effect of transferring approximately half a million acres of cotton from the older growing sections of the State, largely to one district in the western section of our State. There are four congressional districts involved, but most of this acreage—more than 355,000 acres out of the half million—went to the Nineteenth District of Texas. It is a great district, it is represented by a great Congressman, and it produces a great cotton crop. It is reported that this district alone grew more cotton this past year than any State in the Union outside the State of Texas.

Those counties had a large cotton factor without applying any special gadget. Many of the counties of that district would run well above 40 to 45 percent without applying any special gadget.

Think of that—those of you whose counties got 6 and who got 8 and who got a 10-percent factor. Many of the counties of that district would get 45 percent of their total cultivated land in cotton without applying any special gadget. The gentleman from the nineteenth district of Texas complains bitterly that we should not pass legislation which has special application. Last year this committee did pass legislation with a special application. We passed it because we were convinced that there was a situation in the State of California and possibly in New Mexico and Missouri which required special legislation in order to do equity in those States. In an effort to do equity the committee did pass special legislation which applied only to certain areas where certain figures developed.

Now, the gentleman makes a great point of saying: "Can you produce a shred

of written evidence? Can you produce a document showing that the Department of Agriculture told you that Texas would not be involved?" No; I do not think we can produce a written instrument. But for 6 months the committee sat there, and day after day in every one of those meetings that we had the representatives of the Department of Agriculture present and I repeat to you, as did the gentleman from Georgia, that it was the definite understanding of the members of the committee that if we adopted this special formula to take care of a situation which we felt might result in inequity in certain States, that it would not apply to the State of Texas. No; this assurance was not in the form of a letter. Nobody asked that it be in the form of a letter. At that time we felt we could rely on the informal assurance of the Department. Time after time we discussed this matter with the representatives of the Department. We talked about it in committee with them, but not one time that I can recall was there ever a suggestion that this formula would apply to the State of Texas. On the contrary I think the gentleman will find that the recollection of every member of that committee is the same as that of the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. PACE], who has just addressed you, and my recollection when we say that we had no intimation from the Department that this special formula could possibly apply to Texas. On the contrary we had every reason to believe that this special formula would not apply to the State of Texas.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that you laid down a broad principle of law applicable to all the States and that you did not know whether it would apply to the State of Texas or not? Of course it would seem that perhaps some of the witnesses may have been asked this simple question at some of the numerous hearings: Do you think it will apply to Texas?

It just happened under the broad principle of the law that Texas, to the surprise of the gentleman from Texas, and I have no view to the contrary, came under that provision of the law on the 2-year basis.

Let us go on the 2-year basis under the broad terms of the general law or whatever bracket we come in, insofar as the law may apply to our State. That would seem fair to all concerned.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has asked if we did not think maybe the special formula would apply to the State of Texas. The answer is we did not so think, and the Department of Agriculture did not so lead us to think. On the contrary they definitely led us to believe it would not apply to the State of Texas.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think it should be pointed out that the thing that brought about this shift of 350,000 acres of cotton from the central and east sections of Texas to the west section of Texas was a mere 93 acres of cotton.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And that if the State of Texas had planted as much as only 93 acres of cotton less than it did plant, that 350,000 acres would have been distributed in the sections of Texas where they have had the most trouble administering this law.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. It took acreage from the very areas where the factor was already low and took it to counties that already had a very high factor.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And that is in the gentleman's district, in the district of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], and in the district of the gentleman from Texas, Judge COMBS, and others who have had trouble with this law in that respect, is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is absolutely correct.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Did it take an extra 10,000 acres to bring Texas under the California gadget?

Mr. POAGE. After the Department had factored away 117,000 acres of 4-year history from Texas it still required a further addition of 9,907 acres additional of 2-year history to bring Texas under the gadget. The Department conveniently found a 10,000-acre error in the Texas figures, going back to 1948, but they did not find it until after we were making the allotments in 1949. They needed 9,907 acres to bring Texas under this gadget and they found 10,000 acres.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. I want to say to the California delegation, as well as to the Arizona, New Mexico, and Missouri delegations, that when this matter comes to a vote, if they do not choose to keep their seats, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] recommended, that they do vote with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], for the reason that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] was trying to protect those four States, especially California, to give them a fair deal in acreage distribution when we got into this mess, and it was by a mere accident in statistics that we did get into this trouble, and it was never intended. I reiterate, it was never intended in the Committee on Agriculture that Texas should come under the so-called California gadget.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from California was a member of the subcommittee. Did he ever get the intimation from any representative of the Department of Agriculture that the State of Texas would be brought under this gadget?

Mr. WHITE of California. Not at any time.

Mr. POAGE. Let me say this further in that connection: The gentleman from the Nineteenth District of Texas has made much of the point that he did not want special legislation. The legislation which placed 355,000 acres of cotton in his district, which he would not otherwise have received this year, was special legislation in every sense of the word. It was special legislation intended to assist in the correction of a situation in California and certain other States, where the committee felt there would otherwise be inequity. I want to make this clear when we gave special legislation to take care of California and the other States, we did it on the showing that an injustice would result if we did not do it. Has there been any showing that any injustice would result in the Nineteenth District of Texas if we apply the same law in Texas that applies in Mississippi, that applies in Georgia, that applies in North Carolina, that applies in Alabama, and across the belt? Has there been any effort on the part of the representative of the Nineteenth District of Texas to show you that it would work unfairly if we applied the general law in the Nineteenth District of Texas? Has he attempted to point out where anybody who was entitled to a cotton allotment would not receive it, in his district, under the general law? He has made a very eloquent plea to apply the general formula. The bill now before us, the provision immediately before us, does nothing in the world except make sure that the State of Texas will fall under the general formula for the distribution of cotton.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. I ask the House to place this on the basis that the gentleman from the Ninteenth District of Texas asked for, and to give to all Texas, including the Ninteenth District, and all the 17 districts that were slaughtered by the application of this provision this year—to give to all of them exactly the same formula that applies over the rest of the Nation, except where they do have some special formula. In other words, let us take Texas out from any special gadget.

I want further to call to the attention of the gentleman from the Nineteenth District of Texas, when he charges that we were trying to be unfair to his district, that we have not, in any part of this bill, taken away from him the history that he built up this year. Oh, he drew one-third of a million acres that belonged to 17 other districts of Texas, and he got the money in his pocket for it. He cashed it out and this year he grows a third of a million more acres that belong over in east Texas, north Texas, central Texas, and on the coastal bend. He grows it, he sells it, he puts the money in his pocket. We are not asking that he return these profits. On the contrary, we give him the history he has acquired by reason of growing this excessive acreage. We have no animus against the Ninteenth District; certainly we prove this when we do not ask him to forego the history that he built up with this one-third of a million acres. This bill gives to his district the history that it built up by planting those acres that he found lying on his doorstep, that he knew came from down in central

Texas. Oh, he could recognize them; they had our names on them. His district had 118,292 acres from your district, Mr. LYLE; they had 12,999 acres from your district, Mr. BECKWORTH; they had them from all over the great State of Texas, and they could recognize where they came from. They were able to take them in through the operation of the special gadget which he now condemns and says this Congress should not be so little as to engage in special gadgets.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I just wish to ask the gentleman if as a result of these mysterious calculations in the Department of Agriculture which has the result of throwing Texas under the California gadget, it did not actually deprive Texas of war crop credits which they were justly entitled to?

Mr. POAGE. It absolutely did; and, of course, the gentleman knows that that is at the root of the opposition by certain officials in the Department of Agriculture who have never believed in carrying out the contract that this country made—not the Department, but this Congress made—with growers of war crops. Whether it was a wise contract or not, we promised it; and it is my opinion that we should carry it out. But they say "No;" and the gentleman from the Nineteenth District says with his amendment "No." The man who down in your district, Mr. FISHER, grew war crops under this amendment will be blocked off from claiming that credit and be unable to receive the benefits promised him by this Congress. I do not think that is fair.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAHON. My district took a reduction of 400,000 acres, I believe. Is it not true that we got the acres which we did get out of a bill passed by this committee, which the committee said was a good bill a year ago, but which it now seemingly is attempting to repudiate? And is it not true that all I am asking for in my amendment is that you not simply single out Texas for special treatment?

Mr. POAGE. All the gentleman is asking by his amendment is that his district be protected in the advantage it received under this gadget. At the same time he complains that a special gadget used by anyone else is harmful and immoral, but so long as it gives his district 355,000 acres additional then he is willing that we should continue this immoral and unconstitutional special gadget.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from the Twenty-first District.

Mr. FISHER. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that under the terms of the bill now pending—and I think the House should understand this very clearly—Texas will have exactly the same treatment that the other cotton-producing States will have?

Mr. POAGE. Exactly.

Mr. FISHER. It will have exactly the same treatment as Mississippi, the same as Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, North and South Carolina, and all the other States; is not that correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is right, with the exception of those that come under the California gadget, which is the gadget which gives the gentleman from the Nineteenth District 355,000 acres. It is the gadget which he vigorously applauded this year as being a just and meritorious proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from the Twenty-first District.

Mr. FISHER. I think it is important, as has been pointed out here, that all of these other cotton-producing States are now operating under the Public Law 12 and are guaranteed a credit for war crops grown during the war period. Is not that correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. FISHER. If this bill is not passed without amendment then we will be deprived of the war-crop allowance which was guaranteed and assured in Public Law 12. Is not that correct?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right.

Now, let me summarize this if I may: Last year the Congress in an effort to do justice to California and certain other States passed a special gadget which worked very materially to the advantage of the gentlemen from the Nineteenth District of Texas at the expense of the 17 other districts in Texas.

Regardless of how it came about, and the chairman of the subcommittee has pointed this out, as have other members of the committee who heard all of the evidence, it is the clear opinion of the subcommittee it was done deliberately, but, regardless of how it happened, it did happen. An injustice was done to 17 districts in Texas. We simply ask that next year Texas will not operate under any special gadget but that Texas will be on the same basis in distributing its cotton acreage within the State that all the other States except those that showed there was some reason for giving them a gadget, as is the case with California.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WERDEL. I think the gentleman should point out why in the State of Texas the State committee, by withholding its 10 percent, cannot clear up this problem.

Mr. POAGE. I feel that that was probably pointed out before, but the State of Texas cannot clear up this problem, even by use of the State reserve. The State committee did not use the State reserve, that is true and doubtless aggravated a certain situation. But the basic problem here is that there was a shift of a half million acres from sections in the State that would have received it under the general law to areas that received it simply because of the special gadget; but those areas in Texas that had the special gadget made no effort to show that they had any merit or that there was any reason for receiving the special gadget. The State of California showed they had some reason for it. Not so in the Nineteenth District of Texas. It was simply a windfall that fell on their doorstep or their broad plains. Again I call attention to the fact there was no malice on the part of the committee, that we are leaving the Nineteenth District, and I want to make this plain, with a third of a million acres of production this year for which they are getting cash. We are leaving them with a third of a million acres of history which will go on and on as long as they grow cotton. Yet the gentleman from the Nineteenth District says we have animus against his district, that we are prejudiced against it.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that when the law was written in 1949 it was clearly understood that Texas would not come under the California gadget?

Mr. POAGE. It was so understood, and every member of the subcommittee I have heard express himself points out that that was the understanding with the Department of Agriculture.

I want to call attention to the fact that not only was that understood but the gentleman from the Nineteenth District does not claim he had any other understanding. He simply found it lying on his doorstep. Of course, he used it. I do not blame him, and we are charging him no rent for the use; we are not trying to penalize him; but we are saying that because they had a special gadget out in the Nineteenth District in 1950 it does not entitled them to perpetually take advantage of this.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. I want to reiterate the fact that as a member of the committee it was my understanding that Texas did not come under the gadget.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I am absolutely astounded and amazed that somebody did not ask the witnesses when they were before the committee, or ask the Department if Texas was under the 2-year gadget. What you did was to write an over-all bill that applied to all States. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] did not know for sure that his State would be under the 2-year base program.

Mr. POAGE. May I say to the gentleman from the Nineteenth District of Texas that of course we did not suppose the representatives of the Department would run out on what they had told us

informally. We had a lot more confidence in them then than we have now. We thought at that time we could rely upon what they were telling us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this measure very likely would not be before you today except that the Department of Agriculture succumbed as so many of the executive branches have throughout the years to the desire to not only administer but to also write the laws of the land. Therefore, the integrity of our system of government is somewhat at stake, for we must impress upon the executive branch the necessity for them to stay in their field of administration and permit us to write the laws.

It seems at times that they misunderstand the word "executive" and take it to mean that they should execute the laws that Congress passes and that is what happened to Public Law 272. The Department of Agriculture executed it by misinterpretation.

Cotton is important to the Nation, but it is vital to areas such as I represent.

Homes depend upon it for existence and children depend upon it for their food.

Although the impression may have been left that this is a battle for advantage for one section or another in Texas, that is not true. The question is whether or not this Congress should write legislation which will fairly and equitably distribute cotton acreage allotments in the State of Texas and not leave them subject to the whims of the Department of Agriculture.

I do not seek advantage over my neighbors, but I do ask that my district be treated as the law directs and has directed for a number of years.

Our Committee on Agriculture has attempted to write this legislation in such a manner as to accomplish equity and I ask you to follow the committee in this bill.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman's district got about 82,000 acres more under the California gadget than it would otherwise have received.

Mr. BENTSEN. That is quite correct.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course the gentleman wants to keep that 82,000 acres.

Mr. BENTSEN. Absolutely.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not suppose we could find fault with the gentleman individually on that issue, but actually the State of Texas will not lose any acreage as a State if we pass the bill now before us; is that not true?

Mr. BENTSEN. It is my understanding that the districts of Texas will lose acreage by the passage of this bill from what they received in their 1950 quota after Public Law 471 was enacted.

Mr. COOLEY. No; all States will be treated alike at the State level. My question is, when the State of Texas receives its State allotment it will be fair and equitable among the other States of the Nation. Texas does not stand to lose one acre by what we are trying to do here.

Mr. BENTSEN. I do not know that I would say that.

Mr. COOLEY. We are attempting to bring about a redistribution of the acreage within the State of Texas.

Mr. BENTSEN. That is exactly right. That is the point I was going to make. I believe it is more fair that you put the cotton quota where the cotton is planted; that you not go back as far in history as you can go to try to see what they were planting in 1945 and 1946. I think you should put this cotton where it is being planted and where you can encourage its being efficiently grown, as in the vast reaches of west and south Texas. It would be economically unfeasible if you tried to protect the areas of high-cost cotton production, areas that evidently want to go out of the cotton-production business, and penalize those who are increasing their production.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a bill having a provision which for Texas alone changes the apportionment of the cotton acreage for 1951 from what it was for 1950. The provision, in my opinion, is a most inequitable one. The Agriculture Committee has agreed to a piece of legislation for Texas that penalizes progress and efficient production of this major commodity in the districts of south and west Texas. Rather this bill says to those areas who have been reducing their cotton acreage because they can profit more by diversifying their farming endeavors, we want you to plant cotton. We have a bill that will give you a quota that will help keep you in cotton, a quota that will help stop this trend of diversification of farming, a bill that will help stop those new areas of Texas with their modernized and mechanized production from farming their just share of the cotton acreage. A bill that does not concentrate on giving quotas to where cotton is planted, but to giving quotas based on history of what was planted as far back as 1945. This bill says let us go back to the year 1945 and see what you planted in the way of cotton then. Let us not start with the year 1947, when the new areas of Texas were reaching the peak of their progress. Nineteen forty-seven, when thousands of war veterans were planting their cotton in these new areas of Texas, on new lands because the land with the old cotton histories was beyond reach in price. In short, this provision in this bill for Texas says, "Let us stop progress and trends: let us continue business as usual." Not only does this bill drastically reduce cotton acreage of the districts who have been expanding their production of 1947 and 1948, but it goes a step further to punish these new areas. The bill gives to the affected counties a 1950 cotton acreage history equal to the acreage which would have been allotted if this year's State allotment had been apportioned on the basis of 4 years instead of 2 years.

It was stated last Thursday in the debate, "it does not make any difference to those who live in other States of the Union whether Texas operates under the provisions of this law or operates under the provisions of the present law. The State as a whole will get exactly the same." This is correct insofar as saying that Texas as a whole will get exactly the same, but I cannot help but believe that it does make a difference to the Members of this House if an injustice is done within the boundaries of any State as a result of the legislation passed by this House. It has been pointed out that of the 21 congressional districts in Texas, 17 received less acreage because of the use of a 2-year average for 1950 quotas. I put it to you that a majority in numbers alone does not make it right that the acreage of these 4 districts should be divided among the other 17.

Now, I say to my 17 friends and colleagues from Texas who may covet that which I believe rightfully belongs to the farmers of my district by law, study this bill and its applicable quotas carefully before voting for it.

A table was placed in the RECORD Thursday which showed that 17 of our Texas congressional districts would receive more cotton under this bill than under Public Law 272. The joker in this table is that it does not show you your true 1950 quotas after the passage of Public Law 471. Actually, according to estimated figures prepared by Mr. B. F. Vance, chairman of the State committee in Texas, out of 254 counties in Texas, only 71 will receive a higher quota for 1951 under this bill than that received in 1950. Eleven of the 21 congressional districts will receive less cotton quota under this bill than was allotted them in 1950. I ask you to try to explain to your farmers why you voted for a bill that in the great majority of the counties in Texas reduced their quotas for 1951 below what they were in 1950. Reduced their quotas at a time when the country faces its most serious international crisis since World War II. Reduced their quotas when we are spending that farmer's tax money to stockpile rubber, manganese, tin, copper, and yet this country faces a rapidly dwindling Government stockpile of cotton, which is just as essential and which has dropped from over 6,000,000 bales on January 1, 1950, to less than 4,000,000 bales today and is continuing to rapidly drop.

I ask your help in defeating this bill.

I will vote against its passage.

A MISTAKE—NEVER INTENDED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as disclosed here on the floor by a number of speakers, the amount of cotton received by the four districts referred to as favored districts, and I do not criticize their Members for defending the rights of their constituents to have anything that is good for them, was purely a mistake. It was never intended. Our people—the people in Texas—were trying to help the States, like California, New Mexico, and Missouri write a special formula for the benefit of those special cases because they would be discriminated against without this special formula. It was thoroughly understood at all times it would never apply to Texas and it would

not have applied to Texas, except for the fact that some person in the Department of Agriculture discovered two gins out there in west Texas that had ginned, it was claimed, 93 bales more of cotton that particular year than the records disclosed. The records that the committee were acting on were the records which did not include the 93 bales of cotton. So, discovering the 93 extra bales only, Texas came within that special formula intended for Missouri, New Mexico, and California, and coming under that formula which was never intended, it gave our distinguished friend from the Nineteenth District [Mr. MAHON] 355,000 extra acres of cotton in 1950, which was never intended to be given to him or his district. We want all districts treated the same, and just like other districts are treated.

As a result of that, in the eastern part of the State and in the middle section of the State where we have small cotton growers, they were discriminated against. They could not get as much as a half acre of cotton allotted to them to plant, and now where they have planted an acre and a half, some of them have to plow up half of that cotton, because, by reason of that accident, they came within the California formula and all this acreage was transferred to west Texas. That is not right.

Hundreds of families in east Texas and central Texas have been denied the right to make a living with their hands by producing cotton which they have always produced, by reason of this mistake which was made. May I inform you, too, that many of these families are headed by veterans who came back from the war and now are unable to make an honest and decent living performing their duties as farmers as they have always performed because that mistake was made.

Thousands of World War veterans with distinguished records have been denied the privilege of making a living because of that mistake. So all we are doing is asking you to right a wrong. A wrong has been committed—accidentally—never intended—never intended in the world—but it has been actually committed. And certain parts of our State and thousands of our people have been discriminated against and denied the privilege and opportunity of earning a living on the farm because of that mistake.

We are asking you to carry out the original intent of the law by voting against the Mahon amendment and voting for this bill in that respect as it is now written.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. If we vote down the Mahon amendment the State committee will have 10 percent of the State allotment of 760,000 acres with which they can adjust any inequity?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly. Not only that, each county will have 15 percent to make adjustments within the county. We should leave this to Texas, and let the Texas committees handle it. That is the way the bill is written, and I hope the bill, as written in that respect, is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the good faith of the United States Government is involved here. The issue is a very simple one. Back in 1945 this Congress passed a bill which is known as Public Law No. 12, a copy of which I hold in my hand. It was approved February 28, 1945. In that Public Law No. 12 the Congress told the cotton farmers of America that in future allotment programs they would be given credit for war crops which they were encouraged to raise during war times for war purposes and to better meet the demands of the war emergency. Acting in accordance with that public law, and believing, of course, in the good faith of the Federal Government in pursuance of that law, many of the farmers turned to war crops. Now, with the war over, and it being found necessary to impose quotas and restrict the number of acres that can be planted, the farmers find to their amazement, as a result of a departmental interpretation of the law that we passed last fall, that the Texas farmers did not get credit for war crops as they had been assured in Public Law No. 12. Is there anyone who will say that they were not assured in 1945 that they would be given credit for the war crops? Of course not. Everyone knows that is part of that law. It constitutes a contract between the Federal Government and the cotton farmers of America, those who wanted to be included in its provisions.

It happens that a few States had a situation which was unusual, and they brought that to the attention of the committee. They made a special gadget to take care of their particular situation. Everyone understood it did not apply to Texas. There is not a single member of the Committee on Agriculture, from what they have said and from what I have heard previously, who understood it to apply to the State of Texas. But because of the interpretation it was made to apply. Now, to undertake to perpetuate an old law which was misinterpreted, and which would deprive the Texas cotton farmers of their rights to war-crop allotments in making credit during this base period, would be to break faith with the farmers, and, as I have pointed out, contrary to Public Law No. 12. The good faith of the Government is involved. I do not see how this Congress could be impressed by the argument that Texas should be put under a special gadget, which was never intended by the law last fall, and contrary to the intention of the members of the committee and which would be contrary to the express provisions of Public Law No. 12, upon which the farmers in the part of the country where I live have always depended.

If there are injustices which arise in any congressional district or in any part of the State, they can be corrected through withholding the 760,000 acres by the State committee and reassignment to areas which have been adversely affected, where they can show that they are entitled to it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope that this committee will keep Texas where it belongs; that is, in the same category with Mississippi, Georgia, and most of the southern cotton-producing States. Give them the credit that they were told they would have in 1945. Do not treat them differently. All we want is the same identical treatment as is given the other cotton-producing States.

As far as my individual district is concerned, we want no advantage over any other district in Texas. We want the same formula to apply, and we want that formula to be in accordance with what the farmers were told they would have when Public Law 12 was written in 1945. When we have that we have no right to ask for more.

It is our belief that Texas is entitled to the same treatment as the other States. We do not want any more, and we do not think we are entitled to have any less.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is little complaint in my district concerning the amount of acreage this year or last year, but there is considerable complaint as to the way the county committees are to allocate that cotton. For that reason I should like to ask some member of the committee three questions. The first question is: Does the bill require the county committee to allocate cotton to a farm where cotton was planted in 1941 for the last time and war crops were grown in 1947, but the planter intends to plant no cotton in 1950 or future years? Can the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] answer that, please?

Mr. PACE. The gentleman has reference to the war crop credit? It is necessary for farms to have a 1950 cotton allotment in order to get the benefit of the war crop credit.

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

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is talking about another matter. Any cotton farmer has the right under this law to surrender his acreage; he does not have to plant it if he does not want to.

Mr. TEAGUE. But if this farmer planted cotton for the last time in 1941, then planted war crops in 1947, the county committee is required to allocate cotton acreage even if he does not intend to plant cotton in future years?

Mr. ALBERT. He would be entitled to a cotton quota.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is not the county committee forced to allot him whether he plants cotton or not?

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE. And will continue to be entitled to this allotment in future years if not planted.

Mr. ALBERT. Yes; if it is not planted.

Mr. TEAGUE. Does the gentleman think it would be fair, then, to let that county committee reallocate that acreage?

Mr. ALBERT. That authority is in the law, if it is voluntarily surrendered.

Mr. TEAGUE. But if it is not voluntarily surrendered the county committee would not have the authority to reallocate the acreage.

Mr. ALBERT. No. The same principle applies in any other State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is this bill more flexible than Public Law 272 in the matter of allotments?

Mr. ALBERT. Much more.

Mr. TEAGUE. In what way? Will the gentleman state, please?

Mr. ALBERT. Certainly. The language is such as to make reserves mandatory. Another thing, it contains the right to surrender and reallocate. For another thing, the 65-percent base which was an addition to Public Law 272 by Public Law 471 is maintained. In a number of ways the bill is more flexible and will allow greater latitude on the part of the county committee and the State committee in allocating the acreage allotted to them.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, later I will offer an amendment which gives county committees authority to reallocate cotton which is not planted within the county. Time and again it has been said to me by county committee after county committee that we have plenty of acreage allotment for our counties if we could only put it on farms where the producers want to grow cotton. Now, Mr. Chairman, my proposal that the county committee be given more latitude in making allotments to farms is based upon the fact that I believe county and community committees are in a better position to know the individual circumstances in our respective communities and counties and therefore are in better position to make just and equitable allotments to bona fide cotton producers in the county than any formula could possibly give the farmers particularly if that formula is applied to all cotton farmers in the Nation.

I believe these committees will assume the responsibility, and since they are elected by the farmers in the community and county, if they do not assume the responsibility in the making of equitable allotments they will be replaced and others will be put on the committees to do the job for the following year.

Mr. Chairman, I want to quote a part of a letter which I received this morning as a result of a request of mine from Mr. B. F. Vance, the chairman of our State PMA committee:

> Just today I discussed the county allotments with the chairmen of the county committees in 12 east Texas counties, and each chairman was of the opinion that the allotment received for his county in 1950 was ample if it could have been placed on farms where the farmer desires to plant cotton.

Mr. Vance, as chairman of our State PMA committee, whose other members are Mr. W. Lewis David, Mr. J. R. Adams, Mr. V. L. Cade, Mr. Howard T. Kingsbery, and Mr. Ide P. Trotter, make up the State PMA committee in Texas. This committee from Texas has worked hard and done everything possible to make this bill work the way Congress intended it to work.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to be Texas afternoon; we have all been up here. We have some little difference of ideas about this bill, but I do speak in behalf of the Mahon amendment for the reason that I believe your law is adequate to take care of all the discrepancies that may be found throughout the various districts.

I do not think Texas should be singled out and put under any particular gadget. We do not seek any gadgets. We think we ought to be put on a 1-, 2-, or 4-year basis as the State committee sees fit. Let the State committee have a 10 percent leeway there to allocate the acreage among the various counties. We know that under last year's allocation the State committee only saw fit to use a very small part of that 10 percent which was allowed by the law, less than 3 percent, I believe. They allocated cotton to land in many counties that were not planted to cotton. We have in the El Paso Valley land that has been in cotton for more than 50 years, some of it for 100 years. Now, all at once they come along here and find that they are going to come under a special law which will permit the State committee to take from the farms out there some 15,000 acres of land that have been planted to cotton. If the Mahon amendment is adopted, everybody in Texas will receive fair treatment. Under that you have the 10 percent provision. Why do we have to put Texas under a special provision of 4 years when Texas might see fit to do better under the 1-, 2-, or 4-year basis?

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Mahon amendment be given serious consideration in fairness to all of Texas.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Mahon amendment. The good faith of the Government is at stake. The Congress promised all the farmers in Public Law 12 that in any future acreage allotment programs they would be given credit for war crops planted during the base period. If the pending amendment is adopted, no farmer in Texas will be given credit for one single acre of war crops raised during this base period.

This applies particularly in the north central portion of Texas where many of our farmers, in response to the urgent request of the Government during the war, turned to war crops instead of continuing to plant cotton.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I repeat that the good faith of the Federal Government is involved. This amendment should be defeated.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Louisiana delegation have not taken the floor on the bill under consideration for the reason that we have been in constant contact with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], chairman of the Cotton Subcommittee, and we had been advised of the findings and recommendations of the subcommittee, and while we do not feel that the bill under consideration is perfect, we believe that considering the many phases and complexities of the subject that, the committee has conscientiously done the best job possible in an effort to meet the situation in what they consider a fair, reasonable, and equitable manner.

Early in the year the Louisiana delegation held a meeting in regard to discussing the Cotton Acreage Allotment Act, and I ask permission to include in these remarks a copy of the resolution agreed upon at that meeting by the Members present, as follows:

> The Louisiana delegation in the House of Representatives met today for the purpose of discussing the situation arising out of the application of the Cotton Acreage Allotment Act passed in the last session of Congress. At this meeting were present the following: A. LEONARD ALLEN, OVERTON BROOKS, F. EDWARD HÉBERT, HENRY D. LARCADE, OTTO E. PASSMAN, HALE BOGGS, EDWIN E. WILLIS, and JAMES MORRISON.
>
> After considerable discussion, the group present unanimously felt that some modification of the act was imperative and that this change should be brought about as quickly as possible in order to reassure cotton farmers and relieve injustices. The discussion centered around proposed changes of the law which would guarantee that no cotton farmer should be compelled to reduce his cotton acreage by more than 30 percent of the average acreage planted during the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. The discussion further centered around the idea of unfreezing unused cotton acreage presently frozen.
>
> Cotton is still a basic crop in the State of Louisiana; and any action which unduly decreases the production of this staple crop in effect injures the economy of our entire State. In addition to this, any law which in its application results in equities and injustices will produce dissatisfaction among our farm population and cannot bring about wholesome results.

Mr. Chairman, in my own district in Louisiana I met with the leaders of the cotton industry and at that time they agreed upon the general principles indicated in a letter written to me by Mr. G. J. Durbin, district field man, of Baton Rouge, La., which I also ask permission to include at this point, as follows:

> DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
> PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
> *Baton Rouge, La., December 20, 1949.*
>
> Congressman HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. LARCADE: In accordance with the agreement in the Opelousas meeting yesterday, I am outlining below the thinking of the group from St. Landry, Evangeline, and Acadia Parishes of what changes it might be best for Congress to make in the law for establishing 1950 cotton allotments.
>
> The group felt that farmers having more allotments than they want should be permitted to release part or all of their allotments to the PMA County Committee for reapportionment to other farms which the county committee determines received inequitable allotments. The group also thought that the acreage released should be considered released for 1 year only and that for the purpose of establishing acreage allotments in 1951 and subsequent years the acreage released in 1950 by a farm should be considered the same as acreage planted to cotton in 1950 on that farm.
>
> This change in the law would not increase the national acreage allotment but would, in the opinion of those attending the meeting, provide a more equitable distribution of the national allotment.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> G. J. DURBIN,
> *District Field Man.*

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to most of the debate on the bill under consideration, and I was just a little surprised at the remarks of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] on the floor on Thursday

of last week. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] was complaining about the State of California having been discriminated against in the allocation of cotton acreage in favor of the Southern States, and as was well explained by the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], instead of being discriminated against, California has a substantial advantage in allocation over the Southern States, and if anything, the shoe is on the other foot.

The same advantage held by California in the present situation also obtains, in my opinion, as obtained in the allocation of acreage for rice. As a matter of fact, I appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture and presented facts and figures and objections by my constituents showing that Louisiana, one of the largest rice-producing States had been discriminated against in the allocation of rice acreage in favor of California and Texas due to the formula used in making the allocation. Of course, it is true that California and Texas increased their rice acreage, as they have increased their cotton acreage in the last 2 years, and taking the 5-year Louisiana average, under the formula used for California and Texas, Louisiana was penalized in their allocation of rice acreage allocation.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with, nor am I hostile to my neighboring State of Texas, nor to the State of California. On the contrary, I wish to cooperate with both States in any way possible; however, I cannot let the occasion pass without speaking in order to keep the record straight, and at least let it be known that, instead of the State of my good friend, Mr. PHILLIPS, being discriminated against, Califorina has profited and in fact, instead of being discriminated against in the cotton-acreage program—it not only has an advantage in acreage allotment in cotton, but also in rice, at least compared to Louisiana under the formula used in both instances.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I cannot refrain from calling to the attention of the House my insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 27, 1950, outlining the proposed farm plan of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture, as proposed at a meeting of that association held in Atlanta, Ga., on December 10, 1949, and while I am not an expert on agricultural problems, it is my opinion that this plan is worthy of study by the Agricultural Committees of both Houses and the membership as well. The article discusses the cotton support price problem at length and I believe that the suggestion is worthy of consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH: Page 11, after line 16, insert the following:

"SEC. —. Section 346 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) The penalty provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to cotton produced by any veteran of World War II who is recognized by the county committee as being a cotton farmer if his total acreage planted to cotton during the year in which such cotton was produced did not exceed 5 acres. As used in this subsection the term "veteran of World War II" means a person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before September 3, 1945, and who has been honorably separated from such service.'"

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very brief and very simple. It simply says that if a veteran is recognized by his county committee as being a cotton farmer he can plant 5 acres of cotton without being subject to penalty. It is my opinion that this amendment should go even further, and I do have an amendment that goes further; it would provide that any genuine cotton farmer, if he is recognized by his county committee as being a genuine cotton farmer, would receive a minimum of 5 acres.

It is said over and over again that this legislation is mighty fair, which may be true, but in some instance it has worked injustices, and admittedly so.

I have here a letter from one of the Virginia districts that says:

Number of cotton farmers that received less than 5 acres that will cease to grow cotton: 150.

We have one here:

Number of producers ceasing farming for themselves in 1950: 20 estimated.

That is in one county.

Number of producers receiving less than 5 acres that will not plant cotton: 150.

This is in Wilson County, N. C., incidentally.

Here is another one:

Estimate of number of producers receiving less than 5 acres that will probably grow no cotton in 1950: 100.

This is from your county committees:

Producers receiving less than 5 acres who probably will grow no cotton: 250.

This is from an Alabama county.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, why are they not producing cotton? Because of an insufficient amount of land?

Mr. BECKWORTH. There is no question about that. If you give a person one-tenth or one-seventh or half an acre or 2 acres or 3 acres, you are likely giving him so little that he cannot afford to grow cotton. Incidentally, I am going to include as part of my remarks letters that have come from many cotton States, from commissioners of agriculture, from the Farmers Home Administration, and others, that say it is uneconomic for a person to grow less than 5 acres. In a number of instances these letters say that.

When you talk about aiding the farmer, let us mean not one segment of the farmers. Let us refer to all the farmers. Incidentally, I was pleased when you adopted the Combs amendment. I certainly express my appreciation for the fact that this House did adopt that amendment. That is a good amendment. I happen to know a good deal about that amendment. This, though, is one additional step, and if you truly want to help the family-sized farmer to stay on the farm and earn a living there, it will certainly help to do the job.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it the purpose of the amendment to give a minimum acreage of 5 acres to every veteran?

Mr. BECKWORTH. A veteran who is recognized by his county committee as being a genuine cotton farmer; yes, sir.

Mr. COOLEY. That means if a veteran came in and showed that he had a piece of land upon which he could grow 5 acres of cotton, that they would give him 5 acres?

Mr. BECKWORTH. If the county committee said the veteran is a genuine cotton farmer, they would give him 5 acres of cotton to produce.

Mr. COOLEY. So it would be entirely possible that the 14,000,000 veterans of World War II would each receive 5 acres.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman knows that that is not the case, for this reason: There is no county committee in North Carolina that would recognize a New York City or Brooklyn veteran who would be one of the 14,000,000 you are talking about as a genuine cotton farmer. Incidentally, I have a letter from the Department of Agriculture, which is in the RECORD now, that says that these PMA committees would be in a position to judge which is a genuine farmer and which is not, and I will be glad to show that to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. What is a genuine farmer, except a man who desires to honestly till the soil and to grow something on the soil?

Mr. BECKWORTH. What is "adequate" which is used in this legislation?

Mr. COOLEY. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. BECKWORTH. What is "adequate"? I will say this, you have to rely on judgment, and your committee is relying on the judgment of these county committees when it talks about reserving an adequate amount up to 10 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. We reserve 15 percent to the county, and that 15 percent can be used for the very purpose for which the gentleman desires additional acreage.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman asks, "What is a genuine farmer?" I think it is as easy to identify a genuine farmer by your county committee as it is to know the meaning of the word "adequate."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is plain to see that if this amendment is adopted it would be utterly impossible for the administrators to put into effect any satisfactory program. It would make possible

the granting of a 5-acre minimum allotment to every veteran of World War II to the exclusion of all of the veterans of World War I who could show to the satisfaction of the local committee that he was in good faith a farmer and intended to plant the acreage that he was requesting. If you were to grant a 5-acre allotment to all of the veterans, you would throw the whole program out of gear, and it would result in having no program at all.

I should like to say further that the State of Texas is well represented here with two Members of the Texas delegation on the Committee on Agriculture. They have worked diligently in the preparation of this bill. I know that they conducted hearings that extended not only for days and weeks but for months.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] appeared before our committee, and he was then suffering from no limitation of time. No time was fixed for the presentation of his views. This proposition was never offered in the House Committee on Agriculture. I submit to the House that it is not now worthy of consideration here on the floor of the House. It is ill-advised and entirely improper to single out the veterans of one war, the war that was waged in the days of his age and generation, to the exclusion of those of my age and generation who engaged in World War I. It would be mighty hard for me to sit on a committee and deny to an old soldier of World War I the same fair treatment that the gentleman is anxious to give to the younger men of World War II.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman made the statement that I said nothing about this idea before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. I said the gentleman did not offer the amendment.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Yes, I did offer some amendments incorporating this very idea, extending it not only to the veterans but to all genuine farmers. If the gentleman will print the hearings, and I ask him to do that, he will certainly find that in the hearings.

Mr. COOLEY. I have the hearings in my hand, and I find that the gentleman's testimony runs from page 703 to 711.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does the gentleman find the amendment there?

Mr. COOLEY. Let the gentleman come here and see if he can find it.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I know I introduced before the Agriculture Committee an amendment, which in my opinion incorporates this idea.

Mr. COOLEY. Here is the record, if the gentleman wants it.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman is the one who made the statement. I said I offered the amendment that would extend this idea to everyone who is recognized by the county committee as being a cotton farmer, which would include all veterans, of course.

Mr. COOLEY. Here is the record. I do not have the time to read these pages but I will give them to the gentleman. Will he point out where he offered this amendment?

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman is the one who made the statement. Let him point it out.

Mr. COOLEY. It is not here to point out.

Mr. BECKWORTH. It is there.

Mr. COOLEY. Let the gentleman find it, then.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Let the gentleman find it. He is the one who made the statement, and the statement is just a mistake.

Mr. COOLEY. I have the record here. The gentleman wanted all of the record. Let him show that the amendment was offered.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bad amendment. It ought to be defeated. I should just like to know why the gentleman picked out the men who fought the war in his day to the exclusion of those who fought in World War I.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I did not pick them out. As I stated I have offered and do offer an amendment which includes all farmers including all veterans.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman singles out World War II veterans.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I did not pick them out to the exclusion of anyone. The amendment I have offered before definitely includes all of them.

Mr. COOLEY. How much acreage will the gentleman's amendment take?

Mr. BECKWORTH. How much does the gentleman say it will take?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is the one who offered the amendment. So it is plain to see the gentleman does not know anything about the full effect of his amendment. He comes to the floor of the House and offers an amendment to give relief to the veterans of World War II to the exclusion of all other veterans and the exclusion of all other worthy citizens.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do not interpret my amendments as you do. He asked me how much acreage it would take.

Mr. COOLEY. And what did the gentleman tell me?

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want and I do not intend to take issue with this fine Committee on Agriculture, but there is some merit to this amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Texas.

I mentioned to you a while ago, during the 5 minutes I had here on the floor, and all of you know many instances just like the one I mentioned. A lot of these fellows who had little, bitty farms went off to the Army. But the fellows who had big plantations stayed here to build up their history which they are now relying on to get this cotton acreage. It has been mentioned that you are taking the World War II veterans and excluding the other veterans. That is not true. The basic period which is under consideration was the period immediately following World War II. Of course the World War I boys were farming and raising cotton during the time of the basic period involved. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas plainly states that only those who are actual cotton farmers would be protected under his amendment, and would receive any benefits from it.

Gentlemen, it is not a laughing proposition. These fellows in my district on these little farms came back home and were not able to go back on the farm in 1945 and 1946 and are excluded under this cotton program by virtue of the legislation now before the House. I honestly and sincerely feel that they are entitled to some consideration—not just merely because they were veterans, but because of the fact they were not allowed to farm and participate at the time they were building the basic period.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. How about the men who left the farms to go into the shipyards and the munitions plants and all the other war activities? Would you also accord them the right to come back to the farm and get 5 acres of cotton?

Mr. TACKETT. If it were absolutely necessary for them to go to the shipyards and they did not go there to make money, I think they should be included, but that situation is not covered by the proposed amendment.

All these boys whom we are considering here did not go to the shipyards to make money.

Mr. COOLEY. Whom would you authorize to make the determination whether a boy went into a shipyard to make money?

Mr. TACKETT. This amendment does not say anything in the world about shipyards. We are talking about boys who did the fighting, Those are the fellows I am trying to help. If you want to bring in a shipyard amendment, you bring it in.

Mr. COOLEY. I am just asking if you favor that.

Mr. TACKETT. I am not interested in any shipyard amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. You are not interested in the man who left the farm to go into war activities?

Mr. TACKETT. I am interested in those who had to leave the farms.

Mr. COOLEY. That is, only those who were drafted, and not those who volunteered? You would not give a man who volunteered the same benefits?

Mr. TACKETT. Oh, you are trying to get off into deep water where you cannot swim.

Mr. COOLEY. You said only those who were forced to go.

Mr. TACKETT. I have in mind those who actually went, and tried to contribute to the war effort as a soldier.

Mr. COOLEY. And you would give every one of those 5 acres?

Mr. TACKETT. I would give those who were farming, and farming cotton, at the time they left here.

Mr. COOLEY. So if a man had five boys who went into the armed services who came back, he would get 5 acres for each one of those boys?

Mr. TACKETT. Let me tell you something, Mr. COOLEY—just listen a minute—you are not trying to listen.

Mr. COOLEY. No, I am not, because I consider it absolutely ridiculous and unthinkable.

Mr. TACKETT. I know you think it is ridiculous.

Mr. COOLEY. I think it is ridiculous and unthinkable that you should get up on the floor of the House and ask for this sort of an amendment.

Mr. TACKETT. Let me ask you something. Suppose I am a cotton plantation owner and I have 1,000 acres of cotton land which I was farming in 1943. Suppose my neighbor has a little 40-acre farm and he has 5 acres of cotton. Of course I am producing war materials for the war effort. They take this little fellow off the 40-acre farm and send him into the Army. He comes back and he is not able to go on the farm in 1945 or perhaps he is still in the Army. It does not make any difference. He does not have any funds to go back there and raise cotton. He has to try to make a little bit of money to get back on the farm in 1945 and 1946 and 1947. But still the big plantation owner—me—I get the benefit of this legislation that you are passing today to the exclusion of the boy who went over there and fought for the principles of democracy that gave me the opportunity to raise the cotton. Now laugh that off. You know it is true.

Mr. COOLEY. I will not laugh it off.

Mr. TACKETT. You have laughed off every amendment that has come before the House.

Mr. COOLEY. I am just telling you that the farm which that boy was on before he went into the Army still is considered in the history of that farm. The farm is still given the allotment. You fellows who were not here and did not help draft the basic legislation do not seem to understand that no provision is made for any man, the provision is made for the farm, and not to the farmer.

Mr. TACKETT. That is exactly my complaint.

Mr. COOLEY. That is the reason why you want to change the whole philosophy.

Mr. TACKETT. No; I do not want to change the whole philosophy. I want to help those fellows who did not have an opportunity to build up a cotton-planting history.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is necessary to have a cotton allotment program if the Government is going to subsidize the farmers in raising cotton. I fully realize that I do not want to tear down the cotton program, but I do think there should be some exceptions to the cotton program. I do not know of a better exception than the one the gentleman from Texas has brought to the attention of the House. You men who live out in the country know, as I do, that it is not fair for the plantation owners to get all the cotton and the little farmers, who were excluded from the opportunity of growing cotton, to participate in the program. That is exactly what you are doing.

When I was home a few days ago I talked with 10 or 12 fellows who were raising cotton before they went to war in 1943. They came back in 1945 and 1946 and were not able to go back on the farm because they did not have the money to do it with. They eventually got back out there. The GI fund that this Congress provided gave them an opportunity to go back to the farm, and now they cannot raise cotton. They were just as good cotton raisers before the war tore up their economy and tore up their way of living. Certainly, the fellows in World War I and the Spanish-American veterans were raising cotton and they were not hampered in any way from building a record. But the World War II veterans were hampered.

I have never stood up here and insisted that all the legislation in this House should be on behalf of the veterans. I do not think the veterans should, or desire, to tear up the economy of this country, but I honestly and sincerely feel that they should be able to go back and raise cotton as they were doing before they were taken off the farm. I do not see anything wrong in this Congress giving them an opportunity to go back and raise cotton. I do not believe there will be such a great number of acres involved in any event.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, does that include 5 minutes for me?

Mr. COOLEY. Five minutes for the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], 5 minutes for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], as modified?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this appears to me to be a good amendment. I do not believe it will add 1 acre to the requirements, assuming that the law will be administered equitably and fairly. I will tell you why. In the first place, in answer to a suggestion that has been made, I can assure you that the veterans who live in the Northern States are not going to flock down to the Southern States to get 5 acres of cotton. Anyone who knows anything in the world about cotton knows that that will not happen.

In the second place, it only applies to half a dozen, a handful, figuratively speaking and proportionately speaking, because nearly everybody is going to get far more than 5 acres. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] is trying to see that the little fellow is guaranteed at least 5 acres. Nearly everybody gets far more than 5 acres. He wants to see that nobody gets less than 5 acres.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman know that in the State of North Carolina 50 percent of the farmers receive less than 5 acres? That shows what an important problem we are dealing with.

Mr. MORRIS. That is a deplorable condition. I am sorry the gentleman has to make that admission. If that is true, there ought to be a change in the law, because that is not right.

Mr. COOLEY. That is true in seven other States.

Mr. MORRIS. It just is not right that that situation should develop, and that is why this amendment should be adopted. Anyone who is a valid farmer ought not to have less than 5 acres of cotton; that just should not be.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I would like to yield to my colleague from Georgia [Mr. PACE], but I hope he will let me proceed just a little further.

If this amendment prevails it will be to the general country just what the recent amendment was to California. We gave a similar right to California just a few moments ago, did we not?

This amendment does not go far enough. I am going to support this amendment, and I am going to support the amendment the gentleman from Texas has indicated giving every valid farmer in America the right to have at least 5 acres. If we cannot write a law here, Mr. Chairman, giving the people of this country who validly grow cotton at least 5 acres apiece, there is something wrong.

I want to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to this great Committee on Agriculture—and what I say here is not intended in any way as a criticism of this great committee. I wish the gentleman from North Carolina would give me his attention. I have watched the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of this great committee; and I have watched the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], chairman of the great subcommittee, and these other members, and our own beloved member from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]; I have watched them work diligently week after week. You gentleman have performed a great service to agriculture in this country. I take my hat off to you; as a matter of fact, you draw me to your hearts by reason of the efforts that you have made, and I am not standing here criticizing you. I am merely suggesting to you that you with all of your greatness, with all of your astuteness, with all of the energy that you have put into this bill, you are not omnipotent, neither am I, and neither is the great Speaker

of this House; neither is the President of the great United States. No one is omnipotent. We all make mistakes, and you are making a serious mistake, in my estimation, great as you are, in opposing an amendment like this, because it is a guaranty to the little fellow that he at least will have enough money out of his year's work to buy his children just a little food to eat and just a few things to wear. I know, of course, that the speech I am making might indicate that I am kind of demagoging here, but I most certainly am not. I do not intend to mail this speech out to my constituents. As a matter of fact I have never mailed out to my constituents even one, no not one of those I have made since I have been here. Not one speech have I mailed to my constituents in the 3½ years I have been here. No, my friends, I am not demagoging, I am in dead earnest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Time for debate has been limited.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. There are many veterans who have purchased homes from the Farmers Home Administration. They are in this ironical position: They are honest, hardworking people and could pay for their homes if they were privileged to produce as much as 5 acres of cotton per year. They are not privileged to do that, and a lot of them cannot even make payments to a Government agency for the farm home they have purchased, because of their inability to get the small amount of 5 acres of cotton allotted to them.

One of the best bills we passed preceding the end of the war was the GI bill of rights which gave these boys an opportunity to finish up their education after they got out of the service. One of the greatest losses we had during World War II, outside of the loss of life and limb, was the educational loss of these fine young men. We induced them, and properly so, to go back to school and to college and to follow up their education that was interrupted by their war service. But by reason of that act which we passed which was attractive to them, they lose their cotton allotment when they come back home, and the county committees know that they are genuine farmers. They are genuine farmers, but they cannot get an allotment of even 5 acres. Sometimes a half acre is provided them. As the gentleman from Texas mentioned here a while ago, many county committees will tell you frankly that less than 5 acres is an uneconomic operation of a farm. You cannot successfully operate a cotton farm with less than 5 acres of cotton.

We are beginning to see monopoly rear its ugly head in the farming business. Did you know that since it has been made so attractive for farmers to make an honest living, if they work for it, the factory-type farm is coming into being? Did you know that last year 1.7 percent of the farmers produced 25 percent of the farm income?

I may say to the chairman of this committee that if the 5 acres is too large, why does he not suggest something else? I ask him to give this serious consideration because it is not an idle dream. It is something that means a great deal and should have careful consideration. If the 5 acres is too much, tell us why and offer something that will be fair. In the end this acreage will probably come principally from the factory-type farm, the 1.7 percent that are producing 25 percent of the farm income.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Under the law for 1949 We provided that anyone who had planted less than 5 acres during the 3-year period would not be required to make any contribution to the reduction program. In other words, he would have an allotment exempt from any reduction of his planted acreage.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman mean exempt him under 5 acres?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, but say it is one-tenth of an acre. He is still exempt.

Mr. COOLEY. We permit him to plant the highest amount of acreage he had planted in the 3-year period.

Mr. PATMAN. Suppose he was going to school under the GI bill of rights and he is away from home. He has lost his cotton acreage. Why can he not come back and reclaim that cotton acreage?

Mr. COOLEY. I can read from the law the protection which we already have for the boy who was forced to give up growing cotton and had to go to war. The gentleman is not familiar with the law now on the books.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman do that in his own time?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. The question here is, Are you going to discriminate against the veterans who are going to school and who lost their allotments in favor of the factory-type farm that has been growing cotton and getting bigger and bigger and bigger during the past 5 or 10 years? Are you in favor of giving this veteran just a small acreage of 5 when it will not come from any others except those who have greatly increased their acreage during this time of prosperity on the farm? We should not further encourage the factory-type farm. We should encourage the family-type farm.

The way to get away from even the danger of socialism and communism in this country is to encourage farm and home ownership. We are encouraging farm ownership, but you cannot continue it fully unless you give the man enough acres to make a living on that farm.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to repeat here again that when the Secretary of Agriculture says there shall be but so many acres of cotton produced in a year, when you give it to somebody you have to take it away from somebody.

Do not be too much misled by this veteran angle. We have had similar proposals before the committee. Well over half of the cotton farmers today are veterans. Do not go wild about the veteran end of it. What about the veteran who has 6 acres and that is all he has? Are you going to come along and take something away from him?

There is no such thing, Mr. Chairman, as just getting cotton acreage out of thin air. You do not have any quotas when that goes on. Like this year we are going to have so many bales of cotton that require so many acres; then whenever you go out and give to somebody, you must take. In 1945 we passed an act and provided that every cotton farmer who left his farm to go into the service, he will be regarded as having planted cotton every hour he was in the service. That is Public Law 12, of the Seventy-ninth Congress. It says that when he is in the service he is taken care of, and that is the only question that his amendment applies to, because the gentleman's amendment says that the county committee must regard him as a cotton farmer, and he cannot be a cotton farmer under this amendment unless he was planting cotton before the war. Every one of them are being taken care of now if, as a matter of fact, he was a real cotton farmer and wanted to get back into cotton production.

But, in addition to that I want to repeat again that we have given to the State committee of Texas the right to reserve 760,000 acres and give every acre of it to the veterans if they want to. We have authorized every county committee in the State of Texas to reserve 15 percent of the county allotment and give every acre of it to the veterans. We cannot get an estimate as to what this would take in acreage, but the gentleman offered a similar amendment last year when the bill was up, which was defeated, and then we did get an estimate that it could take from five to ten million acres. If you do not have but 20,000,000 acres allocated, and this amendment giving veterans 5 acres, that will take five or ten million acres, what are all the other veterans that are really cotton farmers going to have? Where are they going to get their cotton acreage? You do not have but so much to allot.

What we have done in the bill is to put that into the hands of the home people. If the county committee wants to give every acre of it to a group of veterans, they have the right to do so. But, I appeal to you, do not wreck the entire program to meet a situation that happens to exist down in one county of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]. He has been talking about that county for the last 18 months. I am willing for him to put a local amendment in here to take care of that county if the other Members from Texas will agree. But, my friends, please do not

wreck the entire program. Do not destroy the whole equitable system that has been set up. We have no State lines on this amendment.

The gentleman from California was in here this morning talking about his situation. Let me tell you that if this amendment goes in, it utterly destroys the protection that our States have now, because whenever this group can come in and take five or ten million acres, then you take whatever is left, that is all. As I say, you are taking it from veterans and you are giving it to veterans who now, under the law, if they were honest, real cotton farmers, could go back and get it under the law as it now exists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BECKWORTH) there were—ayes 15, noes 46.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE: On page 8, line 8, after "is", strike out "voluntarily surrendered to the county committee" and insert "not to be planted."

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, under present law the county committee is forced to allocate cotton to any farm which last planted cotton in 1941, planted war crops in 1947, and has no intent of planting cotton again. This amendment will give the county committee authority to take that allotment and reallocate it within that county to a farm which will plant cotton.

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

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Would the gentleman help us by trying to explain how the county committee could ever find out, if the planting season was over, whether or not a man was going to plant his allotment?

Mr. TEAGUE. On line 10 the bill states that "under regulations prescribed by the Secretary." Therefore he can require that a farmer say whether or not he is going to plant his cotton.

Mr. PACE. We have attempted to do that in here. We say if he is not going to do it, he can surrender it.

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman from Georgia well knows that in cotton districts the value of your land is based on your cotton allotment. Therefore, most farmers refuse to surrender the acreage which they do not plant because they are afraid they will lose that allotment to their farm.

Mr. PACE. The farmer loses as much by not planting as he does by surrender. He does not gain anything by hanging onto it and not planting.

Mr. TEAGUE. If the farmer does not plant over a certain period he loses that acreage and the State loses that acreage. This amendment gives the county committee that acreage, and they will keep it within the county and keep it within the State.

Mr. PACE. I just do not see how the county committee could know until after the planting season was over whether he is going to plant.

Mr. TEAGUE. Is it not true this is the same provision that is in the wheat law?

Mr. PACE. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. TEAGUE. One member of the gentleman's staff just told me it was.

Mr. PACE. What the committee did was to say that you can determine when a man is going to plant it by going to him and asking him, "Are you going to plant it?" "No." "Will you sign this surrender?" That closes the book.

Mr. TEAGUE. If he says "No," there is nothing you can do about that acreage, and the great majority of the cotton farmers will not surrender their county acreage.

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

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Suppose the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, and by the middle of May a farmer has not planted, and the county comes to him and says, "Do you intend to plant that acreage?" and he says, "Yes," would the gentleman still suggest the county committee should go ahead and take that cotton away from him?

Mr. TEAGUE. If there is evidence to indicate he has not planted it and that he will not plant it.

Mr. POAGE. What would be that evidence?

Mr. TEAGUE. If he has not planted cotton since 1941, and he has made no preparation to plant, I would say that was sufficient evidence that he was not going to plant it this year.

Will the gentleman answer my question about wheat? Is not this the same provision that is in the wheat law?

Mr. POAGE. I confess I am not familiar with the wheat law. Perhaps it is not in the wheat law, but the wheat law allows a great deal more liberality on the part of the local committees than the cotton law does. If we want to change the cotton law so that we do not have legislation, but simply leave it up to the county committee, of course this bill goes a long way in that direction. However, it strikes me the bill goes about as far in that direction as we can afford to go.

Mr. TEAGUE. The county committee is elected by the people in the county, and I would have no fear as to what that county committee might do as far as reallocating this cotton acreage is concerned.

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

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Suppose farmer A, who grew cotton in 1941, has a 25-acre allotment coming to him, say for 1951, if he wants to use it.

He states he does not intend to plant for 1951, and they allocate the acreage to some other land. What is his status in the spring of 1952?

Mr. TEAGUE. On page 8, line 15, the bill reads:

Any transfer of acreage in 1950 shall not operate to reduce the allotment base for any subsequent year for the farm from which such acreage is transferred.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, by stating any particular year that he does not intend to grow cotton that year, he does not lose the right to grow cotton for some subsequent year.

Mr. TEAGUE. But if he does not plant it over a certain period, he loses it, the county loses it and the State loses it.

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

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I want to correct that. The next year and the years after he does lose it. We simply said that he did not lose it in 1950, because of the act that we passed in April we said he would not. But we have changed that, and hereafter he will lose it.

Mr. TEAGUE. He will lose it.

If you transfer it or do not plant it, you lose it. That is, if you do that for 3 years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So that you come to the spring of 1951, and you say: "Are you going to plant this acreage"——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. A short while ago I was stopped in midair.

Mr. COOLEY. I am sorry.

Mr. MORRIS. That was unfair to me. Not that the gentleman from North Carolina was unfair, but the situation was. I made a statement which might on its face appear as if I was making a demagogic statement. But I say to the gentleman and to the Members of the House that I was not. I was in dead earnest. I have not sent out one speech—not one in 3½ years—and I was not making the speech to be broadcast. I was making it because I believe in the justice of this amendment. I have not sent out any speech, and I do not intend to send this one out.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree that the gentleman was left hanging in mid-air because of the circumstances which we faced at the time, to wit, that the time had been fixed.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. May I call attention to the fact that if we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, it will leave any man who tried to diversify by planting cotton only 1 year out of 3 in such position that I do not see how he can continue with his program.

Mr. TEAGUE. The Secretary has the right to write the regulation on that, and

what the gentleman states in my opinion is not correct.

Mr. COOLEY. The law provides that if he does not plant once in 3 years he loses it, and if he does plant once in 3 years he retains it. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] says, we are trying to encourage a program of diversified agriculture so that farmers would engage in rotation practices, and I am very much afraid that the gentleman's amendment would destroy that program.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. The State chairman of Texas wrote this yesterday:

I discussed the county allotments with the chairmen of county committees in 12 east Texas counties, and each chairman was of the opinion that the allotment received for his county in 1950 was ample if it could have been placed on farms where the farmer desired to plant cotton.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, but if the farmer desired to surrender his acreage, he may voluntarily do so.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH: On page 11, after line 16, insert the following:

"Section 346 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (e) the penalty provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to cotton produced by any person who is recognized by the county committee as being a cotton farmer if his total acreage planted to cotton during the year in which such cotton was produced did not exceed 5 acres."

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that was mentioned several times a while ago.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 7 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, as I said, this is the amendment that has been talked about heretofore. I offered it a year ago, on August 3. Incidentally, things have not been nearly as serene today as they were a year ago. It is obvious there have been inequities existing in the year gone by.

I do want to say this: that there have been some figures used here. Five million and ten million were used as an estimate a year ago. Those same figures were used. I happen to have the August 3 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and here is what I said:

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] spoke about 6,000,000 bales. On July 25 the Department wrote me a letter as to the number of farmers growing five bales or less, on an average, and there were 601,273.

Now, that refers to bales, but it also gets its origin from the acres, which is found in the August 3, 1949, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I said there:

It would be interesting, indeed, when we consider the fact that I have here a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, written on July 5, 1949, that this particular figure I have given, and I ask Mr. PACE to supply the source of his figures.

Later on Mr. PACE wrote me this year. I answered that letter, and I asked Mr. PACE again to give me the source of his figures. Before the House I simply want to ask that the source of these figures and the figures be given to me, that I might find them, because honestly I have not been able to find any such figures. The contrary is true. I have these figures that were supplied me on July 25, 1949, by the Department of Agriculture (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, part 8, p. 10710), the latest figures I have been able to get. If we have later figures, I simply want to courteously ask that they be given.

Mr. PACE. Do you want me to give them to you now?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No. I asked you in a letter, and you have not answered my letter. I also stated in the August 3, 1949, RECORD that I would appreciate your giving me the figures. All I ask him courteously today is to send me the figures.

This shows that 601,273 farmers were growing 9 acres or less—not 5 acres or less—in 1945, out of over 1,000,000 growers. If all of them grew 5 acres, that would be only a little over 3,000,000 acres, and it is for that reason that I am anxious to get the source of the 6,000,000 or the 10,000,000 figure, in writing, or on the floor of the House, as I have heretofore requested. I think it will be conducive to helping clarify this whole picture. I assure you I will be very grateful to have it.

This same amendment which I am referring to would simply permit any recognized cotton farmer to have 5 acres of cotton. Incidentally, in many sections that will not grow more than two bales of cotton; in fact, not two bales. I propose to include in the RECORD at this point some figures and some letters from authoritative agricultural people showing that.

My suggestion is this: If you cannot do this for the smallest, there is something wrong with the program, because I do not believe anybody will make the argument that he feels a man can go out and produce 5 acres of cotton and make very much of a living doing it if this is his chief money crop. I do not think anybody will make the argument that that can be done, if that is his primary money crop. If anybody feels that that is his primary money crop and he can make a living on 5 acres of land, I would be glad to have him express himself, that a man can do well when and if that is his main money crop.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. As a matter of fact these reservations of the State and county committees in substance are intended to relieve hardship cases, are they not?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is exactly right.

Mr. MORRIS. If it is carried out as it should be, no one should have less than 5 acres, should they?

Mr. BECKWORTH. There are many, as will appear from the RECORD tomorrow who say that is their belief.

Mr. MORRIS. Then, the truth of the matter is that this would just be guaranteeing to the little fellow that he would have 5 acres.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is right. You could not tell him: "You can have one-tenth of an acre, one-half of an acre, that is all." You could not tell him a thing like that.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, July 27, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will confirm the information given to you by telephone today to the effect that we have had no request from the House Committee on Agriculture, nor have we reported to them on H. R. 9109.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. OVERBY,
Assistant to the Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1950.

Mr. B. F. VANCE,
Production and Marketing Administration, College Station, Tex.

DEAR MR. B. F. VANCE: I have received the letter of July 26 and the list which you sent me at the request of Mr. TEAGUE. You mention 12 East Texas counties. I would like a list of the counties to which you refer.

Sincerely.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., July 26, 1950.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At the request of Congressman TEAGUE I am enclosing herewith a list of Texas counties giving the 1950 county cotton allotments under Public Law 272 and the total allotment after applying Public Law 471. In the last column I have listed the approximate allotment each county would receive in 1951 under H. R. 8969, assuming that the national allotment will be the same in 1951 as was announced in 1950 before Public Law 471 was passed. You realize, of course, that these figures are purely estimates since the bill provides for certain adjustments and I am not in a position to know just what adjustments would be made when all the facts are available.

I am of the opinion that certain amendments should be made in the present law; however, I think the most urgent need is for more flexibility in making allotments to

farms. Just today I discussed the county allotments with the chairmen of the county committees in 12 East Texas counties, and each chairman was of the opinion that the allotment received for his county in 1950 was ample if it could have been placed on farms where the farmer desired to plant cotton.

I hope this information will be of value to you.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

1950 county cotton allotments, Texas

[Preliminary, July 17, 1950]

County	Under Law 272 [1]	Under Law 471 [1]	Other adjustments [1]	Total allotments [1]	Estimated 1951 allotments [2]
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Anderson	14,665	2,775	126	17,566	15,085
Andrews	1,641	1,411	------	3,052	1,507
Angelina	4,772	375	------	5,147	4,125
Aransas	1,029	134	------	1,163	1,322
Archer	1,554	280	------	1,834	1,655
Armstrong	954	31	------	985	893
Atascosa	5,696	2,796	------	8,492	11,332
Austin	23,138	793	------	23,931	25,223
Bailey	85,910	4,431	235	90,576	76,472
Bandera	(3)	------	------	------	------
Bastrop	16,173	1,338	------	17,511	16,497
Baylor	13,433	1,775	635	15,843	15,193
Bee	8,887	3,828	------	12,715	13,470
Bell	83,165	5,581	316	89,062	89,744
Bexar	5,429	782	------	6,211	7,921
Blanco	467	19	------	486	568
Borden	19,512	------	------	19,512	15,947
Bosque	16,102	1,666	62	17,830	15,529
Bowie	29,338	1,061	75	30,474	27,108
Brazoria	11,129	514	------	11,643	10,644
Brazos	26,208	89	21	26,318	25,924
Brewster	(3)	------	------	------	------
Briscoe	18,258	548	68	18,874	16,002
Brooks	3,399	336	------	3,735	3,191
Brown	5,423	1,386	317	7,126	5,939
Burleson	36,541	103	------	36,644	36,496
Burnet	8,042	1,359	------	9,401	10,682
Caldwell	28,131	2,457	------	30,588	29,222
Calhoun	18,039	10	------	18,049	18,258
Callahan	5,673	2,407	------	8,080	8,656
Cameron	161,660	------	779	162,439	137,002
Camp	6,965	87	------	7,052	5,058
Carson	(3)	------	------	------	------
Cass	24,343	1,630	------	25,973	20,621
Castro	6,639	2,573	30	9,242	6,504
Chambers	261	2	------	263	312
Cherokee	15,726	2,147	68	17,941	12,493
Childress	51,242	2,141	27	53,410	51,046
Clay	16,238	2,923	38	19,199	20,592
Cochran	81,434	1,162	2,067	84,663	67,739
Coke	4,492	3,295	27	7,814	7,230
Coleman	19,021	10,135	------	29,156	33,865
Collin	129,882	2,380	------	132,262	134,147
Collingsworth	73,425	2,271	------	75,696	74,614
Colorado	13,123	817	55	13,995	14,607
Comal	671	49	------	720	896
Comanche	4,989	1,435	------	6,424	6,158
Concho	24,500	711	40	25,251	23,928
Cooke	13,972	1,970	------	15,942	15,352
Coryell	23,149	2,670	569	26,388	24,296
Cottle	57,263	483	------	57,746	56,385
Crane	(3)	------	------	------	------
Crockett	106	------	------	106	78
Crosby	99,910	1,882	------	101,792	96,661
Culberson	191	------	55	246	------
Dallam	(3)	------	------	------	------
Dallas	53,199	2,246	------	55,445	58,662
Dawson	228,758	------	6,727	235,485	187,909
Deaf Smith	1,563	344	------	1,907	960
Delta	54,769	------	18	54,787	55,129
Denton	33,614	5,027	8	38,649	38,452
DeWitt	21,536	2,117	208	23,861	26,197
Dickens	53,521	342	------	53,863	52,124
Dimmit	633	53	------	686	460
Donley	28,416	3,387	32	31,835	31,655
Duval	17,867	381	------	18,248	17,500
Eastland	2,533	607	------	3,140	3,154
Ector	315	30	------	345	306
Edwards	8	------	------	8	------
Ellis	166,927	239	517	167,683	176,282
El Paso	44,208	------	253	44,461	43,643
Erath	9,293	3,373	------	12,666	9,720
Falls	96,795	2,563	105	99,463	101,991
Fannin	116,023	1,240	------	117,263	124,022
Fayette	36,252	2,977	5	39,234	38,409
Fisher	84,229	1,453	------	85,682	87,591
Floyd	46,073	6,911	73	53,057	38,776
Foard	17,194	274	------	17,468	18,303
Fort Bend	72,541	12	------	72,553	73,818
Franklin	8,780	385	------	9,165	8,121
Freestone	26,951	446	41	27,438	25,252
Frio	836	260	------	1,096	622
Gaines	32,913	10,922	10	43,845	27,508

1950 county cotton allotments, Texas—Con.

[Preliminary, July 17, 1950]

County	Under Law 272 [1]	Under Law 471 [1]	Other adjustments [1]	Total allotments [1]	Estimated 1951 allotments [2]
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Galveston	30	------	------	30	14
Garza	48,733	10	38	48,781	46,160
Gillespie	790	58	------	848	813
Glasscock	4,861	3,063	------	7,924	4,733
Goliad	5,427	1,797	------	7,224	8,022
Gonzales	22,182	1,377	3	23,562	23,028
Gray	3,153	443	------	3,596	3,048
Grayson	63,682	4,806	------	68,488	69,802
Gregg	3,110	13	19	3,142	2,232
Grimes	19,289	1,439	60	20,788	21,635
Guadalupe	27,145	4,730	------	31,875	31,226
Hale	77,399	12,663	126	90,188	68,553
Hall	103,335	------	87	103,422	101,417
Hamilton	10,770	2,418	------	13,188	12,350
Hansford	(3)	------	------	------	------
Hardeman	36,196	1,207	------	37,403	36,830
Hardin	62	------	------	62	21
Harris	5,061	467	------	5,528	4,729
Harrison	25,027	450	1,313	26,790	23,919
Hartley	(3)	------	------	------	------
Haskell	123,517	245	------	123,762	119,441
Hays	10,944	1,012	------	11,956	11,731
Hemphill	1,549	130	------	1,679	1,303
Henderson	12,705	2,322	301	15,328	10,474
Hidalgo	141,999	508	78	142,585	110,836
Hill	158,381	42	------	158,423	161,870
Hockley	203,884	20	------	203,904	176,071
Hood	2,788	1,081	------	3,869	2,752
Hopkins	45,576	2,849	54	48,479	48,115
Houston	26,777	5,595	61	32,433	29,033
Howard	87,927	2	------	87,929	80,519
Hudspeth	14,936	------	292	15,228	13,353
Hunt	149,182	2	------	149,184	156,143
Hutchinson	(3)	------	------	------	------
Irion	807	72	------	879	618
Jack	2,744	636	------	3,380	3,022
Jackson	17,413	936	------	18,349	17,825
Jasper	1,001	17	------	1,018	585
Jeff Davis	(3)	------	------	------	------
Jefferson	359	19	------	378	268
Jim Hogg	1,912	339	------	2,251	2,169
Jim Wells	20,395	5,515	19	25,929	30,218
Johnson	44,406	2,012	259	46,677	47,225
Jones	96,872	5,441	------	102,313	107,965
Karnes	38,031	6,562	------	44,593	54,013
Kaufman	94,013	1,472	57	95,542	97,932
Kendall	14	------	------	14	10
Kenedy	11	------	------	11	86
Kent	23,173	316	2,312	25,801	23,918
Kerr	11	------	------	11	------
Kimble	250	16	------	266	355
King	11,546	------	------	11,546	12,646
Kinney	290	------	------	290	------
Kleberg	7,932	897	60	8,889	8,153
Knox	72,616	67	42	72,725	75,903
Lamar	99,233	------	------	99,233	94,183
Lamb	188,710	351	------	189,061	164,120
Lampasas	2,804	668	------	3,472	3,529
LaSalle	1,459	601	65	2,123	1,850
Lavaca	42,036	621	------	42,657	42,697
Lee	11,144	1,470	------	12,614	12,593
Leon	13,698	1,735	------	15,433	14,501
Liberty	3,416	154	------	3,570	3,214
Limestone	100,062	1,408	306	101,776	106,542
Lipscomb	(3)	------	------	------	------
Live Oak	15,835	3,426	------	19,261	20,011
Llano	347	87	------	434	544
Loving	460	------	------	460	402
Lubbock	248,703	55	------	248,758	228,089
Lynn	203,782	13	------	203,795	182,053
McCulloch	10,188	6,938	83	17,209	21,541
McLennan	111,797	9,686	47	121,530	114,422
McMullen	1,363	306	------	1,669	1,707
Madison	9,755	297	------	10,052	8,925
Marion	5,093	21	13	5,127	3,873
Martin	99,435	------	------	99,435	86,231
Mason	834	415	------	1,249	1,530
Matagorda	16,742	762	------	17,504	17,954
Maverick	7,296	414	195	7,905	5,721
Medina	495	91	------	586	768
Menard	452	379	------	831	967
Midland	23,297	422	229	23,948	23,464
Milam	64,407	2,791	15	67,213	67,474
Mills	2,539	588	------	3,127	2,750
Mitchell	67,009	943	------	67,952	71,643
Montague	5,714	1,196	25	6,935	6,615
Montgomery	1,559	91	------	1,650	1,101
Moore	(3)	------	------	------	------
Morris	7,065	171	------	7,236	6,988
Motley	38,814	139	140	39,093	35,857
Nacogdoches	12,752	1,123	87	13,962	11,505
Navarro	139,499	292	131	139,922	142,103
Newton	723	33	------	756	411
Nolan	38,649	2,647	------	41,296	41,526
Nueces	92,113	7,440	485	100,038	112,518
Ochiltree	(3)	------	------	------	------
Oldham	(3)	------	------	------	------
Orange	(3)	------	------	------	1
Palo Pinto	2,385	778	------	3,163	2,655
Panola	17,463	1,656	69	19,188	15,542

1950 county cotton allotments, Texas—Con.

[Preliminary, July 17, 1950]

County	Under Law 272 [1]	Under Law 471 [1]	Other adjustments [1]	Total allotments [1]	Estimated 1951 allotments [2]
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Parker	2,692	645	------	3,337	3,101
Parmer	4,972	707	------	5,679	4,099
Pecos	17,145	548	------	17,693	15,425
Polk	4,721	345	------	5,068	4,529
Potter	(3)	------	------	------	------
Presidio	2,151	255	357	2,763	1,845
Rains	12,370	1,810	772	14,952	12,976
Randall	(3)	------	------	------	------
Reagan	503	104	------	607	429
Real	(3)	------	------	------	4
Red River	50,145	1,265	------	51,410	50,330
Reeves	20,269	541	45	20,855	18,005
Refugio	10,030	1,907	30	11,967	12,543
Roberts	(3)	------	------	------	------
Robertson	39,292	869	20	40,181	41,327
Rockwall	33,166	------	------	33,166	34,684
Runnels	85,320	4,469	------	89,789	91,777
Rusk	23,918	2,571	------	26,489	19,353
Sabine	3,274	140	------	3,414	2,480
San Augustine	7,855	402	14	8,271	6,683
San Jacinto	3,409	114	3	3,526	3,329
San Patricio	67,590	4,260	------	71,850	79,293
San Saba	5,650	3,120	------	8,770	9,628
Schleicher	4,999	1,910	------	6,909	5,324
Scurry	84,917	112	507	85,536	84,257
Shackelford	2,169	800	------	2,969	3,242
Shelby	15,780	2,205	67	18,052	14,534
Sherman	(3)	------	------	------	------
Smith	16,658	876	29	17,563	13,185
Somervell	1,525	503	------	2,028	1,710
Starr	24,974	795	259	26,028	20,944
Stephens	900	165	------	1,065	818
Sterling	52	33	------	85	97
Stonewall	21,608	3,046	------	24,654	26,049
Sutton	(3)	------	------	------	------
Swisher	7,319	4,472	------	11,791	7,607
Tarrant	14,774	1,689	7	16,470	16,118
Taylor	28,253	8,219	169	36,641	36,679
Terrell	102	------	------	102	72
Terry	118,973	9,688	25	128,650	110,612
Throckmorton	4,831	1,064	74	5,969	5,123
Titus	10,453	448	6	10,907	10,209
Tom Green	56,978	543	------	57,521	53,392
Travis	46,597	3,163	15	49,775	48,696
Trinity	4,437	350	------	4,787	4,309
Tyler	544	3	------	547	392
Upshur	10,214	114	4	10,332	8,431
Upton	(3)	------	------	------	------
Uvalde	252	40	------	292	371
Val Verde	47	------	------	47	------
Van Zandt	36,395	2,845	60	39,300	37,420
Victoria	25,824	876	------	26,700	26,524
Walker	7,464	682	30	8,176	7,190
Waller	6,672	765	197	7,634	7,275
Ward	11,622	27	------	11,649	11,600
Washington	34,442	591	10	35,043	35,053
Webb	1,390	142	------	1,532	1,245
Wharton	81,339	526	190	82,055	89,367
Wheeler	30,085	3,653	12	33,750	30,448
Wichita	10,083	782	------	10,865	10,242
Wilbarger	66,354	423	55	66,832	70,286
Willacy	109,473	5,964	------	115,437	95,973
Williamson	140,286	740	241	141,267	150,655
Wilson	6,755	2,419	83	9,257	10,997
Winkler	(3)	------	------	------	------
Wise	3,267	353	------	3,620	3,611
Wood	10,433	384	------	10,817	8,691
Yoakum	9,576	7,148	201	16,925	9,372
Young	9,654	1,908	------	10,962	9,633
Zapata	1,611	202	------	1,813	1,205
Zavala	6,019	555	20	6,594	3,540

[1] Actual acres are rounded and therefore do not add to actual totals based on acres and tenths of acres.

[2] Estimated 1951 allotment under H. R. 8969 assuming State allotment for 1951 is same as 1950 allotment before applying Public Law 471.

[3] No cotton.

AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL
COLLEGE OF TEXAS,
College Station, Tex., July 25, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Your letter of inquiry regarding the minimum number of acres in cotton a family of a man, wife, and three or four children need in order to make a living in the South was referred to our Mr. C. A. Bonnen who heads up our research work in farm management. Mr. Bonnen has written you giving you the benefits of such research and observations that we have

made along this line. I have discussed this with Mr. Bonnen and have no further comment to offer. I feel that the most comprehensive and useful study that has been made along this line was that made by the Southwide Committee of which Dean Frank Welch, of Mississippi State, was chairman.

Sincerely yours,

L. P. GABBARD,
Head of Department.

THE FEDERAL LAND BANK OF HOUSTON,
Houston, Tex., June 5, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am sending your letter of May 25, 1950, to the research division of A. and M. College and asking that they make reply to your inquiry; namely, what is the minimum number of acres in cotton a family of a man, wife, and three or four children need in order to make a living in the South.

Very truly yours,

STERLING C. EVANS,
President.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This acknowledges your inquiry of May 13, 1950, regarding the minimum number of acres of cotton the average family in the upland area of the South, with cotton as the primary money crop, would need in order to make a living for the family.

Such an estimate, as you well appreciate, would need to be based on average conditions, because of soil type, rate of fertilization, kind of power available, and other conditions that influence production. The average gross cash income of our operating loan borrowers in Texas for the 1948 crop year was $2,283. The average gross cash income of such borrowers in Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Oklahoma for the same period ranged from $1,381 to $2,204. The operating loan borrowers referred to are operators of not larger than family-type farms to whom the Farmers Home Administration has advanced production loans. To produce a gross cash farm income of $2,000 under present market prices, with 80 percent of the income from cotton, would require 16 acres, averaging approximately 450 pounds of lint cotton per acre.

Throughout the cotton areas of the South, there are many thousands of farmers who produce less than an average of 450 pounds of lint cotton per acre. For such farmers to obtain a gross cash farm income of $2,000 would require a proportionately larger acreage of cotton or the making of adjustments in their farming operations to provide additional sources of income.

Should additional information regarding this question or any phase of our activities be desired, we shall be glad to furnish it upon request.

Sincerely yours,

DILLARD B. LASSETER,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Montgomery, Ala., May 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Your communication of May 15 is requested our judgment as to the minimum number of acres in cotton the average upland family in the south, with cotton as their primary money crop, would need in order to make a living for the family. Such an estimate, as you well appreciate, involves many variables but, in my opinion, a minimum of 15 acres would be required.

Sincerely yours,

JULIAN BROWN,
State Director.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Montgomery, Ala., May 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of May 13, addressed to the Commissioner of Agriculture, you are advised that the number of acres of cotton necessary to meet the needs of a family of five varies with the general type of farming done by the particular family. In some instances six or eight acres might be sufficient, in other cases three or four times that number of acres might be required. Since we have no factual data on this subject, we are hesitant in suggesting a minimum acreage.

I am sorry that we are unable to give you some definite information.

Very truly yours,

J. C. GARRETT,
Agricultural Statistician.

ALABAMA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
Auburn, Ala., June 12, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Your letter addressed to the Alabama A. & M. College at Auburn has been referred to me. I am sorry to have to report that it is quite impossible to give you an answer to your question that can be defended.

In certain areas it may take 4 acres of cotton to make a bale, while in other areas a bale per acre can be made with no great difficulty under average seasonal conditions. The number of bales of cotton that might be picked depends on the number of persons in the family who might be willing or forced to pick cotton. A number of these kinds of considerations might be listed, all of which show that a real, usable answer cannot be given to your question.

Very truly yours,

M. J. FUNCHESS,
Dean and Director.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Montgomery, Ala., June 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of May 26, addressed to the Commissioner of Agriculture, you are advised that the number of acres of peanuts necessary to meet the needs of a family of five varies with the general type of farming done by that particular family. In some instances 6 or 8 acres might be sufficient, in other cases three or four times that number of acres might be required. Since we have no factual data on this subject, we are hesitant in suggesting a minimum acreage.

I am sorry we are unable to give you some definite information.

Very truly yours,

J. C. GARRETT,
Agricultural Statistician.

STATE AGRICULTURAL AND
MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Magnolia, Ark., July 3, 1950.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: I have our letter of June 27 inquiring about the advisability of acreage allotments of less than 3 acres. In my opinion, regardless of the type of land and the type of farming operation involved, no farmer could afford to include cotton in his diversification program and plant less than a minimum of 5 acres. I base this statement on farm-management courses studied in college and on my experience in owning and operating farms.

In my opinion, your personal information gathered as a young man in east Texas would be sufficient on which to base your judgment. I believe you understand the small farmers' problem as well as any other Member of Congress.

Please call on me at any time that I may be of service to you.

Sincerely,

CHARLIE S. WILKINS,
President.

STATE AGRICULTURAL AND
MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Magnolia, Ark., June 12, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your inquiry of June 7, 1950, I would say that the very least number of acres of upland cotton a farmer could afford to grow economically in our State would be 10 acres. This could be made economical only on a highly diversified plan, in which the farmer expected to realize not more than one-fifth of his total farm income from cotton.

Sincerely yours,

E. E. GRAHAM.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND
MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Tallahassee, Fla., May 17, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of May 12, 1950, relative to acreage required where a family of a man, wife, and three or four children depend on cotton as their primary money crop.

In my opinion, through observations, the minimum would be eight acres per family of this size.

Yours very truly,

MARTIN D. HURST,
Chairman, Leon County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Atlanta, Ga., June 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Your communication of May 15, 1950, addressed to the State Director of Farmers Home Administration for Georgia regarding cotton acreage was received on May 25. You asked for our opinion as to the minimum number of acres of cotton a man, wife, and three or four children should have in order to make a living where cotton is the primary money crop.

In order to arrive at a figure which may represent an average, we will have to consider many factors. In the first place, in financing farmers under our program we consider the land resources of the individual operator, its adaptability to cotton production, family resources and the ability of the family to produce cotton under boll-weevil conditions. We also have to consider the county average yield. In some counties in Georgia where cotton has previously been the major cash crop, we now recommend planting less than one-half of acres formerly planted to cotton. In counties where yields under good farming methods are less than 400 pounds of lint we discourage cotton production except a small acreage during the

transition period to other cash enterprises. Generally speaking, farmers in the northern half of the State are getting away from cotton as a primary cash crop.

In our opinion, a Georgia farm family of the size referred to above should have as a minimum a gross cash income of $1,500 plus adequate subsistence crops in order to enjoy a fair standard of living. Based on present price levels and average yields which are less than 400 pounds of lint in many counties, you can readily see that it would require from 15 to 17 acres of cotton in areas where cotton is the primary crop.

In our program we are recommending a more diversified type of farming which calls for less cotton acreage with better cultural practices and more livestock and livestock products.

The above comments are largely related to our program in Georgia and may not reflect the thinking of all the agricultural leaders in the State.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. VANSANT,
State Director.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Atlanta, Ga., June 28, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have your communication of June 7, 1950, in which you ask our opinion as to the least number of acres of upland cotton a farmer can afford to grow or economically grow in Georgia.

Our letter of June 6 on a similar subject reflects our thinking as to the number of acres of cotton a family-type operator should have where cotton is the primary cash crop. The question in your last communication is more difficult to answer for the reason that you refer to farmers in general and not a special group. We have a number of farmers in Georgia who cultivate and harvest their cotton crops with mechanized equipment. This type of operator can utilize more cotton acreage than a farmer with less facilities.

After considering the above and all the factors outlined in our letter of June 6 and based on our observations, it is our opinion that the average cotton producer whose major cash income is derived from cotton needs from 15 to 20 acres in cotton. We have not taken into consideration a few large operators who use all mechanized equipment and employ hired labor and share croppers.

Should additional information regarding this subject be desired, we shall be glad to furnish it upon request.

Sincerely yours,

S. L. VANLANDINGHAM,
Acting State Director.

GEORGIA AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
Experiment, Ga., June 5, 1950.

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your request of May 25 addressed to the president of the University of Georgia for information on the minimum number of acres in cotton needed to make a living has been referred to me.

I am enclosing copies of two reports containing information bearing on your question, one of which is Project I Agricultural Adjustments Toward an Efficient Agriculture in the South, a statement presented to Special House subcommittee on cotton on July 7 and 8, 1947. Table 5 of this report shows estimates of acreages needed in various subregions of the South. You will note from the other publication (see p. 28), Farm Adjustment Opportunities in Greene County, Ga., that we do have many families making a living on 30 acres or less of cultivated land. This obviously may not be a very satisfactory living.

I hope that this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. HENDRIX,
Agricultural Economist.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Atlanta, Ga., May 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: I am in receipt of copy of your general letter in which you asked the question, "What is the minimum number of acreage in cotton a family of man and wife and three or four children require when depending on cotton as their primary money crop?"

Naturally, this is a difficult question to attempt to answer as there are so many factors involved—type of soil, ability of the farmer to produce, and many other things. I would rather think of the question not in number of acres needed, but the production necessary to give this family a reasonable cash income. Certainly not less than 8 to 10 bales of cotton are necessary for such a family when depending on cotton as their main source of income.

As a matter of fact, I am definitely of the opinion that that type of farmer should not be restricted at all, but given the opportunity of producing all he can, with a minimum guaranteed price announced at the beginning of the year for a certain portion of his production, based on the amount of cotton that is to be consumed domestically.

I am mailing you, under separate cover, a mimeographed copy of my editorials that appeared in the Market Bulletin last November and December in which I have attempted to analyze the permanent farm plan that has been approved by the southern commissioners of agriculture. I hope you will have the opportunity of reviewing this plan, as we think it is the only logical and reasonable farm program that has been proposed so far.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

TOM LINDER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

GEORGIA STATE OFFICE,
Athens, Ga., May 16, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letter of May 12 requesting observations or information in regard to the minimum number of acres of cotton per family.

We would like to state at the outset that your question is very broad, and the assumption much too general to allow for a definite answer. Since the agricultural picture in the Southeast has changed so radically in the past 7 years, and we have tended to lose sight of actual cotton farm conditions because of our loss of contact with the cotton farmer, we are not at all certain that the "family cotton crop" is the basis for the production of this commodity as it was 10 years ago. There are undoubtedly still a large number of "family crops" of cotton still being produced, however, there are certain indications that the relative number of people producing cotton on this basis has substantially lessened. A great deal of the production of these units has been taken over by subsistence farmers; the increasing numbers of farmers operating with motorized equipment; and those persons producing cotton to maintain labor for other crops and farm products.

For your information and study, we are enclosing a tabulation for Georgia showing by counties the number of cotton acreage allotments in various acreage ranges. These acreage ranges refer to the cotton acreage allotments established for farms, and the tabulation was prepared subsequent to the establishment of "new grower" cotton allotments, but before putting into effect of Public Law 471.

Another point in your question that prevents a direct answer is the lack of a definition of what would constitute a "living for the family." The constant pressure to improve social and economic conditions has caused an elevation which probably is approaching the limit of the physical capacity of the family unit to produce cotton sufficient enough to provide them with the means for reaching the levels toward which they are being educated.

We dislike having to evade your question but it is not felt that an adequate answer could be made based on conditions that were predominant in the past and the existence of which are not positive at this time.

If it will be of any assistance to you in the formulation of your idea in this matter, we are outlining below a few of the accepted costs and value estimates regarding cotton in this area. The various cost figures are for the actual cost of the items and do not include any incidental cost connected with the business of farming.

Cost of:

Seed	per acre	$3
Fertilizer	do	10
Insect control	do	10
Ginning	per bale	8
Picking	per hundred	3

Gross value of cotton and cottonseed per acre: 1948, $106.50; 1949, $64.

Very truly yours,

T. R. BREEDLOVE,
Chairman, State PMA Committee.

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
Baton Rouge, May 25, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of the twelfth making inquiry as to what, in my opinion, is the minimum number of acres planted to cotton necessary for a family of from 5 to 6 to make a living on from the production of cotton in the average upland cotton area of the South.

I feel that a minimum of 25 acres are necessary for a family this size to make a reasonable living.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. ANDERSON, *Commissioner.*

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AND AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Baton Rouge, La., May 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Your letter of May 12 to Mr. L. A. Mullin, chairman, State PMA committee was referred to me for further attention. There are many variables in the problem with which your question is concerned, such as the ages of the children, the normal yield of cotton, the price of cotton, and other farm enterprises in addition to cotton.

After discussing the matter with Mr. Felix Stanley, our farm management specialist, we would say that the average upland cotton farmer who depends primarily on cotton for cash income should have 30 acres of cotton and 30 acres of other cropland as a minimum in order to make a living for his family

above out-of-pocket costs of operation. This conclusion is based on an assumed average cotton yield per acre of 250 pounds and a market price of 30 cents per pound.

Summary

Estimated cash income	$2,400
Estimated expenses for labor, mule work, picking, machinery, materials and services	1,057
Farm income	1,343
Less interest on investment	300
Labor income	1,043

If the farmer should own all the capital involved, he would of course return for himself the interest earnings.

Kindly write me if you have need for further information.

Sincerely yours,

B. M. GILE,
Head, Department of Agricultural Economics.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COMMERCE,
Jackson, May 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have your letter of May 13 with reference to cotton acreage.

In the old days when most cotton was produced on the small farm by mule power it was believed that from 15 to 20 acres was all of the cotton which could be properly planted, cultivated and harvested by the average small family. This same situation would exist today in the hill section with the poorer class of farmer. On the other hand if the farmer has a tractor and other machinery and if he employs day labor during peak seasons, this acreage could easily be doubled or tripled.

The amount of cotton acreage would also depend on the amount of time consumed on other crops, livestock, poultry, dairying and so forth.

I believe you will understand from the above many factors enter into acreage and production. I would say that 20 acres is still not a bad estimate, but I would further say that the average family with little means, doing its own work, can live, but would make a bare existence if it depends on cotton production.

Very truly yours,

ALLAN MCCLUER,
Chief Inspector.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COMMERCE,
Jackson, June 13, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have your recent letter with reference to the minimum acreage of upland cotton in this State.

I would say that many of the most progressive small farmers in upland counties grow no cotton at all. The minimum acreage would depend entirely on other pursuits which were carried on at the same time. If a farmer depended on cotton alone I would say a 10 acre minimum. If, on the other hand, he produced hay, grains, hogs, beef cattle, dairy products, vegetables, poultry, and the many other pursuits which are open to him, he would probably be better off with 2 or 3 acres or no cotton at all.

Very truly yours,

ALLAN MCCLUER,
Chief Inspector.

MISSISSIPPI STATE COLLEGE,
SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE AND EXPERIMENT STATION,
State College, Miss., June 6, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Your letter of May 25 addressed to the President has been referred to me for reply.

It appears that no categorical answer can be given, good for all times and places, on any definition of "a living for the family." It depends on the price of cotton and cottonseed, or rather their buying power, their relative price; and on yields per acre, which vary greatly not only as between areas but also from farm to farm within most areas. It also depends on what else can be advantageously produced—on what combination of farm enterprises, in a given locality with its marketing opportunities and its natural advantages, will accomplish the best use of all resources, including labor especially, so as to bring the largest net returns from the whole enterprise. And such matters as soil conservation must also be considered. The adaptation of the land, because of topography, to the use of farm machinery is another variable factor, influencing the potentialities.

We enclose two publications which we suggest you look over, along with two maps which you can obtain from Mr. Ralph R. Botts, Principal Agricultural Economist, Division of Agricultural Finance, BAE: "County Average Yield of Cotton for Period 1939–46" and "Coefficient of Variation in County Average Yield."

Unless, by use of the new insecticides, the boll weevil is controlled, not all the cotton acreage that a family can cultivate in hill areas of the lower South, east of the Texas high plains, will make a decent American living for the average producer or the below-average producer; unless, indeed, economical fully mechanized cultivation and picking become practical in those areas—and it can hardly be said that this is now in sight.

The farm family of a man, wife, and three children, no matter how large the farm and even without legal limitation on acreage, is not likely to undertake, or be able, to cultivate more than 10 acres of cotton—maybe 12 sometimes. The average in scores and hundreds of counties is below 250 pounds per acre, county-wide average; and half the cotton land makes less, of course. In a large number of counties it is below 200 pounds. Four or five bales, therefore, is average, per farm family of the size mentioned, when cotton is the main cash crop. Such a family cannot carry on much else but cotton farming, because of the high labor requirement in the two peak periods. At present prices, the gross sales from the farm is, therefore, likely to be less than $1,000; and the net only a fraction of that, because costs are, with low yields, a relatively large part of the gross.

In other hill areas there are a relatively few counties that have an average of 350 or even 400 pounds per acre; and there are some farmers in most counties in the Cotton Belt that average as well or better.

Without stating this as an official view of the college, I may say that many of us believe that where yields are below 250 pounds, at least, on an average, more farmers still should go out of cotton production; because there is little if any profit—unless the yields can be raised.

In any case, in most hill areas especially but in the Delta also, we do not believe it most profitable for a family to cultivate all the cotton possible; rather, it is advisable to select the cotton land, and to organize the farm enterprises for diversified production.

If such a family grows cotton, perhaps six or seven acres of cotton, together with 8 to 12 dairy cows where dairying can be carried on, with some other production, would be advisable; and a minimum size for the farm might be 50 or 60 acres of reasonably good open crop and pasture land. A family might make a minimum standard of income on such a farm. If beef cattle, then a larger farm is needed. And we, in fact, see the family farm of the future (except for specialized poultry and the like) to be from 80 to 150 open acres, up to 250 acres, in average hill areas.

In sum, we do not see how it is practicable for an average family, with cotton as the almost sole money product, to make a living that is acceptable, outside areas like the high plains, unless economical fully mechanized operations become practical—in which case the family farm would be much larger.

We may say, Congressman, that we know now of many hill farms that are making a living and some of them include cotton; but we need field studies of these family farms in the hills—and need funds in order to make these studies.

These statements are as precise as we feel we can make. If there is anything else you wish of us, please advise us.

Very truly,

H. P. TODD,
Assistant Agricultural Economist.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Raleigh, May 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This acknowledges your letter of May 12, 1950, requesting my opinion as to the minimum number of acres of cotton necessary to produce a living for a family of five or six, a man, his wife, and three or four children. This is a rather difficult question to answer since it would depend on a number of factors such as the age of the children, productiveness of the soil, and the standard of living, and whether or not it was an independent operation in which all of the work had to be done by hand, or whether or not it would be a part of a large operation in which more mechanical devices would be used.

On an independently operated farm in North Carolina where cotton is the primary money crop, I would say that a man, his wife, and three or four small children could handle only about 5 or 6 acres. This, of course, would produce a very meager income for a family of that size. In cases where the children are large enough to work, the family could handle considerably more acres, say up to 12 or 15 or more.

It is hard to discuss the acreage needed without determining the amount of acres that the family could harvest. At any rate, I would not suggest that a family of a man, his wife, and three or four children, small, should have less than 5 or 6 acres of cotton. Even then, the family would need considerable supplementary income from other phases of his farming program. The above suggested acreage is predicated on a production of not less than 400 to 500 pounds of lint cotton per acre.

Very truly yours,

L. Y. BALLENTINE.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND
ENGINEERING OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Raleigh, May 30, 1950.

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BECKWORTH: In response to your inquiry of May 25 addressed to Chancelor Harrelson, I would like to make the following comments:

1. It is difficult to answer your question unless it is framed in a given set of circumstances.

2. I do not believe a small farm family can grow enough cotton using conventional or workstock methods of production to afford the kind of standard of living which is usually recommended. To attain an acceptable standard of living, it would be necessary to produce a good many things in addition to cotton.

3. The maximum acreage which a family of four or five can handle in cotton under present workstock methods of production is approximately 10. If this is the primary source of income, it would not afford a very high standard of living unless the price was extremely high.

4. I am enclosing a bulletin entitled "Opportunities for Adjustments in Farming Systems Southern Piedmont Area, North Carolina" which will give you additional information on this subject.

If I can be of additional assistance, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

H. B. JAMES,
Head, Department of Agricultural Economics.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Oklahoma City, Okla., June 30, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your inquiry as to the minimum acres of upland cotton a farmer can afford to grow or economically grow in Oklahoma, we advise you that, generally speaking, we believe from 12 to 15 acres is the very least such a farmer can afford to grow and that would be as a cash crop in conjunction with other enterprises. Our experience indicates that where cotton farmers have too little of their major crop, there is a tendency for failure.

Sincerely,

E. LEE OZBIRN,
State Director.

PANHANDLE AGRICULTURAL
AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE,
Goodwell, Okla., May 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In response to your letter of May 25 I wish to say that a lot of things would enter into one's estimate as to the number of acres of cotton a family of five or six would need in order to make a living. The type of land, rainfall, and the price of cotton would all enter into the picture. It is my honest opinion that a person would need a minimum of 50 acres of average Texas land planted to cotton each year in order to have anything like an average standard of living.

I would like to point out this is just an estimate. From my observations while living in the cotton area, it is my belief that the average family does not have adequate living conditions, comparable to those of families producing other agricultural products.

Yours very truly,

MARVIN MCKEE, *President.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1950.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
Stillwater, Okla.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the average upland cotton area of the South where a family of a man, wife, and three or four children depend on cotton as their primary money crop, in your judgment, what is the minimum number of acres in cotton this kind of family needs in order to make a living for the family?

Any observations or information you may give me in this connection will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

(Answer:) 30 acres of cotton; 50 acres of feed crops; 30 acres of pasture; about 5 cows, 2 sows, 50 hens, and desirable number of good roosters. Of course presuming that he has four good work horses or a tractor with other necessary implements to go with them.

With the above he may come out even.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Columbia, S. C., July 11, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Present cotton-growing requirements, especially insect-control equipment, make it necessary for the average grower to have five or more acres in cotton if he is to follow a well-balanced farming program.

On our opinion, a cotton allotment in excess of 5 acres lends itself admirably to proper diversification and good farming practices until it reaches a point of occupying one-third of the cultivated acres on the farm.

Sincerely yours,

R. F. KOLB, *State Director.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Columbia, S. C., May 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Our State average cotton yield for the past 10 years (1941–49, inclusive) is 306 pounds of lint. The average price per pound over a like period is approximately 21 cents, resulting in about $600 income from 10 acres of cotton.

Based on these figures and the labor requirements in this section, it is our belief that a minimum of 10 acres of cotton when properly balanced with other farm enterprises will be required to support a family of five or six on a fairly satisfactory living standard.

Sincerely yours,

R. F. KOLB,
State Director.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Nashville, May 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Our estimate in this department is that 12 acres in cotton are necessary for a family to make a living in Tennessee. The average for the State is about 8.5 acres.

Yours very sincerely,

EDWARD JONES, *Commissioner.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Nashville, Tenn., May 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: It is my thinking that 10 would be a minimum number of cotton acres as outlined in your letter of May 15.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. BEASLEY,
State Director.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Nashville, June 9, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: It is the consensus of opinion in this department that the least number of acres of cotton a Tennessee farmer can afford to grow economically in this State is 12 acres.

Yours very sincerely,

EDWARD JONES,
Commissioner.

STATE OF TEXAS,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Austin, June 12, 1950.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: Absence from the office and a desk piled high with correspondence account for the delay in answering your two letters.

In one you ask, "In the average upland cotton area of the South where a family of a man, wife and three or four children, depend on cotton as their primary money crop, in your opinion what is the minimum number of acres in cotton this kind of family needs in order to make a living for the family?"

Lindley, you asked the $64 question. Acres do not mean production since climatic conditions enter the picture. Therefore, no farm program which makes allotments in acres will ever succeed. The allotments must be in units such as bales, bushels, or pounds, based on acreage and soil fertility.

Since we have small farmers, medium sized farmers, and large farmers, all of whom have equal rights as citizens and pay taxes in proportion to the property they own, it is very evident that any farm program which will be constructive and enduring must allot to each farmer—according to the acreage and fertility of the soil—his fair share in the American market, allotments to be made in units upon which he must receive full parity price.

Regardless of whether he be a small, medium, or large farmer, he must be permitted to use his own judgment as to whether or not he will produce in excess of his domestic allotment for sale in foreign markets at world market prices. No democratic government can discriminate for or against citizens just because they have more or less of this world's goods. When a farmer is given his fair share in the American market, according to his acreage and the soil fertility, that is as far as the Government can go. Some think that there should be a family exemption up to so many bushels, bales, or pounds, but that would bring such complexities that it would not work.

Wishing you everything good, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. E. MCDONALD,
Commissioner.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana such time as he may desire.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, coming from one of the largest cotton producing districts in Louisiana, and my own parish, being off and on, one of the largest cotton-producing parishes in Louisiana, I feel that the amendment by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has considerable merit and is worthy of consideration.

I think that the system under which we operate in the State of Louisiana, with a large percentage of our cotton farmers being sharecroppers, and since many of the families, both white and Negro grow cotton on the same farms, reducing the amount of acreage allowed to any one farmer or family has resulted in disorganizing and causing hardship to these small cotton farmers, and especially since no family can exist on less than 5 acres of cotton when the farms have been reduced to a point where there is less than 5 acres of cotton to be planted, the landowner has no other alternative than to let the tenant or sharecropper off and out of the farm, and these poor, small farmers have no other place to go to raise cotton as all of the others use the acreage allotted to them, and unless they are able to find some other employment, they become a public charge. This has resulted in affecting the economy of our section, and many families who have been planting small cotton acreage all of their lives are frustrated and homeless.

Mr. Chairman, I could place in the record hundreds of letters which I have received from my constituents, but I will only ask permission to place in the RECORD two sample letters which I think show the situation in regard to the 5-acre farmers, as follows:

EUNICE, LA., *March 13, 1950.*

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: I am a farmer, a veteran of the recent war, living in Evangeline Parish, and am having difficulty getting enough cotton acreage to make a living.

It is my understanding, that a farmer is allotted at least 5 acres under the cotton-quota system. I have been allotted but 3½ acres of cotton to plant this year. This is not enough to make a living for me and my family. I have appealed several times to the parish PMA office to let me plant at least 5 acres, but have had no results. With such a small allotment, I will have difficulty supporting my wife and three children.

I would appreciate any help or consideration on this matter, and receive it in time that I may plant my crop.

Yours truly,

WILSON SOILEAU.

ST. LANDRY PARISH
YOUNG FARMERS ORGANIZATION,
Opelousas, La., May 8, 1950.

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE,
Congressman of Louisiana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LARCADE: We, the undersigned committee, were authorized by the executive committee to represent the St. Landry Parish Young Farmers Organization, which is composed of some 400 or more young farmers, in the matter explained below.

We, as representatives of this organization, wish to appeal to you as our lawmakers, and ask that you look into the cotton acreage quota law and see if it cannot be amended in a manner that it will equalize the cotton acreages given to tenant and sharecropper farmers. As the law stands, the cotton-acreage quota is based on a per-farm basis and not on a per-family-unit basis. This will force some of the landowners to reduce the number of tenants on their farms, thereby forcing these same tenants to leave the farm; and in society they will fit nowhere.

This law as it presently stands has a ruling that no farm can get a smaller quota than 5 acres, unless there was less cotton planted on the farm the previous 3 years. We have no complaints against the amount if the man concerned is a landowner. However, if it takes 5 acres' production to balance a family's farming system and that family is a one-half share cropper, this same family will actually receive in labor inome the proceeds of 2½ acres of production, which is not enough. The landowner will get by, on the other hand, by cutting down the number of families on his farm. When this takes place, however, you will have displaced about one-fifth of the tenants on a farm. It will not be possible for them to go to another farm, because all landowners are faced with the same problem.

These tenants have in most cases been farming all their lives, therefore, are not qualified for any other occupation. When they leave the farm they will become social misfits, not by their own choice but for reasons beyond their control.

Hoping we have made our point clear and that you look into this matter, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

NICK DUBUISSON, *Chairman.*
GEORGE BULLER.
JOSEPH HAROLD RICHARD.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr Chairman, this is just an enlargement upon the amendment which was defeated a little while ago. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], sought first to provide 5 acres as an allotment for every veteran of World War II who could satisfy a local committee that he was in good faith a farmer and desired to plant cotton.

The effect of this amendment is even more gracious on his part and he is a little more generous, because he now wants to give to every Tom, Dick, and Harry, man, woman, and child, a 5-acre minimum acreage allotment. The effect of his amendment would be to destroy the cotton-control program entirely. I think that anybody who knows anything at all about the amendment knows that that would be its effect were it to be adopted.

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

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not true that 40 percent of the farms of the United States now have a cotton allotment of 5 acres or less?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. POAGE. That would mean that 40 percent of the cotton farmers could not save anything in the way of acreage.

Mr. COOLEY. In my own State of North Carolina over 50 percent of the farmers have less than 5 acres in cotton. This would mean that 50 percent of the farmers in my State could not contribute anything to this acreage-reduction program.

Mr. Chairman, without further delay, I do want to insist that this is an important amendment and it would be very disastrous to the cotton program if adopted. I hope the membership of the House will vote the amendment down.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PACE. The committee has two amendments at the desk. I should like to be advised when they are reached.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the understanding of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that the pending amendment to section 2 is the amendment now at the Clerk's desk offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. The gentleman from Georgia has two amendments which concern section 3 and section 9 of the bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. Under the rules of the House how long can the Committee of the Whole continue a free-for-all among the cotton growers and particularly the Texas cotton growers?

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee of the Whole will continue in session until a motion to rise is adopted.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: Page 10, after line 16, strike out paragraph 4 down to and including all of line 3 on page 11.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I prepared this amendment as a companion amendment to the amendment which I offered earlier this afternoon and which was not adopted. I wish to keep the RECORD straight and insist that the position presented by these two amendments is correct and sound.

The arguments which I urged in seeking to strike out the language on page 3 that applied only to Texas apply in the same manner to the pending amendment. It is not necessary to repeat those arguments. All the talk in the world cannot erase the fact that the pending bill deprives the State of Texas of operating under the general terms of the law as is the case with every other State in the Union.

May I take a moment to say that on the final vote I shall vote against the pending bill. Let me say further that if the pending bill becomes the law I predict that there will be widespread dissatisfaction throughout all parts of Texas. Those who ardently defend the pending bill seem not to realize that if the pending bill becomes the law the farmers in 11 of the 21 congressional districts in Texas will get a smaller cotton acreage allotment in 1951 than they received in 1950. I am speaking of congressional districts and not of individual counties and individual farmers. This unsatisfactory condition will be partially brought about by the fact that the House Committee on Agriculture has failed to reenact Public Law 471 of the present Congress which gave emergency relief to

many cotton producers throughout the State. I had hoped that the 1950 program would be improved and that the 1951 program would be better than the 1950 program. The pending bill, while it contains some helpful provisions, is so hopelessly inadequate it is unacceptable.

The following statement has been prepared by the Production and Marketing Administration in regard to the controversy over whether or not Texas allotments in 1950 should have been made on a 2-year base period or on a 4-year base period.

Officials of the Department have been repeatedly attacked on the floor. I personally have found officials in the Department to be gentlemen of high character who have cooperated in a very fine way. Since I am not aware of all the facts and circumstances I have requested the Department to supply me with a statement on the attitude of the Department in regard to the controversy. I expect to get unanimous consent to insert that statement in the RECORD at this point.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. GEORGE MAHON,
Member of Congress.

DEAR MR. MAHON: In reply to your request for a statement from this office regarding certain charges concerning the determination of 1950 cotton acreage allotments for the State of Texas and the counties therein the following informationg is supplied.

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator, PMA.

This statement deals with the matter of apportioning cotton acreage allotments to the State of Texas and the counties therein and the charge that officials of the Department of Agriculture made a mistake that was intended to be made in order to make the allotments work out in the State of Texas in the manner which it did. It was stated in effect, if not in fact, that officials of the Department of Agriculture had intentionally miscalculated acreage in applying the formula set forth in the law for apportioning State and county cotton acreage allotments in Texas with the intention of forcing the State acreage allotment in Texas to be computed on the basis of the years 1947 and 1948 rather than the 4 years 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948.

I want to review for your information some of the basic steps and basic facts which served as a fundamental basis for the cotton allotment legislation which Congress passed in 1949 and which is before Congress at this time for amendment. On April 24 and April 25, 1949, a meeting was held in Memphis, Tenn., generally known as the Belt-wide conference, at which time various representatives from the cotton-producing States met for the purpose of formulating basic recommendations with respect to apportioning cotton-acreage allotments for future programs. It is an established fact that this group came forth with a number of recommendations, the principal one of which consisted of a formula for apportioning the national cotton-acreage allotment to States and State acreage allotments to counties. The statement was made that representatives of the Department of Agriculture had advised the committee that that portion of the Memphis agreement dealing with establishment of a State acreage allotment based on the planting from 1947 and 1948 instead of plantings during the 4-year period 1945 to 1948 would not apply to the State of Texas and that it did not do so until the original acreage figures were changed. It is largely with respect to this statement that I direct your attention. I submit that the exact contrary is the fact with reference to the statement that the Department of Agriculture advised the committee that this gadget would not apply to the State of Texas.

I submit for the record a copy of table No. 2 which was formulated and adopted at the Memphis meeting and which today is the basic formula in the cotton acreage allotment law. I refer you to the fifth column of this table and direct your attention within this column opposite the name Texas showing an adjustment for the State for the purpose of carrying out the 1947–48 protective provision of the agreement. This is further identified by the note at the bottom of the table. A copy of this same table can be found in the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, dated June 14, 15, 22, 27, 1949, regarding S. 1962, which was the basic bill embodying the principle worked out at the Belt-wide conference in Memphis, I submit also a copy of a table relating to this same matter worked out by the Department and made available to the Cotton Subcommittee of the House dealing with this same subject, both of which point to the probability that the State of Texas would receive the protection of the special provisions relating to 1947 and 1948. The reason I use the word "probability" was the fact that at the time the committees were considering this legislation and the Department made application of the various formulas being considered, the amount of war-crop credits which would be used with respect to each State was undetermined and was not available to the Department or anyone else for several weeks after the law was enacted. No representative of the Department, not even once, ever gave any member of the House Agriculture Committee the assurance that the State cotton acreage allotment would work out in any specific manner. Proof of this is the fact that no one in the Department could have, at the time this legislation was being considered, known what the exact final answer was going to be. However, all the determinations made and submitted to the committees with respect to the application of the basic formula up to the time the Public Law 272 was finally enacted, pointed very clearly to the probability that Texas might be one of the States protected by the so-called gadget provision as relates to 1947 and 1948.

In applying the law to the best available statistics the calculations gave Texas its allotment on the basis of 95 percent of the cotton grown in 1947 and 1948. When this fact became known the Department was accused of misinterpreting the provisions of the law. A case was filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia concerning this matter and on March 27, 1950, the court ruled that the law had been properly applied by the Department. This approach having failed, an attempt was made to shift responsibility for the way the law worked to the Department. The Department was then accused of deliberately miscalculating the figures.

Since cotton acreages had not been measured since 1942, the Department used the best available statistics, which were the official figures of the Crop Reporting Board of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The basic factor which the Board uses in estimating acreages of cotton during years when there are no measurements are the bales of cotton produced as supplied to the Bureau of the Census by cotton ginners. In the fall of 1949 the Census Bureau reported the sum of 3,210 bales of cotton which was ginned by three gins in the State of Texas which had not been previously reported. As is done in all such instances by the BAE when such facts are brought forth conclusively, adjustments were made in the basic statistics. Also, some adjustments were made in the State acreage statistics in the fall of 1949 for Georgia. This situation was not something new or unusual.

The Crop Reporting Board follows an established policy and program in preparing cotton acreage and production estimates. This program is as follows:

1. The first acreage estimate for the season is made as of July 1 and relates to cotton acreage in cultivation as of that date.

2. The first production forecast is made as of August 1, and subsequent production forecasts are made as of the first of the months of September, October, November, and December.

3. The first estimate of acreage for harvest for the current year is made as of September 1 each year.

4. It is required by law to estimate ginnings; therefore, it is not possible to release estimates of production for any year until early May following the year of production. At that time the Bureau of the Census has final reports on ginnings.

5. When the results of each quinquennial census of agriculture becomes available the Crop Reporting Board reviews the acreage and production estimates prepared since the previous quinquennial census.

6. Revisions are made in the estimates for previous years at other times during the season when conclusive evidence becomes available.

During the past year, questions were raised with respect to the acreage determination in a number of States, among which was Texas, where county committes presented evidence of additional ginnings which had not been included in the census records. A similar situation developed in Georgia for the years 1947 and 1948 where new gins were located which had not reported their ginnings to the Bureau of the Census. These additional ginnings, not previously reported, were verified and accepted by the Bureau of the Census. Whenever this situation arises the additional ginnings are not considered official until fully verified by the Bureau of the Census. The discovery of these omissions necessitated the revision of acreage estimates in the two States concerned. A complete background information on the Texas situation was provided Mr. POAGE in a letter dated February 24, 1950, by Mr. C. E. Burkhead, head, Division of Field Crop Statistics, and also another statement by him dated February 10, 1950.

Because of the uses BAE cotton acreage estimates were put in the fall of 1949 and early 1950 the Crop Reporting Board made a thorough analysis of the data for the years 1944 through 1948, by counties, and on a State and National basis. While a minimum number of changes were finally required in the State estimates a number of changes, both upward and downward, were made in the county estimates, primarily based on the PMA 532–c data and total quantity grown reported by the Bureau of the Census. Therefore, for all practical purposes the actual production for each county is known.

While the Board gave considerable study to the estimates for a period of years in the fall of 1949 the procedure was not unusual. The primary purpose of the review was to arrive at the most accurate estimates possible based on all available information. In the final analysis comparatively few changes were required. A record of these changes is included on page 7 of House Report 1509.

A memorandum dated January 19, 1950, was given to Mr. Joseph C. Parker, counsel for the House Committee on Agriculture, from Mr. S. R. Newell, Assistant Chief of BAE, and Chairman of the Crop Reporting Board, setting forth in more detail the policy followed in reviewing and revising the cotton estimates in the course of the 1950 cotton acreage allotment program. Copies of this material are available for anyone interested in further studying the facts. The Department carried out the law in accordance with the facts.

TABLE 2.—*Cotton distribution, 1945–48 average acreage in cultivation, July 1, with allowance for Public Law 12 adjustments on ratio basis, small farm minimum and State adjustment for 1947–48, national total, 22,500,000 acres (consistent with an approximate national baleage of 12,000,000 bales)*

State	Basic distribution, 1945–48 [1]	1947 acreage	1948 acreage	Averages, 1947–48	Adjustment, State [2]	Adjustment, small farm minimum	Adjustment, total
	Thousands of acres	*Thousands of acres*	*Thousands of acres*	*Thousands of acres*			
Missouri	423	440	534	487	36	4	463
Virginia	24	23	24	24		2	26
North Carolina	712	654	725	689		29	741
South Carolina	1,122	1,055	1,133	1,094		25	1,147
Georgia	1,456	1,278	1,313	1,296		24	1,480
Florida	36	24	27	26		3	39
Tennessee	715	704	753	729		23	738
Alabama	1,640	1,505	1,627	1,566		41	1,681
Mississippi	2,541	2,379	2,560	2,469		40	2,581
Arkansas	2,093	2,085	2,371	2,228		18	2,111
Louisiana	945	838	940	889		21	966
Oklahoma	1,188	1,155	1,074	1,114		4	1,192
Texas	8,222	8,426	8,974	8,700	37	6	8,265
New Mexico	166	157	215	186	10	1	177
Arizona	215	226	275	250	23		238
California	546	536	810	673	90	3	639
Illinois	4	4	4	4			4
Kentucky	13	11	13	12			13
Total	22,060	21,500	23,372	22,436	196	244	22,500
Provision small farm minimum	244						
State adjustment	196						
Total	22,500						

[1] Public Law 12 adjustment included on ration basis.
[2] Reduction in no State more than 5 percent of 1947–48 average acreage.

NOTE.—With an estimated 5 percent underplantings the net acreage would be approximately 21,375,000 acres.

Proposed base for distribution of 1950 and 1951 allotments using the 1945–48 average cotton acreage in cultivation adjusted for war crops (see below) (2) for 1947 and 1948 plantings, and (3) estimated additional acreages for small farm minimum allotments

State	Basic distribution, 1945–48 [1]	1947 acreage	1948 acreage	Averages, 1947–48	Adjustment, State [2]	Adjustment, small farm minimum	Adjustment, total
	Thousands of acres	*Thousands of acres*	*Thousands of acres*	*Thousands of acres*			
Missouri	423	440	534	487	36	4	463
Virginia	24	23	24	24		2	26
North Carolina	709	654	725	689		29	738
South Carolina	1,118	1,055	1,133	1,094		25	1,143
Georgia	1,450	1,278	1,313	1,296		24	1,474
Florida	36	24	27	26		3	39
Tennessee	712	704	753	729		23	735
Alabama	1,633	1,505	1,627	1,566		41	1,674
Mississippi	2,531	2,379	2,560	2,469		40	2,571
Arkansas	2,085	2,085	2,371	2,228		18	2,103
Louisiana	941	838	940	889		21	962
Oklahoma	1,183	1,155	1,074	1,114		4	1,187
Texas	8,222	8,426	8,974	8,700	37	6	8,265
New Mexico	166	157	215	186	10	1	177
Arizona	215	226	275	250	23		238
California	546	536	810	673	139	3	688
Illinois	4	4	4	4			4
Kentucky	13	11	13	12		1	13
Total	22,011	21,500	23,372	22,436	245	244	22,500
Provision small farm minimum	244						
State adjustment	245						
Total	22,500						

[1] Public Law 12 adjustment included on ratio basis.
[2] Reduction in no State more than 5 percent of 1947–48 average acreage or 15 percent under 1948 plantings.

Prepared for Mr. Joseph O. Parker, clerk, House of Representatives, Committee on Agriculture, about May 26, 1949.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, without trying to impose upon your time, I want to call attention to what this amendment would do if it were passed. You will recall that the gentleman from the Nineteenth District of Texas sought a short time ago to change this bill in order to enable his district to perpetuate a special gadget or formula under which his district will receive substantial benefits this year. The committee was of the opinion that we should place Texas as most of the States of the Union, under a general formula that would apply to all alike, to his district and to all others alike. The committee rejected the gentleman's amendment.

His district for this year had the benefit of 355,000 acres of cotton that in the absence of the special gadget would have gone to 17 other districts in Texas. That there was no animus on the part of those of us who sought to have the general formula apply in Texas is evidenced by the proviso that the gentleman now seeks to strike out. That provision provides that any county in the State of Texas may in the coming years count for their history either the cotton that was actually planted in 1950 or the amount that they would have had had Texas not operated under a special gadget in 1950.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that under the regular law, if my amendment is adopted, my district would get the credit for its plantings in 1950, the 2-year basis. That is the reason why I offered the amendment.

Mr. POAGE. No; other States will not share on the 2-year basis. Only those that are under a special gadget and that have shown some reason why they should be under a special gadget will operate under the formula that the gentleman proposes. As a matter of fact, if this amendment is adopted the Nineteenth District of Texas and three other districts will receive history credit for cotton to which they were not entitled and they will perpetuate it on down through the years in their history. We

are not objecting to that. We are letting them keep that history. This amendment would however say to those districts that were denied their fair share of the Texas allotment in 1950 that you can never get your history back. Remember this history we are talking about only relates to the division or acreage within the State of Texas and does not add anything to the national allotment or the State allotments. Those of you who come from other States need not fear. We are asking that in the future Texas cotton be divided on the basis of history as between the counties of Texas as if those who were denied this half million acres this year had received it. We are not trying to take from the gentleman the history that he built up this year, even though he built it up under a misapprehension of facts. We are simply saying those districts who lost this year will have the benefit of coming in on equal terms with those districts that got the advantage this year. His district got a cotton allotment this year to which it was not entitled. He is going to have a history next year as the result of that, although it was a mistake. Now, then, he comes along and tries to deny to those of us who were denied the full right to grow a full crop this year even the right to grow cotton in the future. It seems to me to be grossly unfair. I am sure that the membership of this House will want those districts in Texas that contributed so generously to the tremendous crop grown in the Nineteenth District to have a history comparable to what they would have had had he not found this extra cotton on his doorstep.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: Page 13, line 15, after "(e)", strike out the comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: Page 16, line 13, strike out section 6 in its entirety.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes out section 6 in its entirety. Section 6 is the section which relates to the changing of the allocation of the wheat acreage. It was felt necessary to put this provision in here earlier in the session because of the hardship that apparently would be worked on certain Western States were it not placed in the bill. In recent weeks the allotment of acreage for wheat has been determined by the Department and is substantially greater than had originally been supposed would be possible. This makes it possible for the Department of Agriculture, through the operation of the formula that is now in effect, to give to the States that had expected to suffer an unconscionable cut a percentage of wheat acreage which we understand is satisfactory to all of them. I think it can be fairly stated that the Representatives from both the western and eastern sections are in agreement that this section should now come out and that the Department should allocate wheat on the basis of the letter which I placed in the RECORD last Thursday on page 11278 in which the Department explains the method whereby wheat will be allocated. That method of allocation will give to the States that had expected an unconscionable cut a reasonable amount of wheat. They, therefore, proposed to strike out the entire section and to operate on the basis as outlined in the Department letter. We believe it will work substantial justice to all sections of the country without increasing by 1 acre the wheat allotment, and I think everybody was anxious to achieve that result. I am authorized to offer this amendment on behalf of the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to detain the Committee for the full 5 minutes, but I should like to ask a question or two so that we can clarify the idea expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], to which, of course, I am not going to object. If I understand this correctly, my own State of Colorado, since they have increased the wheat-acreage allotments from 72,719,000 to 72,784,810 acres for this year, would for this year, the 1951 crop, or the 1950 acres, be allotted 2,856,632 acres less, or 96.1 percent of our acreage for 1949. I am sure we will make no objection if that is the case.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; because the statement of the Department to the subcommittee, and their letter, which is in the RECORD of last Thursday, states that they will carry out the allocation upon that basis. I have before me now their statement, which gives the figures in each State, and those are the correct figures as given to the subcommittee by the Department of Agriculture. They state in their letter that they will act on that basis.

Mr. HILL. One more question. That would answer my objection. Take a county which had an increase of over 100,000 under gadget 272, that county then would not be cut under the application of this formula more than 4.9 percent. This would follow the average curtailment of the wheat acres in the State. Is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. If it had the State average, that would be true. I cannot give the gentleman assurance that every county in the State will get the same treatment, but I understand that the formula will enable his State committee so to handle his State acreage that there will be only a 3.9 cut within his State.

Mr. HILL. That would be even better than the figures I just mentioned?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I think I should state in all fairness to everyone that I cannot help but feel that the Department has the intention and every idea of carrying out this wheat allocation or allotment to the States in the manner the gentleman has mentioned. Therefore, I think we can accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Further, Mr. Chairman, it does seem that a factor which we must consider in this matter is that as long as this wheat amendment or section of the cotton bill is being considered by the legislative branch of our Government, it would be impossible for the Department of Agriculture to fix the acreage allotments in the various States and also be impossible for the State committees to assign county allotments. Since August is here and wheat farmers are anxious to know the wheat acreage they can plant this fall, and whereas this bill might be delayed in the Senate for some time, I feel that with the definite promise of the Department of Agriculture to carry out the wheat allotment as proposed by charts and maps presented to our Committee on Agriculture, we should accept the amendment and strike this section from this bill.

Last year this House passed Public Law 272, which protected the wheat farmers of several Western States, including Colorado, and permitted them to hold the wheat acreage for the 1950 crop.

Under this gadget as provided by Public Law 272 the testimony by experts from the Department of Agriculture indicated that had this gadget not been provided wheat farmers would have increased the wheat acreage in the United State for the crop of 1950 more than 500,000 acres. So, really, gadget 272 curtailed wheat acreage. The reasonableness of it appealed to the farmers and they complied with the recommendations of the Department in a most commendable manner.

If the present wheat allotment is carried out as indicated by statements from the Agriculture Department, wheat growers in the West and in Colorado should be able to produce wheat in sufficient quantities to provide for our usual consumption, as well as a necessary reserve in time of crop shortage or worldwide general food supply.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes, including the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I remind the committee and Members of the House of the statements I made last year during the consideration of the acreage allotment measure.

Members of the committee have labored under the false premise that just because a farm was out of cotton production during the years 1946, 1947 and 1948 that it had gone out of cotton production. As a matter of fact, the base period should be lengthened. In western Oklahoma we are faced with a two-crop system, principally cotton and wheat, diversifying by raising additional crops such as oats, barley, alfalfa, grain sorghums, cattle, and some clover, millet, and so forth, depending on rainfall, hail, drought, windstorms, greenbugs, and so forth.

No law enacted from a national standpoint can work equitably without some exceptions. We need those exceptions in western Oklahoma. If the Department of Agriculture were permitted to express its opinion here today, we would find that it would oppose many of the provisions in this bill.

Our farmers are interested in the farm program and it is their desire to comply with any act which is fair and equitable. I hope the committee will adopt my recommendations in conference, because the future will be determined by our action today.

The crop year 1949 should not have been excluded. It is not fair to allow only those who raised cotton in 1950 to vote on next year's program.

There should be a small set-aside to constitute a national reserve, to be allocated by the Secretary of Agriculture to emergency areas.

There should be a special provision to allocate some acreage to the Secretary in order that he could allocate allotments to irrigation and reclamation areas to the extent that the acreage would not be taken from the acreage of the dry-land farmers.

The program should be so planned as to make the most advantageous use of the soil to which it is adapted.

By all means a provision should be included in this bill to provide exchanges of cotton and wheat allotments at the county level through the triple-A committees.

In the interest of our country we should take every precaution to protect the family size farms to the extent that the farmers and their families will have economic family-operating units.

We should encourage diversification, the use of soil conservation practices and soil conservation in this and every other farm measure.

Our State PMA committees and our county committees exercised full use of the provisions under the 1949 act, yet many hardships occurred. This was not the fault of the State or county committees.

Although this bill today is an improvement over the one passed last year it still has many provisions which should be corrected.

Before you vote on the measure I should like to read the following news article from Saturday's Washington News:

GOT TO GROW MORE COTTON

Cotton experts say Government must spur cotton planting next year if we're not to run into actual shortage by 1951. We've a short crop and stocks are going fast.

By August 1, 1951, carryover's likely to be 3,000,000 or 3,500,000 bales, and experts say 4,000,000 is danger point. That means 1951 cotton farmers must produce crop big enough to meet all 1952 needs plus at least 500,000 bales to carry over. It means planting 27,000,000 acres next year, compared with 19,000,000 this year, they say.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARSALIS].

Mr. MARSALIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the committee amendment striking section 6, the so-called wheat amendment, from this bill. This amendment was originally put into the bill for the purpose of taking care of the situation that existed in Colorado and a few other Western States. At that time the national allotment as originally announced by the Secretary of Agriculture for the 1950 crop of wheat was 68,944,099 acres. In view of the Korean war situation, however, the Secretary of Agriculture increased this acreage for the 1951 crop to the sum of 72,784,810 acres.

The amendment provided that no county should be cut more than 5 percent of its last year's allotment. The Department of Agriculture, through a modified formula which it adopted, based on the previous law in effect prior to the special legislation adopted last year, states that such formula will protect against undue hardship cases in Colorado and other States and that it will be equally as effective as section 6 of the bill. The distinguished and able gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] gave an excellent explanation of how such areas as Colorado would be taken care of under this formula in answer to my question to him during the debate on this bill last Thursday.

As explained to me by the Department of Agriculture, the Colorado wheat acreage allotment for this year will be 2,856,653 as opposed to 2,971,769 which was allotted last year. In other words, this new figure represents 96.1 percent of the acreage planted to wheat last year. The Department also stated that the State committee would in turn compute each county's last 3-year average and scale it to the State allotment and that in no event should any one county receive less than 95 percent of its last year's acreage, nor more than 105 percent of such acreage.

In view of these representations by the Department of Agriculture, under which any county in the State would be as well off as it would be under the amendment, and in view of the further fact that the farmers otherwise would have to wait until legislation including this amendment is passed, which might take considerably longer since it has not as yet been scheduled in the Senate and farmers are ready to start planting their crop at this time. I feel it is for the best interests of wheat farmers in my district that the amendment be adopted and section 6 taken out of the bill thereby permitting much quicker action in determining the specific allotments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 6?

Are there any amendments to section 7?

Are there any amendments to section 8?

Are there any amendments to section 9?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH: On page 19, after line 18, insert the following:

"4. Add at the end of section 359 of such act the following new subsection: '(j) the penalty provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to peanuts produced by any person who is recognized by the county committee as being a peanut farmer if his total acreage planted to peanuts during the year in which such peanuts were produced did not exceed 2 acres.' "

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this is in line with the general principle I have advocated in regard to a minimum for cotton producers. A strange thing has happened in some of our counties. We find that a person who has been growing cotton cannot grow cotton, and in instances he has been growing peanuts, he cannot now grow any peanuts—certainly not enough to stay in the business.

I have here some letters from folks—some, incidentally, not from my district. This one says:

Number of producers who will cease to grow peanuts: 50.

That is from one Texas county.

Number of producers receiving less than 2 acres who will cease growing peanuts: 90 percent of those who receive less than 5 acres.

In another Texas county there are 53 old grower farms that receive less than 2 acres, and 69 new grower farms that receive less than 2 acres. It is estimated that 80 percent of the farms will cease to grow peanuts and 50 percent will cease to farm.

I submit to the Members of this House that by legislation, you are definitely putting people out of the business of growing a given crop which they have

grown, and also putting them out of the farming business in some cases. It is my opinion that an amendment like this would have a salutary effect to prevent that being done, putting people off the farms or out of the business of growing certain crops.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1950.

DEAR FRIENDS: County by county in your State I'd like the following information:

I would like to know the number of peanut producers in each county. Generally in thinking of your average farmer and producer, what is the least number of acres he can afford to grow or economically grow? How many producers in your State received allotments less than the number of acres you mentioned in answer to the immediate previous question? How many of your peanut producers received allotments of less than 2 acres? Of the number of peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts? Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves? How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in your State this year—1950? How many acres did you have to distribute to them? Approximately how much did each receive?

I repeat I'd like to obtain this information county by county.

Regards,

LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., June 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of May 29 in which you requested certain information regarding peanut acreage allotments and the acreage of peanuts that should be grown on the farm to sustain the farm family.

I am attaching a summary of the number of farms and total allotted peanut acreage for all Texas counties. The summary is prepared to show data separately for "old" farms and "new" farms.

We do not have information on the other questions raised in your letter and feel that we cannot afford to ask our county committees to make the statistical analyses and summaries required since each county has a very heavy work load for the next several months. I trust that the attached summary will answer most of the questions on peanut allotments.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State Committee.

1950 peanut allotments (original issue)

County	Old farms	Allotments	New farms	Allotments
Anderson	1,011	12,196.3	296	207.7
Angelina	78	125.9	14	2.8
Atascosa	968	26,638.7	74	314.2
Austin	174	2,379.6	6	24.1
Bailey	4	33.5	1	1.6
Bastrop	344	2,654.5	71	51.5
Baylor	3	43.3	1	0
Bee	96	1,096.7	34	33.1
Bexar	571	9,466.7	30	101.8
Blanco	1	10.5		
Bosque	86	1,949.2	15	26.2
Bowie	58	306.9	7	3.9
Brazos	34	127.0	5	2.8
Brooks	10	48.1		
Brown	526	9,242.8	3	12.3
Burleson	79	525.4	10	6.9
Burnet	22	344.7	2	4.7
Caldwell	89	717.0	19	9.4
Callahan	596	8,675.3	33	100.1
Camp	39	91.5	13	2.9
Cass	122	718.3	54	23.2
Castro			1	5.5
Cherokee	206	1,470.2	203	77.7
Clay	42	365.6	13	13.4
Coke	5	83.0	1	1.1
Coleman	12	98.2		
Collingsworth	89	1,443.9	20	27.3
Colorado	137	1,391.5	24	21.0
Comanche	1,924	56,071.4	20	180.8
Cooke	674	8,328.6	20	84.2
Coryell	31	271.6	3	8.8
Dallas	9	66.9	1	1.1
Denton	619	9,478.2	35	111.1
De Witt	462	3,700.0	27	41.7
Dickens	1	0	1	0
Dimmit	3	116.1	4	6.6
Duval	120	2,083.0	3	20.8
Eastland	1,575	37,612.4	17	112.5
Erath	1,286	22,733.8	28	163.3
Falls	25	90.1	5	1.2
Fannin	882	9,854.3	36	101.8
Fayette	268	2,507.2	12	29.3
Fisher	19	235.8	5	5.4
Fort Bend	5	175.6	1	4.2
Franklin	239	634.6	33	9.7
Freestone	228	1,080.0	37	20.6
Frio	421	18,919.9	28	192.9
Gaines	69	2,356.5	29	67.7
Garza	16	406.0	2	4.7
Gillespie	207	2,475.1	6	26.0
Goliad	31	165.4	7	4.5
Gonzales	351	4,227.2	55	65.7
Grayson	936	15,331.4	66	174.2
Gregg	10	19.6	2	.2
Grimes	107	584.9	58	20.4
Guadalupe	403	5,272.8	30	61.4
Hall	16	237.2		
Hamilton	52	445.3	6	5.9
Harris	95	3,383.4	9	38.7
Harrison	8	20.6		
Henderson	310	1,880.0	227	86.9
Hidalgo			1	3.4
Hill	534	8,358.8	9	61.7
Hood	575	11,615.3	23	135.2
Hopkins	534	2,241.1	113	46.5
Houston	561	8,440.8	127	143.6
Jack	87	639.0	15	14.3
Jackson			1	.7
Jim Hogg	47	1,358.4	6	17.1
Jim Wells	20	239.9	8	15.2
Johnson	502	5,557.6	5	15.1
Jones	165	2,757.9	7	30.1
Karnes	176	1,696.6	30	30.5
Kent	51	909.4		
Kimble	5	41.4	2	4.8
Kleberg			7	4.6
Lamar	370	3,041.7	24	33.9
Lamb	3	66.5		
Lampasas	22	418.6	1	4.3
LaSalle	57	2,891.5	3	29.6
Lavaca	639	3,104.3	91	47.0
Lee	980	10,218.0	78	121.3
Leon	345	2,559.1	77	46.3
Liberty	14	55.0	10	1.9
Limestone	257	1,859.1	40	29.1
Live Oak	36	420.7	12	8.0
Llano	167	4,007.5	1	6.9
McCulloch	65	1,644.9	7	21.8
McLennan	99	1,111.1	17	18.6
McMullen	3	35.7		
Madison	101	729.1	39	20.7
Marion	31	168.8	2	3.3
Mason	293	8,271.3	13	36.9
Maverick	9	27.5	6	1.8
Medina	182	2,889.7	23	36.3
Menard	12	122.3	4	4.3
Milam	440	2,885.5	49	49.1
Mills	91	1,707.4	9	17.9
Montague	477	3,851.7	34	47.6
Montgomery	36	282.8	8	4.1
Morris	248	1,617.2	22	21.1
Motley	23	561.3	4	18.2
Nacogdoches	62	245.7	29	8.6
Navarro	4	10.6		
Nueces	1	11.8		
Palo Pinto	187	3,296.1	20	45.9
Panola	24	60.9	6	1.6
Parker	798	11,088.6	67	129.1
Parmer	1	8.0		
Polk	11	9.4	3	.2
Rains	22	112.6	7	3.6
Red River	66	287.8	54	10.8
Robertson	294	1,450.2	31	21.0
Runnels	50	650.9	4	7.9
Rusk	209	488.7	48	14.5
Sabine	4	6.3		
San Jacinto	19	29.9		
San Patricio	4	37.3		
San Saba	372	8,736.1	30	96.5
Shelby	44	52.6	2	.6
Smith	58	135.7	37	5.8
Somervell	151	3,624.1	5	31.0
Starr	3	52.6	16	10.7
Stephens	58	724.0	3	9.8
Stonewall	184	4,808.3	9	53.8
Tarrant	196	1,165.2	10	7.9
Taylor	9	68.2	3	2.3
Terry	22	582.9	6	10.1
Titus	566	2,297.5	156	43.1
Travis	9	177.2		
Trinity	36	248.5	27	5.4
Tyler	19	23.0		
Upshur	165	440.3	64	15.0
Van Zandt	187	638.4	95	25.3
Victoria	25	183.9	4	2.6
Walker	25	47.5		
Waller	273	7,070.3	* 47	103.6
Washington	19	76.9	12	4.6
Webb	3	56.0	4	1.7
Wheeler	35	372.1	3	5.4
Wichita	1	0		
Williamson	50	327.3	3	3.8
Wilson	1,157	22,660.1	107	272.7
Wise	912	11,765.3	33	130.1
Wood	477	1,284.4	56	21.6
Young	31	293.9	5	6.4
Zapata	14	297.1	14	3.5
Total	31,918	477,397.9	3,711	4,996.8

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Giddings, Tex., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of May 15 and we herewith enclose the following information:

1. Number of peanut farms in Lee County: 1,054.

2. The least number a farmer can afford to grow: 10.

3. Number of producers receiving allotments less than the above: 661.

4. Number of producers receiving allotments less than 2 acres: 174.

5. Number of producers who will cease to grow peanuts (approximate): 50.

6. Number of producers who will cease to farm for themselves (approximate): 25.

7. Number of producers who applied for new grower allotment, 1950: 72.

8. Number of acres to distribute to them: 109.7.

9. Approximate acreage for each new grower: 1.5.

Very truly yours,

WARREN D. MOODY,
Secretary, Lee County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Montague, Tex., June 7, 1950.

Re peanut questionnaire.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your recent questionnaire, you will find listed below the information you requested concerning peanut growers in Montague County.

Number of peanut producers in county: 375.

Smallest acreage producer could afford to plant: 5.

Number of producers receiving less than 5 acres: 207.

Number of producers receiving less than 2 acres: 71.

Number of producers receiving less than 2 acres who will cease to grow peanuts: 90 percent or approximately 64.

Number of producers receiving less than 2 acres who will cease to farm for themselves: 50 percent or approximately 35.

Number of applicants for new grower allotments: 34.

Number of acres for distribution to new growers: 73.2.

Acreage (approximate) each new grower received: 1.5 to 3.

Yours truly,

BUEL E. WRIGHT,
Secretary, Montague County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Bastrop, Tex., June 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will reply to your letter dated May 15, 1950, regarding peanut farms in Bastrop County.

Bastrop County has 346 old grower peanut farm allotments and 69 new grower peanut farm allotments. The committee believes that the average producer cannot afford to economically grow less than 3 acres of peanuts. In Bastrop County 96 old grower farms received an allotment of less than 3 acres, and 69 new grower farms received less than a 3-acre allotment.

There are 53 old grower farms that received less than 2 acres and 69 new grower farms that received less than 2 acres. It is estimated that 80 percent of the producers on the farms receiving less than 2 acres will cease to grow peanuts and 50 percent will cease to farm for themselves. There were 73 applications for new grower allotments and 69 received allotments. New grower farms received 51.5 acres from the State committee reserve. Allotments ranged from 0.1 to 1.5 acres.

Respectfully,

NORMAN U. NOVOSAD,
Administrative Officer, Bastrop County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Allendale, S. C., June 1, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am listing below the information requested in your letter dated May 18, 1950:

1. What is the least number of acres an average farmer can afford to grow or economically grow: 5.

2. How many producers received allotments less than the number of acres shown in 1: 135.

3. How many peanut producers received allotments less than 2 acres: 76.

4. Of the number of peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts: 50 percent.

5. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.

6. How many new producers applied for peanut acreage this year (1950): 9.

7. How many acres were distributed to them: 18.6.

8. Approximately how much did each receive: 2.

Very truly yours,

HENRY B. BARKER,
County Administrative Officer, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Thomasville, Ga., June 30, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter dated May 17, 1950.

Peanut producers in Thomas County	983
Peanut producers who received less than 5 acres	567
Peanut producers who received less than 2 acres	164
Peanut producers who ceased to grow peanuts in 1949	28
New producers who applied for peanut acreage in 1950	74

Generally, in thinking of the average farmer, 5 acres of peanuts is the least number of acres he can afford to grow economically.

One hundred seventy-four and one-tenth acres were distributed to the 74 new producers. This averaged approximately 3.2 acres per producer.

We cannot yet determine the number of producers who will cease to grow peanuts in 1950.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN Z. STERLING,
County Administrative Officer,
Thomas County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND, MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Crawfordville, Fla., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In compliance to your letter dated May 12, 1950, we are furnishing you with the following information:

Number of peanut producers in county	78
Least number of acres producers can economically grow	5
Number of producers that received allotments less than the number of acres given in immediate previous question	40
Number of producers that received allotments less than 2 acres	16
Of the number of producers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts	8
Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves	5
How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in your county this year—1950	15
How many acres did you have to distribute to them	31.3
Approximately how much did each receive	2.9

Yours very truly,

KENNETH A. STRICKLAND,
Administrative Officer, Wakulla County, Fla.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Wellington, Tex., May 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 16, 1950, with reference to the peanut-acreage allotment for our county:

1. We have 109 farms with peanut allotments.

2. Producers in general should have at least 15 acres per farm in order to grow them economically.

3. There are 78 farms in the county that have an allotment of less than 15 acres.

4. We have 15 farms with less than 2-acre allotments.

5. All farms with less than 2-acre allotments will cease to grow peanuts.

6. Probably none of these producers will cease to farm for themselves, but will have to grow other crops for a livelihood.

7. We have 21 producers who applied for new-grower allotments.

8. A total of 27.3 acres were allotted to new growers of this county by the State committee.

9. On an average each new grower received 1.3 acres.

Trusting this supplies the information requested.

Yours truly,

MILLARD P. BROWN,
Secretary, Collingsworth County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quincy, Fla., May 26, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 12, 1950, we have 175 peanut producers in Gadsden County. The least number of acres a farmer can grow economically is usually 5 acres; 89 of these allotments are under 5 acres; 39 received less than 2 acres. Nearly all of these will quit growing peanuts for harvest. We have no way of knowing how many farmers will cease to farm for themselves on this account. It will cause some to do so. Seventeen new growers applied for peanut acreage this year—1950. We had 17.4 acres to distribute to them. These range from 0.5 to 1.7 acres.

Trusting this is the information you desired, I am,

Yours truly,

BERNARD H. CLARK,
Administrative Officer, Gadsden County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Inverness, Fla., May 22, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have one farmer producing peanuts in Citrus County, Fla., on allotment. In growing these peanuts to be dug it is not economically profitable to grow less than about 30 acres, since no other growers in the county are growing peanuts for digging, and it is not possible to rent a picker, etc. This one producer has an allotment less than he can produce economically. No producer received an allotment of less than 2 acres. None will cease to grow peanuts or to farm for themselves because of allotments of less than 2 acres. No new producers applied for allotments for 1950 because no allotment was available for distribution to new growers in this county.

Yours very truly,

E. A. ZELLNER,
Chairman, PMA County Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Arapaho, Okla., May 31, 1950.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 18 we wish to advise that we are a very small peanut-producing county. In fact we have only two allotments, both of which are about 20 acres. They are both group I or old grower allotments.

We received approximately 30 applications for 1950 new grower peanut allotments. We were unable to give any of these new grower allotments because the county reserve for new grower allotments was zero. This was due to the fact that our county allotment was approximately 40 acres and 1 percent of our county allotment would be less than one-half acre for new grower farms.

Hoping this information will be helpful to you, we remain,

Yours very truly,

RUSSELL E. DILL,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Greenville, S. C., June 2, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter dated May 17, 1950, we wish to advise that Greenville County is not a peanut county and has only 5 peanut-allotment farms with a total of 12.4 acres. The least number of acres the average farmer and producer can afford to grow is 10 acres. All allotments in the county are less than 10 acres, and three allotments are less than 2 acres, and none of these will cease to grow peanuts or farm for themselves. We did not have any applications for new-grower allotments.

We hope this information will be of help to you, and at any time we can furnish you any information we will be glad to do so.

Very truly yours,
T. LLOYD GARRETT,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Little Rock, Ark., June 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We have forwarded your letter of May 26 to the extension service for reply, as their farm management specialist says he has some information which may be useful to you. Several other persons were contacted, but did not know how large an acreage of peanuts is needed to support a family that depends on peanuts as their primary money crop.

Inasmuch as a question of this kind involves farm management and sociology, and also since I have not raised peanuts, it was believed best to refer the matter to the extension service.

Sincerely,
MILES MCPEEK,
Agricultural Statistician.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quitman, Tex., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to your letter, dated May 13, 1950, to the Wood County PMA Committee.

We have approximately 400 peanut producers in the county. The least number of acres each producer can afford to grow is 2 acres. We have about 150 producers who received allotments of less than 2 acres. Of those growers having allotments of less than 2 acres, there will be about 25 or 50 who will cease to grow peanuts. I do not believe there will be any cease to farm for themselves. The number of new producers were 35 and the number of acres distributed was 21.4 acres and the average to each was 0.6 of an acre.

The excess acreage (for oil) up to the 1947 picked and threshed will help at least 150 or 200 producers in Wood County.

Hoping the above is the desired information, I am

Yours very truly,
ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary, Wood County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Quitman, Tex., April 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to your letter of April 5, 1950, to the county committee.

(1) The number of farmers receiving 5 acres of cotton or less was 1,248. (2) The number of new producers of that applied for allotments were 340. (3) The acreage that was available to distribute among the new producers was 300. (4) Each producer received from 1 to 1.1 acres. (5) The number of zero allotments were 10. (6) The percent of new producers regarded as genuine farmers was 88 percent (300) applications.

The number applications left from item 2 less item 5, less item 6, consisted of 30 applications that did not meet the necessary eligibility requirements.

If you desire further information, please advise.

Yours very truly,
ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary, Wood County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Stillwater, Okla., June 23, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Attached is a list, by counties, of the number of 1950 peanut acreage allotments in Oklahoma.

We do not know the exact number of peanut producers in each county; however, the attached list of allotments will represent approximately the number of producers in each county.

This information is being submitted in compliance with your communication of June 9, 1950.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES T. CAMERON,
Chairman, Oklahoma State PMA Committee.

Number of 1950 peanut allotments in Oklahoma

Atoka	1,073
Beckham	52
Bryan	2,095
Caddo	2,265
Canadian	96
Carter	444
Choctaw	1,015
Cleveland	76
Coal	488
Comanche	343
Cotton	23
Creek	909
Custer	2
Dewey	4
Garvin	461
Grady	618
Grant	2
Greer	22
Harmon	20
Haskell	288
Hughes	2,065
Jackson	94
Jefferson	138
Johnston	537
Kingfisher	2
Latimer	26
LeFlore	103
Lincoln	1,022
Logan	31
Love	627
McClain	278
McCurtain	378
McIntosh	425
Marshall	303
Murray	44
Muskogee	180
Okfuskee	1,197
Oklahoma	154
Okmulgee	827
Osage	13
Pawnee	29
Payne	151
Pittsburg	933
Pontotoc	694
Pottawatomie	993
Pushmataha	328
Seminole	1,483
Stephens	766
Tulsa	28
Wagoner	11
Washita	101
Total	24,237

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Richmond, Va., June 12, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge receipt of the return of our letter of June 8 with attachment of summary of 1950 peanut acreage allotments for Virginia. We note that at the bottom of this letter you have requested that we give you county-by-county the number of producers in each county.

For your information, under the 1950 allotment regulations, all farms on which peanuts were produced in any year of the 3-year period 1947, 1948, and 1949, are eligible for allotments and should have been issued allotments. In addition, the instructions provided for issuing "new farm" allotments to certain farms on which peanuts will be produced in 1950 but on which peanuts were not produced in the past 3 years. Therefore, allotments have been issued to all farms producing peanuts in each county and the number of producers should be identical with the number of allotments shown in our tabulation. It is, of course, true that on many farms tenants are involved who might be considered peanut producers and the number of allotments as shown in our tabulation would include only one producer for each farm. However, all our contacts are with the farm operators and we have no record of the number of tenants involved on various farms on which peanut allotments have been issued.

As requested, we are returning herewith your letter and the attached tabulation of 1950 peanut allotments.

Yours very truly,
R. B. BRIDGFORTH,
Chairman, Virginia PMA State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Richmond, Va., June 8, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letter of May 29, 1950, requesting

certain information on peanuts produced in Virginia. I regret the delay in replying to your letter, which was occasioned by my absence from the city.

For your information I am enclosing a tabulation showing by counties the number of peanut allotments established and the acreage allotted for 1950.

The remaining information requested by you would require a great amount of time and clerical help in making a compilation, and because of the pressure of other work in our office at this time, I do not believe we will be in a position to furnish the other information until a later date.

As soon as our work will permit us to gather this information, we will be glad to furnish it to you.

Very truly yours,

R. B. BRIDGFORTH,

Chairman, Virginia PMA State Committee.

Enclosure.

Summary of 1950 peanut acreage allotments—Virginia

County	Number of allotments	Allotted acreage
Accomac	4	20.5
Brunswick	498	1,682.0
Charles City	1	7.5
Chesterfield	46	172.5
Dinwiddie	646	5,575.7
Elizabeth City	1	3.6
Greensville	1,110	13,327.4
Gloucester	3	12.3
Isle of Wight	1,267	21,224.0
James City	13	182.4
King and Queen	2	11.1
Lunenburg	3	15.3
Mecklenburg	76	262.2
Middlesex	2	15.3
Nansemond	1,446	20,086.5
New Kent	11	81.5
Norfolk	35	349.7
Nottoway	1	5.4
Prince George	520	5,413.5
Princess Anne	5	15.1
Southampton	1,949	40,575.4
Surry	749	11,216.3
Sussex	1,159	20,045.5
State totals	9,547	140,300.7

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Stillwater, Okla., July 19, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Enclosed is a tabulation showing, by counties, the 1950 peanut acreage data which you have requested from each of the peanut counties in Oklahoma. This data is being submitted in compliance with your request in our recent telephone conversation.

The data in columns 2, 5, and 6 are necessarily based on estimates. Where dashes appear in these columns, we were unable to secure an estimate from the county committee.

We hope that the enclosed tabulation will serve your purpose and that you will call on us for any additional information which you think will be helpful.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES T. CAMERON, *Chairman,*
Oklahoma State PMA Committee.

1950 peanut data—Oklahoma

District	County	Number of peanut producers (1)	Smallest acreage which can be grown economically (2)	Number of producers with allotment less than that in column 2 (3)	Number of producers with allotment under 2 acres (4)	Number of producers in column 4 who will cease to grow peanuts (5)	Number of producers who will cease to farm for themselves (6)	Number of producers who applied for 1950 "new grower" allotment (7)	"New grower" allotment (8)	Average of "new grower" allotment per producer (9)
2	Grant	2	20	2	1	1	0	2	0	0
	Total district	2		2	1	1	0	2	0	
3	Osage	13	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0
	Pawnee	29	3	1	1	0	0	35	0	0
	Tulsa	21	2	0	0	0	0	7	0	0
	Wagoner	11	5	1	0			6	0	0
	Total district	74		5	2	1	0	48	0	
4	Beckham	44	5	3	0		0	9	4	4.0
	Custer	2	10	0	0		0	30	0	0
	Dewey	4	5	1	0	0	0	5	0	0
	Washita	101	5	46	30	30	0	6	10	1.7
	Total district	151		50	30	30	0	50	14	
5	Canadian	73	3	13	8	6	2	43	5	50.0
	Cleveland	76	5	27	10	10	0	5	0	0
	Creek	909	3	371	214	128	20	120	45	2.8
	Grady	598	5	273	131	0	0	80	46	2.4
	Lincoln	987	5	721	141	90	0	51	39	3.0
	Logan	31	5	9	4	0	0	2	0	0
	McClain	275	4	155	142	0	0	38	13	6.5
	Okfuskee	1,250	5	712	278	139	25	122	65	.5
	Oklahoma	148	4	87	17	5	1	20	8	3.0
	Payne	147	5	63	6	0	0	33	7	1.7
	Pottawatomie	925	3	103	47			92	63	3.0
	Seminole	1,479	3	389	190	125	19	133	75	2.8
	Total district	6,898		2,923	1,188	503	67	739	366	
6	Haskell	251	5	109	38	38	8	37	9	3.0
	Hughes	1,940	5	542	137	14	7	64	192	5.5
	McIntosh	425	3	181	99	5	0	62	19	1.3
	Muskogee	179	5	73	70	68	0	30	11	3.7
	Okmulgee	687	4	348	153	75	0	105	37	2.0
	Pittsburg	900	5	410	138	75	25	205	58	4.8
	Total district	4,382		1,663	635	275	40	503	326	
7	Caddo	2,260	6	729	223	190	100	275	202	1.6
	Comanche	301	6	150	44	44	0	19	17	1.5
	Cotton	23	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Greer	20	5	5	1	1	0	0	0	0
	Harmon	20	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Jackson	70	2	0	0	0	0	24	8	4.0
	Total district	2,694		891	268	235	100	318	317	
8	Atoka	965	5	292	106	79	39	108	67	2.8
	Bryan	2,020	5	463	186	96	12	267	281	5.0
	Carter	435	10	117	7	7	0	40	32	4.0
	Coal	481	5	262	72	43	0	51	22	3.0
	Garvin	442	8	156	11	11	0	19	26	5.5
	Jefferson	107	5	41	11	11	0	31	8	8.0
	Johnston	540	5	96	9	5	5	19	50	2.5
	Love	610	15	326	7	3	0	17	74	4.4
	Marshall	296			2			13	72	10.3
	Murray	37	5	13	4	4	0	5	0	0
	Pontotoc	688	5	439	228	110	20	40	30	7.0
	Stephens	752	7	206	21	10	0	54	49	4.9
	Total district	7,373		2,411	664	379	76	664	711	

1950 peanut data—Oklahoma—Continued

District	County	Number of peanut producers (1)	Smallest acreage which can be grown economically (2)	Number of producers with allotment less than that in column 2 (3)	Number of producers with allotment under 2 acres (4)	Number of producers in column 4 who will cease to grow peanuts (5)	Number of producers who will cease to farm for themselves (6)	Number of producers who applied for 1950 "new grower" allotment (7)	"New grower" allotment (8)	Average of "new grower" allotment per producer (9)
9	Choctaw	1,045	4	240	33	20	10	150	42	3.0
	Latimer	26	5	6	0	0	0	3	0	0
	Le Flore	95	5	32	2	2		8	6	3.3
	McCurtain	294	5	232	122	56	10	88	9	3.0
	Pushmataha	323	5	122	38	22		34	20	4.0
	Total district	1,783		632	195	100	20	283	77	
	State	23,357		8,577	2,983	1,524	303	2,607	1,811	

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Nashville, Tenn., June 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 29 requesting information in regard to peanut production in this State, we are enclosing a tabulation which will furnish you with most of the information you desire from the questions which you have asked in your letter.

In regard to your question as to what is the least number of acres a producer can afford to grow or economically grow, this is a question which is very difficult to answer in this State for there are so many variable factors involved, such as the size of the farm, other crops and livestock on the farms, and since peanut production in this State is a minor crop. We do not have very many farmers that depend solely upon peanuts for a living for himself and family.

The number of peanut allotments of less than 2 acres established in this State is 277. The number that will cease to grow less than 2 acres is estimated at 50. The number that will cease to farm for themselves is estimated at none. We have in this State a number of farms which produce less than 1 acre of peanuts and these farms do not have an allotment established for them, under the present regulations for peanuts.

Trusting this is the information you desire and assuring you that it has been a pleasure to have served you in this instance, I am

Very truly yours,

CARL FRY,
Chairman, State PMA Committee.

1950 peanut allotments

County and code	Total number allotments	Number		Acreage allotted old farms	Acreage allotted new farms	Total acreage allotted
		Old farms	New farms			
63-003. Benton	93	84	9	516.9	4.6	521.5
63-006. Bradley	8	7	1	18.2	.4	18.6
63-009. Carroll	6	5	1	33.0	.6	33.6
63-016. Coffee	1	1	0	.5	0	.5
63-020. Decatur	87	79	8	436.5	6.8	443.3
63-022. Dickson	10	10	0	10.5	0	10.5
63-024. Fayette	2	2	0	16.5	0	16.5
63-033. Hamilton	5	3	2	3.2	.7	3.9
63-036. Hardin	7	7	0	34.1	0	34.1
63-041. Hickman	55	52	3	100.7	.9	101.6
63-043. Humphreys	367	332	35	1,602.7	20.3	1,623.0
63-050. Lawrence	22	18	4	29.3	2.8	32.1
63-051. Lewis	133	130	3	265.5	1.4	266.9
63-057. Madison	1	1	0	6.4	0	6.4
63-068. Perry	195	173	22	939.4	3.6	943.0
63-081. Stewart	2	2	0	2.3	0	2.3
63-091. Wayne	32	30	2	71.7	3.2	75.0
Giles	2	1	1	3.7	0	3.7
Hardeman	4	1	3	13.8	3.3	17.1
Total	1,029	938	91	4,104.9	48.6	4,153.5

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Paris, Tex., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In complying with your letter of May 16, 1950, please find below the information you were seeking.

Number of peanut producers in Lamar County: 393.

What is the least number of acres he can afford to grow or economically grow: 1 acre.

Number of producers in county that received less allotment than mentioned in above question: None.

How many peanut producers received allotments of less than two acres: 80.

Of the number of peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than two acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts: None.

Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.

How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in your county this year, 1950: 24.

How many acres did you have to distribute to them: 78 acres.

Approximately how much did each receive: 1.5 acres.

Very truly yours,

ROY P. MASON,
Secretary, Lamar County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Cross City, Fla., May 31, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third Congressional District of Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Reference is made to your letter of May 12 relative to peanut producers in Dixie County, Florida. Dixie County is primarily a livestock county and most of the farmers produce peanuts for hog feed. However, we do have some 20 farmers who grow peanuts for digging. Of these 18 have less than two acres allotment. It is the general thinking of the average farmer that they cannot economically dig and pick less than 5 acres. Of the number of farmers having less than two acres allotments none will cease growing peanuts but about 75 percent of them will not dig. We had no new producers applying for acreage this year but the reason for this was that when told the probable size of new grower allotments those that were interested decided that it would not be worth the trouble of filling out the forms.

Trusting that this is the information that you desire, I am,

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE L. DICKINSON,
County Agent.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Fairfield, Tex., June 6, 1950.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Appreciate receiving your recent letter regarding peanut producers in our county; however, at the present time we are so busy with measuring peanut and cotton crops, that we do not have a clerk available to secure the necessary information you requested.

Yours very truly,

NORMAN H. LAMBERT,
Secretary, Freestone County PMA.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
Department of Game and Fish,
Santa Fe, N. Mex., June 8, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of May 26 relative to the number of acres of peanuts required to support a family.

It is my opinion that in the section of eastern New Mexico where peanuts are raised successfully that from 5 to 7 acres of peanuts in good irrigated land is sufficient to support a family nicely.

Yours very truly,

ELLIOTT S. BARKER,
State Game Warden.

NORTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Raleigh, June 7, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 26, 1950, this is to inform you that the number of acres that a family of a man, wife, and three or four children need for a primary money crop is from 8 to 10 acres of Virginia-type peanuts. I mention the Virginia-type peanuts as this is the only variety grown on a commercial scale in this State. The above estimate of acres is based on a yearly average of from 1,000 to 1,100 pounds per acre, and also on the basis of the present support price.

Very truly yours,

L. Y. BALLENTINE, *Commissioner.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
De Ridder, La., June 1, 1950.

DEAR SIR: Please find enclosure for your attention.

Yours very truly,

T. SHELBY OAKES,
Parish Administrative Officer,
County Committee of Beauregard County.

1. Cotton producers in Beauregard Parish	307
2. Farmers receiving 5 acres or less of cotton	272
3. New producers applied for acreage	150
4. Acreage to distribute among new producers	415
5. Acreage each received	2-3.4
6. Farmers receiving zero acreage	13
7. Percent of new producers regarded as genuine farmers	90
8. a. Acreage the new cotton amendment helped new producers	None
b. Old ones	None
9. Number of producers receiving less than 5 acres that will probably grow no cotton	15
10. Number of farmers that will cease to farm for themselves	-----

---

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
De Ridder, La., May 22, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reference to your letter of May 18, 1950, listed below is a tabulation to your questionnaire.

Thank you for your interest in peanut and cotton farmers.

Very truly yours,

T. SHELBY OAKES,
Administrative Officer,
Beauregard Parish Production and Marketing Administration.

Peanuts, 1950

Number of peanut producers	67
Number of peanut acres he can economically grow	5
Number of producers received allotment less than 5 acres	60
Number of producers received allotment less than 2 acres	47
Number of producers received less than 2 acres that will cease to grow peanuts	25
Number of producers that will cease to farm for themselves	---
Number of new producers applied for allotment in 1950	8
How many acres did you have to distribute	5.9
Approximately how much did they receive (all 3)	5.9

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Troy, N. C., May 26, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Questions requested in letter dated May 18, 1950:

1. Number of peanut producers: 1.

2. Least number of acres he could economically grow: 16.

3. Producers that received allotments less than 16: None.

4. Producers that received allotments less than 2: None.

5. Number of peanut farmers to receive allotments less than 2: None.

6. How many will cease to grow peanuts: None.

7. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.

8. How many new producers applied for peanut acreage this year: None.

9. How many acres did you have to distribute to them: None.

10. How much did each receive: None.

Very truly yours,

DAVID MCALISTER,
Secretary, Montgomery County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Junction, Tex., May 24, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of May 13, 1950, please find the following information:

1. Number of peanut producers in your county: 10.

2. Least number of acres of peanuts farmers and producers can afford to grow or grow economically: 15.

3. Number of producers in your county receiving allotments less than the number of acres we mentioned in answer to the immediate previous question: 1.

4. How many of your peanut producers received allotments of less than 2 acres: 1.

5. Of the number of peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, how many will cease to grow peanuts: 1.

6. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: 1.

7. How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in your county this year, 1950: 2.

8. How many acres did you have to distribute to them: 4.8.

9. Approximately how much did each receive: 2.4.

Yours very truly,

MILDRED M. SNEAD,
Secretary, Kimble County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Jackson, Tex., June 7, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congressman, Third District, Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In answer to your letter relative to peanut allotments in Jack County.

We believe the least acreage allotment to the farmer should be not less than 10 acres since special equipment is needed in harvesting the crop.

We have only six old growers who have an allotment of less than 2 acres which I believe was caused by not planting their allotment and maintaining their history.

Jack County had 15 applications for new-grower peanut allotments for 1950. I believe the law limits the State to 1 percent of the State allotment for new growers. Due to heavy work in the county this year the State office asked that we send the new-grower applications to them to figure. The 15 were allotted 14.3 acres but not many will plant their allotment of less than 1 acre.

We had so many in 1949 that didn't plant their allotment that we sent cards to all of our peanut growers asking that they return the card stating if they would or would not plant their 1950 peanut allotment. Then if they said they would not plant their allotment the county committee took all the allotment they were permitted to and distributed it to other growers.

We are more of a livestock county than farming but we do have 548 allotment farms: Wheat, cotton, and peanuts.

We do appreciate your interest in the small farmer who must be cared for in the marketing-quota program because there are children to be fed, clothed, and sent to school besides some soil- and water-conservation work to do.

Everyone should feel their responsibility on soil and water conservation since it affects everyone.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM E. YOWELL,
Administrative Officer, Jack County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Dade City, Fla., May 29, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Your letter of May 12, regarding peanut producers in this county, is hereby acknowledged.

Please be advised that we have only two peanut allotments in this county, with both receiving allotments in excess of 2 acres. These two allotments are 17.4 acres and 2.4 acres, respectively. They were not affected by the new regulations.

Very truly yours,

CARL P. DEAL,
Administrative Officer, Pasco County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Saluda, Va., June 1, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: With reference to your inquiry of peanut producers in Middlesex County, we wish to advise that there are only two peanut growers in our county. One of these farmers maintains an allotment of approximately 10 acres, which is the least acres that the producer can afford to grow economically. The other producer now has an allotment of 2.7 acres, which we do not believe justifies him to grow peanuts.

There were no producers applying for new peanut allotments this year.

These farmers farm for themselves and we believe they will continue to do so. This we hope will give you the desired information, since we are not a peanut-producing county.

Yours very truly,

FLORENCE G. WILLAFORD,
Secretary, Middlesex PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Conway, S. C., May 29, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: With reference to your letter of May 17, 1950, the following information from Horry County, S. C., is supplied herewith:

1. The average farmer in this county feels that the least number of acres of peanuts that he can afford to economically grow would be 2.5 acres.

2. There are 339 peanut producers with allotments in Horry County. Of this number 287 have allotments less than 2.5 acres.

3. 279 farmers in this county have received allotments of less than 2 acres.

4. It is not believed that any producer who is interested in peanut production would cease to grow peanuts this year because his allotment is less than 2 acres.

5. Since this is primarily a flue-cured tobacco county, no farmer will cease to farm for himself because of his small acreage of peanuts.

6. There were not applicants for new grower peanut allotments in this county for this year, the reason being that there is hardly any probability of a person receiving over a 1-acre allotment.

Yours very truly,

BUCK N. KING,
County Administrative Officer.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Henrietta, Tex., June 1, 1950.

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: There are 42 peanut producers in Clay County. About 3 acres is the least number of acres a farmer can afford to grow. There were 13 producers in this county that received allotments of less than the 3 acres mentioned above. There were 6 producers that received allotments of less than 2 acres. Peanut farmers receiving allotments of less than 2 acres, will cease to grow peanuts commercially but will grow some for home use. None will cease to farm for themselves. There were 13 new producers that applied for peanut acreage in Clay County in 1950. New grower reserves were retained in the State office. All new growers received a total of 13.4 acres.

Yours truly,

ERMON D. WILLIAMS,
Secretary, Clay County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Burgaw, N. C., May 26, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of May 18, 1950. The following is a list of the questions and answers requested in your letter:

1. The number of peanut producers in Pender County: 335.
2. Number of acres of peanuts a producer can grow economically: 5.
3. Number of allotments less than 5 acres in county: 185.
4. Number of allotments in county less than 2 acres: 56.
5. Number of allotments in county less than 2 acres which will not be planted: None.
6. Approximately how many will cease to farm for themselves: None.
7. Number of producers who applied for new allotments in Pender County in 1950: 11.
8. How many acres did we have to distribute to them? We did not have any acreage to distribute to them as the distribution of acreage is done in Raleigh for new growers.
9. How many acres did the new growers receive in Pender County: 3.

Very truly yours,

T. W. GARRISS,
Secretary, Pender County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Lampasas, Tex., May 27, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In answer to your letter of May 13, 1950, we give the following information.

There are 24 peanut producers in Lampasas County, and 20 acres is the least number of acres that he can afford to grow or economically grow. Twelve producers in our county received allotments less than the number of acres mentioned above. There were no producers who received less than 2 acres. One new producer applied for peanut acreage in our county this year, 1950. We had 4.5 acres to distribute to them. Each one received 4.5 acres since there was only one new producer.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM W. WILSON,
Secretary, Lampasas County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Burnet, Tex., May 29, 1950.

To: Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

From: Raby A. Alford, secretary, Burnet County PMA.

Subject: Information requested in letter of May 13, 1950.

Information as requested is listed below:

What is the least number of acres average peanut producer can afford to grow: 5.

How many producers received allotments less than acreage mentioned above: 7.

How many of your peanut farmers received allotments of less than 2 acres: 2.

How many of this number (receiving allotments of less than 2 acres) will cease to grow peanuts: 2.

How many will cease to farm for themselves: None.

How many new producers applied for peanut acreage in 1950: 2.

How many acres did you distribute to them: 4.7.

Approximately how much did each receive: 1.5 and 3.2.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to observe that this amendment is objectionable just as the other amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] have been objectionable, and I urge defeat of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 9?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: Page 20, after line 5, insert a new section 11 reading as follows:

"SEC. 11. The first sentence of section 363 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'Any farmer who is dissatisfied with his farm marketing quota may, within 15 days after mailing to him of notice as provided in section 362, have such quota reviewed by a local review committee composed of three farmers from the same or nearby counties appointed by the Secretary.'"

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment relates to the appointment of review committees. It is simply a clarifying amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. What is the use of review if the bill has already limited him to the amount of increase to which he may be entitled? What is the purpose of this review?

Mr. PACE. In most every case, if a cotton grower is dissatisfied with his cotton allotment, he can file an application with a review committee. That is the general law. This amendment simply clarifies the appointment of those committees.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY, 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. 9109) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress; the Agricultural Act of 1949; and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 728, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BRAMBLETT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BRAMBLETT moves to recommit the bill H. R. 9109 to the Committee on Agriculture, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment: On page 1, strike out line 3, and all that follows down through line 6 on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof: "That section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act" and renumber the following sections accordingly.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demand by Mr. BRAMBLETT) there were—ayes 10, noes 70.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 120, nays 179, not voting 131, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

YEAS—120

Addonizio	Arends	Bennett, Mich.
Allen, Calif.	Auchincloss	Bentsen
Allen, Ill.	Baring	Biemiller
Angell	Bates, Mass.	Bishop

Boggs, Del.	Horan	Patten
Bramblett	Jackson, Calif.	Phillips, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Jackson, Wash.	Potter
Byrnes, Wis.	Javits	Poulson
Canfield	Jenison	Reed, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.
Clevenger	Jensen	Ribicoff
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Rich
Corbett	Keating	Riehlman
Cotton	Kilburn	Rodino
Crawford	Kunkel	Rogers, Mass.
Curtis	LeFevre	Saylor
Davis, Wis.	Lovre	Scott,
Dollinger	McConnell	Hugh D., Jr.
Dondero	McCulloch	Scrivner
Douglas	McDonough	Scudder
Doyle	McGrath	Secrest
Ellsworth	McKinnon	Shafer
Engle, Calif.	Mack, Wash.	Shelley
Fellows	Macy	Short
Ford	Madden	Smith, Wis.
Fulton	Mahon	Stockman
Gamble	Mansfield	Taber
Goodwin	Martin, Mass.	Tauriello
Gorski	Mason	Tollefson
Graham	Merrow	Van Zandt
Gwinn	Meyer	Velde
Hagen	Michener	Vorys
Hale	Miller, Calif.	Wagner
Hall,	Miller, Md.	Weichel
Leonard W.	Mitchell	Werdel
Halleck	Multer	White, Calif.
Harden	Murdock	Wickersham
Havenner	Nicholson	Wigglesworth
Herter	Nixon	Wolcott
Heselton	O'Hara, Minn.	Wolverton
Hoffman, Mich.	O'Konski	

NAYS—179

Abbitt	Feighan	Mills
Abernethy	Fernandez	Monroney
Albert	Fisher	Morris
Andersen,	Flood	Noland
H. Carl	Fugate	O'Brien, Ill.
Andresen,	Garmatz	O'Hara, Ill.
August H.	Gary	O'Sullivan
Andrews	Gathings	O'Toole
Aspinall	Gossett	Pace
Barden	Granahan	Passman
Bates, Ky.	Grant	Patman
Battle	Green	Peterson
Beckworth	Gregory	Philbin
Bennett, Fla.	Gross	Pickett
Blatnik	Guill	Poage
Bolling	Hardy	Polk
Bolton, Md.	Harrison	Preston
Bonner	Hart	Price
Bosone	Hays, Ark.	Rabaut
Boykin	Heffernan	Rains
Brooks	Herlong	Rankin
Brown, Ga.	Hill	Regan
Bryson	Hobbs	Rhodes
Buchanan	Hoeven	Richards
Buckley, Ill.	Holifield	Rivers
Buckley, N. Y.	Holmes	Rogers, Fla.
Burdick	Hope	Rooney
Burleson	Howell	Roosevelt
Burton	Hull	Sasscer
Byrne, N. Y.	Jacobs	Sikes
Cannon	Jones, Ala.	Simpson, Ill.
Carlyle	Jones, Mo.	Sims
Carroll	Jones, N. C.	Smathers
Cavalcante	Karsten	Smith, Va.
Celler	Kearns	Spence
Chatham	Kelly, N. Y.	Steed
Chelf	Kennedy	Stefan
Chesney	Kerr	Stigler
Chudoff	Kilday	Sullivan
Clemente	King	Tackett
Cole, Kans.	Kirwan	Talle
Colmer	Kruse	Teague
Combs	Lanham	Thomas
Cooley	Larcade	Thompson
Cox	LeCompte	Thornberry
Crook	Lind	Trimble
Crosser	Linehan	Walsh
Cunningham	Lucas	Walter
Dague	Lyle	Wheeler
Davies, N. Y.	Lynch	Whitten
Davis, Ga.	McCormack	Whittington
Deane	McGuire	Wier
DeGraffenried	McMillan, S. C.	Williams
Delaney	McSweeney	Wilson, Ind.
Denton	Mack, Ill.	Wilson, Okla.
D'Ewart	Magee	Wilson, Tex.
Donohue	Marcantonio	Withrow
Doughton	Marsalis	Wood
Durham	Marshall	Yates
Elliott	Martin, Iowa	
Fallon	Miles	

NOT VOTING—131

Allen, La.	Hand	Patterson
Anderson, Calif.	Hare	Perkins
Bailey	Harris	Pfeifer,
Barrett, Pa.	Harvey	Joseph L.
Barrett, Wyo.	Hays, Ohio	Pfeiffer,
Beall	Hébert	William L.
Blackney	Hedrick	Phillips, Tenn.
Boggs, La.	Heller	Plumley
Bolton, Ohio	Hinshaw	Powell
Breen	Hoffman, Ill.	Priest
Brehm	Huber	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Irving	Ramsay
Burke	James	Redden
Burnside	Jennings	Rees
Camp	Johnson	Robeson
Carnahan	Jonas	Sabath
Case, N. J.	Karst	Sadlak
Chiperfield	Kean	Sadowski
Christopher	Kearney	St. George
Cooper	Kee	Sanborn
Coudert	Keefe	Scott, Hardie
Davenport	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson	Klein	Smith, Kans.
Dingell	Lane	Smith, Ohio
Dolliver	Latham	Staggers
Eaton	Lichtenwalter	Stanley
Eberharter	Lodge	Sutton
Elston	McCarthy	Taylor
Engel, Mich.	McGregor	Towe
Evins	McMillen, Ill.	Underwood
Fenton	Miller, Nebr.	Vinson
Fogarty	Morgan	Vursell
Forand	Morrison	Wadsworth
Frazier	Morton	Welch
Furcolo	Moulder	Whitaker
Gavin	Murphy	White, Idaho
Gillette	Murray, Tenn.	Widnall
Gilmer	Murray, Wis.	Willis
Golden	Nelson	Winstead
Gordon	Norblad	Woodhouse
Gore	Norrell	Woodruff
Granger	Norton	Young
Hall,	O'Brien, Mich.	Zablocki
Edwin Arthur	O'Neill	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

In this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Stanley against.

Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Miller of Nebraska against.

Mr. Case of New Jersey for, with Mr. Evins against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Golden against.

Mr. William L. Pfeiffer for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mrs. Woodhouse against.

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Priest against.

Mr. James for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Heller against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Cooper against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Young against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Frazier against.

Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Burke against.

Mr. Johnson for, with Mr. Karst against.

Mr. Patterson for, with Mr. Perkins against.

Mr. Sadlak for, with Mr. Redden against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Davenport with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Rees.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Huber with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.

Mr. Irving with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Dolliver.

Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Forand with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.

Mr. Breen with Mr. Harvey.

Messrs. HALE, BENTSEN, MAHON, JUDD, ANGELL, AUCHINCLOSS, and WOLVERTON changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair just counted 297 Members. A quorum is present.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 160, noes 85.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct section numbers.

There was no objection.

WHERE ARE WE? WHY? WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if Good Old Joe's purpose—President Truman's characterization—is a desire to establish communism throughout the world, we are now in world war III, a war declared by the United Nations, not by your Congress.

Assuming, as we may, that the North Korean Communists' attack on the Republic of South Korea was instigated, and is carried on, by order of Stalin, there is reason to believe that he will, when he deems it expedient, bring about similar attacks in Indochina, Greece, Turkey, Yugoslavia, and in Germany. It is more than probable that these attacks

will be first made, not by Russian soldiers, but by the troops of Stalin's satellite governments.

In Germany, undoubtedly he will use the large, well-trained, well-equipped army which he has created under the guise of establishing a police force in Eastern Germany. That force will be strengthened by the Red armies of countries whose governments Stalin controls.

Where are we? Fighting the first battles of world war III.

Why are we in world war III?

Because, after our armed forces and those of our allies had beaten Hitler's armies and our fighting men, without Russia's help, had beaten Japan, those in authority, not desiring to offend Stalin, ordered our soldiers to stay out of Berlin and Eastern Germany; gave to Russia jurisdiction over a large part of China; authority over several hundred million people in Asia. Because of the fears of France and Britain, we adopted the Morgenthau plan, which prevented the German people from becoming self-sustaining, rebuilding their nation as a barrier against Russian aggression; gave Russia part of Berlin, control over eastern Germany and the opportunity to establish communism there and in the adjoining countries. We aided Russia in taking Manchuria, establishing there a Communist army of around a million men. It now threatens Korea.

Our contributions of dollars and material and our concessions to, and appeasement of, Joe Stalin made him so powerful that now he has brought on world war III and actually threatens our national security, either through direct armed force, or by entrapment into wars on so world-wide a front as to exhaust us.

The program of the internationalists may result in the end of our Republic, the enslavement of our pepole; the imposition upon us of the obligation to furnish the armies and the munitions necessary to carry on from generation to generation wars which they deem expedient, either for world peace or for the fulfillment of their own plans or ambitions.

Where do we go from here?

That question cannot be answered by anyone until we know what the administration, that is, Mr. Truman, intends to do.

Secretary of State Acheson, who has been so friendly to, so afraid of offending, Stalin, while stating that, for our own security, we must and would "maintain armed forces in Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines," said on January 12, 1950, that it would be "a foolish adventure" to attempt to defend Formosa.

He made it absolutely clear to the Russions that, so far as he was concerned—and presumably he was outlining our foreign policy—we would defend neither Formosa nor Korea.

When, on May 5, 1950, Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, was asked whether we were seriously considering abandoning South Korea, he said, "I am afraid it is going to happen, whether we want it or not," and he added that Korea was not "greatly important."

Yet, when the Communists of North Korea, reinforced and directed by the Russian Communists who came to power in Manchuria under a policy established by Acheson and others, invaded South Korea, Mr. Truman, without consulting Congress, at the request of the Security Council of the United Nations, without authority declared war.

Mr. Truman had no such power. On October 29, 1945, Dean Acheson asked the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the President be given a free hand in ordering the use of our troops whenever United Nations Security Council so voted. But the Senate rejected the proposal.

Public Law 264, which was approved December 20, 1945, expressly provided that, before placing any troops at the disposal of United Nations, the President must obtain the approval of Congress.

The only modification of that law was the amendment of October 10, 1949, which authorized the President to assign no more than 1,000 Americans to United Nations to serve strictly in a "non-combatant capacity."

Nor can Mr. Truman justify his actions under the North Atlantic Treaty. Article 5 reads:

> The parties agreed that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered as an attack against them all.

Korea is in neither.

How can anyone stand behind a President, as we are being asked to do, when we do not know from day to day where he stands nor what he intends to do next?

As your Congressman here in Washington, the only things that I know the President is certain about is that he wants more money to carry on the war effort—and that he will get; he wants additional billions for his socialization program, more power to use arbitrarily for his own and his party's political advancement. Oh yes; one thing more he wants—a subservient "rubber stamp" Congress.

Mr. Truman is in clear over his head. The Congress, particularly the Senate, should take him in hand, outline a foreign and a domestic policy which has as its objective the welfare of this country; then, regardless of the advice of the Achesons, see that the administration adheres to that policy.

Where do we go from here? Like many others who will not admit it, I know little, if anything, about military science or world affairs. But is it permissible to inquire whether, instead of carrying on, for 5 or 10 or more years, a war all over the world and by so doing completely exhaust ourselves, destroying our ability to defend ourselves here at home, assuming that Joe Stalin and the Communists intend to destroy us and world civilization—if our air offensive is what we have been told it is; if the atomic bomb is as powerful as we have been led to believe, we should not, without delay, use both on Stalin, in Russia, where it will hurt the most, and bring peace?

Cruel and murderous, do I hear you say? Yes. But when was war anything but just that? How many times have we been told by those in authority that Stalin intends to bomb us when he has the ability? Why sit around, waiting for him to destroy us? Would you rather have our wounded, with their hands tied behind them, when captured, shot? Would you rather have your boys prisoners of war, made the slaves of barbarous Korean, Chinese, or Russian Communists in Siberia?

War is hell. I have done my best to keep our Nation out of it, but the more decisively and the sooner it is ended, the quicker will peace come to us and to the world.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SYSTEM OF PRIORITIES, ALLOCATIONS, AND REQUISITION OF MATERIALS AND FACILITIES

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 740, Rept. No. 2763), 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. 9176) to establish a system of priorities and allocations for materials and facilities, authorize the requisitioning thereof, provide financial assistance for expansion of productive capacity and supply, strengthen controls over credit, regulate speculation on commodity exchanges, and by these measures facilitate the production of goods and services necessary for the national security, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. 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, with or without instructions.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 741, Rept. No. 2764), 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. 9129) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 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 Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 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.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN MAJOR DISASTERS

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 742, Rept. No. 2765), 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. 8396) to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, 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 Public Works, 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.

FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 249, relating to the enrollment of H. R. 6533.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 6533) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed to strike out paragraph (c) of section 2 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) the formulation and adoption of plans of restocking waters with food and game fishes according to natural areas or districts to which such plans are applicable, together with the acquisition of such facts as are necessary to the formulation, execution, and testing the efficacy of such plans;".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEXANDER STEWART

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1991) for the relief of Alexander Stewart, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after "alien", insert "which are based upon the same facts upon which such warrants or orders were issued."

Page 1, line 12, after "1947" insert "upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM B. BUOL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2225) for the relief of William B. Buol, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, after "States", insert ", upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN MICHAEL ANCKER RASMUSSEN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3464) to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of alien John Michael Ancker Rasmussen, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after "laws", insert "upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who is the recipient of the payment?

Mr. WALTER. These are amendments made necessary because the fiancées have become brides since the House passed the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUK ONN WON

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3805) for the relief of Yuk Onn Won, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 9, after "natural-born", insert: "alien."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. FERDINANDO SCHIAPPA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4188) for the relief of Dr. Ferdinando Schiappa, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 4, after "tax", insert "and visa fee."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. FRANCESCO DRAGO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4806) for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 4, after "tax", insert "and visa fee."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VIRGINIA DALLA ROSA PRATI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5016) for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Dalla Rosa Prati and her minor son, Rolando Dalla Rosa Prati, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Virginia Dalla Rosa Prati and her minor son, Rolando Dalla Rosa Prati, shall be held and considered to be lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entries into the United States upon payment of the required head taxes and visa fees. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. AGOSTINO DELISI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5566) for the relief of Dr. Agostino DeLisi, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "June 26, 1948" and insert "June 27, 1948."

Line 7, after "residence", insert "upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHENG SICK YUEN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6066) for the relief of Cheng Sick Yuen, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Cheng Sick Yuen, the minor adopted child of Keung Jack Cheng, a citizen of the United States, shall be considered as eligible for admission to the United States under the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred it.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUN YIP CHIN AND CHUNG LUM

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6173) for the relief of Sun Yip Chin and Chung Lum, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Sun Yip Chin and Chung Lum (Lum Chung), the minor children of Lan Bow Chin and Lee Lum (Lum Lee), respectively, who are citizens of the United States and honorably discharged veterans of World War II, shall be deemed to be eligible for admission into the United States under the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AIMEE HOYNINGEN-HUENE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6225) for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Hoyningen-Huene, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "1947" and insert "1946."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JIRINA ZIZKOVSKY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6461) for the relief of Jirina Zizkovsky, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 7, after "date" insert "upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee."

Strike out lines 8, 9, and 10 and insert:

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DAVID MUNSON OSBORNE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6505) to legalize the entry of Mrs. David Munson Osborne (nee Janet Mary Tole), a native of New Zealand, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, after "York", insert "upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUBY THAW AND HLA SEIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6758) for the relief of Ruby Thaw and Hla Sein, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 8, after "Massachusetts", insert ", upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MASA IYOKI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7071) for the relief of Mrs. Masa Iyoki, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 9, after "citizen.", insert "If otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, Mrs. Masa Iyoki shall be held and considered to be a returning resident under the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KAZUKO KAMADA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7228) for the relief of Kazuko Kamada, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause down to and including "Force:" in line 11 and insert: "That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Kazuko Kama, the Japanese fiancée of Sgt. Ralph S. Merithew, and that the said Kazuko Kamada may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months:".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARTHA APORTA STRICKLAND

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7812) for the relief of Martha Aporta Strickland, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YOSHIKO EMORY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8117) for the relief of Yoshiko Emory, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 9, strike out all after "veteran," down to and including "residence" in line 11 and insert: "and that the said Yoshiko Emory may be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ALESANDRO RIZZO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8245) for the relief of Dr. Alesandro Rizzo, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, after "States", insert: "upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOAE KAWASHIMA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8440) for the relief of Noae Kawashima, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Noae", and insert "Naoe."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Noae", and insert "Naoe."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Naoe Kawashima."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOSHIKO KIKYO AND FRANCIS KIKYO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8655) for the relief of Toshiko Kikyo and Francis Kikyo, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 15 and 16 and insert "them as of the date of their last entry into the United States upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. Con. Res. 181) favoring the granting of status of permanent residence to certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, after line 9, insert:
"[redacted], Forostyna, Lidia Maria."
Page 1, after line 9, insert:
"[redacted], Fortunescu, Radu Constantine."
Page 1, after line 13, insert:
"[redacted], Gyarfas, John Erving."
Page 1, after line 13, insert:
"[redacted], Hasek, Joseph Karel, alias Joseph Karel Jisa."
Page 2, after line 3, insert:
"[redacted], Lazlo, Ervin."
Page 2, after line 3, insert:
"[redacted], Lazlo, Mary."
Page 2, after line 4, insert:
"[redacted], Marinescu, Mihail, or Mihai Z. Marinescu."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KOREAN LEGISLATION

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our fighting forces in Korea I have introduced two bills which I hope will be acted upon without delay. Both bills extend the authority of the War Claims Commission to cover our current struggle to contain the totalitarian army of North Korea. One bill would authorize the War Claims Commission to award up to $10,000 to the widow, children or parents of a member of our Armed Forces who, as a prisoner of war, was illegally killed by the Government of North Korea. Newspaper reports attest daily to the cruel treatment handed out to our soldiers when they are captured by the North Koreans. While we hope and pray that our enemy will soon subscribe to the rules of warfare, we must, nevertheless, do something for our boys and their families under these ruthless practices. The second bill I have introduced will amend the War Claims Act of 1948 by authorizing the Commission to compensate prisoners of war held by the North Koreans and any of our soldiers hiding in Korea to avoid capture by the North Koreans.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow noon the Speaker be authorized to sign the enrolled bill H. R. 7273, to provide a civil government for Guam, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. EVELYN M. HRYNIAK

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2655) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2749)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2655) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak, 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 disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum passed by the House insert *$6,250*; and the House agree to the same.

WILLIAM T. BYRNE,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the Senate appropriated the sum of $7,500 to Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak for personal injuries, pain and suffering, permanent disability, and loss of earnings sustained by her and arising out of an accident which occurred at Gudensberg, Germany, on October 21, 1948. The bill was reduced by the House to $5,000 and at the conference the sum of $6,250 was agreed upon.

WILLIAM T. BYRNE,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GLADYS J. SENYOHL McCARTHY

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2234) for the relief of Mrs. Gladys J. Senyohl McCarthy, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BYRNE of New York, DENTON, and KEATING.

LOUIS J. MARX

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4528) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Louis J. Marx, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, notwithstanding the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 2680, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Louis J. Marx, New York, N. Y., against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained allegedly as a result of an assault by a soldier in the United States Army.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claim may be instituted within any time of 1 year of the enactment of this act. In any such suit brought pursuant to this act proceedings shall be had and the liability, if any, of the United States shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of tort claims against the United States (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 1346 (b)): *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act does or shall constitute an admission of liability on the part of the United States."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Louis J. Marx."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN G. ESSENBERG

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4628) for the relief of John G. Essenberg, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to John G. Essenberg, of 436 Sixty-eighth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of his personal injury in an accident, involving a United States Army truck, which occurred on the West Side Elevated Highway between Forty-ninth and Fiftieth Streets, New York, N. Y., on March 20, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATUXENT DEVELOPMENT CO., INC.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6363) conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Patuxent Development Co., Inc., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Patuxent Development Co., Inc., of Southern Pines, N. C., against the United States for damages, if any, sustained by reason of the allegedly tortious use and occupancy between August 17, 1943, and August 31, 1943, inclusive, of the Pine Needles Hotel property, at Southern Pines, N. C., by the Army Air Forces Technical Training Command under contract No. W202 eng-16862, dated March 3, 1942.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act. In any such suit brought pursuant to this act proceedings shall be had and liability, if any, of the United States shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of tort claims against the United States (28 U. S. C., sec. 1346): *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act does or shall constitute an admission of liability on the part of the United States."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. ROY E. BEVEL

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6458) for the relief of Maj. Roy E. Bevel, with a Senate amendment there-

to, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out all after "pay." over to and including "paid." on page 2, line 3.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN THE FISCAL YEAR WHICH ENDED LAST MONTH SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JOHNSON DID MANAGE TO MOVE $2,000,000,000 FROM THE REAR ECHELONS TO FRONT LINE SERVICE AND COMBAT—HE DID THIS BY SEEMINGLY TRIVIAL REFORM—HOLMES ALEXANDER

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two statements.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, again I wish to tell of the innumerable calls, letters, and telegrams that I have received with respect to the statement in which I told of the magnificent job that Louis Johnson is doing and has done since the very day upon which he became the Secretary of Defense.

This morning's mail brought to me a copy of a special article written by one of America's most conservative, and certainly one of our best nationally known columnists, Mr. Holmes Alexander. This article, headed "The Washington Scene," clipped from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram—makes it crystal clear that Mr. Alexander did not jump at any conclusions at which he arrived, but as he himself wrote:

He has spent some time and considerable shoe leather in digging up the facts.

As usual, Holmes Alexander is totally disinterested and unbiased, impartial, and so palpably fair in giving credit where credit is due that it is for me as great a pleasure as I deem it a privilege and duty to direct it to the attention of my colleagues in this House.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last our Secretary of Defense appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee and there made a statement of tremendous current interest, not alone to the Members of both Houses of Congress, but to every citizen in these United States, and particularly to the men, the families, and the friends of those in the forces now fighting to their death in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, because of that interest and the further fact that this statement will not be printed in the hearings of the Senate Appropriations Committee and thus become available for distribution for some weeks to come, I ask unanimous consent to insert the same into the RECORD.

What follows, Mr. Speaker, is the column of July 26, the Washington Scene, as written by Holmes Alexander and clipped from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram together with a statement made that same day by the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

THE WASHINGTON SCENE

(By Holmes Alexander)

THE MILITARY DOLLAR

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 26.—There are no neutrals in the war of Louis Johnson, now raging over the cocktails and inkpots of this stirred-up Capital.

Ranged against the Secretary of Defense are some who held great personal affection for the late James Forrestal, whom Johnson replaced; some who were disemployed or "discombobulated" by Johnson's economy wave which engulfed over 170,000 useless civilian workers, and some who believe the locker-room rumor that Johnson has beached the Navy, dissolved the Marine Corps, grounded the Air Force, and depopulated the Army.

On Johnson's side are his personal friends and a discouragingly small number of thoughtful persons who know what the Secretary is trying to do. Since I intend to support the Secretary in this column, I admit to liking him personally and to have spent some time and shoe leather in digging up facts. I frankly embrace the theory that Johnson, regardless of his ambitions and heavy-handed methods, has greatly improved the country's ability to fight world war III and to live under the long-term war economy which now seems to be our fate.

No amount of rhetoric, of course, will prove these points, but I shall soon give some case histories for that purpose. In broad terms, Johnson has created a climate of economy among the services, causing Federal dollars to go much further than in the past. This will not seem important to those who assume that Federal dollars are limitless or that desk-borne generals and admirals shouldn't be forced to pinch pennies. But in the fiscal year which ended last month Johnson did manage to move $2,000,000,000 from the rear echelons to front-line service and combat. He did this by seemingly trivial reforms, such as:

EVERY MAN HIS OWN SHIRT

In the Army and Air Force, the enlisted personnel used to turn in worn-out clothing and draw new garments. Now all three services are under the Navy system which gives cash allowance for clothing. The money incentive has made the men's clothes last a lot longer, and in 1951 the Army and Air Force will have a purse of $140,000,000 to spend on other items, presumably battlefield hardware.

BACK TO THE FLIGHT LINE

Until recently the Air Force assigned 150 men and 72 vehicles to the cops-and-robbers game of apprehending stragglers and deserters. At the suggestion of Johnson's office this job is now done by the FBI and local cops. The personnel (equivalent to more than a dozen heavy bomber crews) and the machines (enough to serve a wartime squadron) have been assigned to more essential duties.

LESS SHIPS, MORE MEN

For many years the Navy has conducted reservists sea training in a flotilla of small craft. By moving the trainees to fewer but larger vessels, as suggested by the Secretary's management committee, the Navy increased the training capacity from 36,000 to 46,000 reservists a year—and also saved $2,000,000 per annum to spend elsewhere. Navy aviation, by grounding some desk officers and cutting nonessential skylarking, got an additional 700,000 hours of combat-training time out of its planes.

GET IT FOR YOU WHOLESALE

All three armed services were separately converting their communications to ultra high frequency waves when Johnson's office brought everybody in for consultation. By revising the specifications and pooling the orders, each service purchased 2 years of radio supplies with a 1-year budget.

All such savings must become visible on paper before they become tangible in the battlefield. Contrary to much misinformation on the subject, none of the money saved goes back into the Treasury. All of it gets to the battle area.

In terms of the 1951 budget, still before Congress at this writing, the Navy traded its savings for three attack carriers, three carrier air groups, one cruiser, four marine fighter squadrons, and six marine battalions. The Army got an extra division and $51,000,000 worth of heavy material, largely artillery and engineering equipment, now very useful in Korea.

These are only a fistful of examples, but they show the pattern of what Johnson is trying to do. Largely because of his 16-month concern with pinch-penny details, the Federal dollar will buy us more front-line fighting than ever before. That's something to think about in a nation that may be under arms for a generation to come.

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE LOUIS JOHNSON BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, JULY 26, 1950

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the last time I appeared before this committee was April 26, 2 months before the Republic of Korea was invaded. At that time I said:

"The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, as a working committee of the National Security Council * * * have also appraised recent events which make it entirely possible that appropriations in excess of those which have been requested for the current year will be required in succeeding years, not only for our own military forces but also for the military aid program. Just as it is possible that in future years this Nation will have to devote an increased percentage of its total budget to these items, it is also possible that our partners in the North Atlantic Pact will be required by the force of events, and by the force of collective planning as well, to take similar action. The events to which I allude include the Soviet atomic explosion, the fall of China, the serious situations in southeast Asia, the break in diplomatic relations with Bulgaria, and deteriorating relations with other satellite countries, the Soviet assumption of control over the armed forces of Poland, Soviet naval expansion, the increased Soviet pressures in Germany, the recent attack on a naval aircraft in the Baltic, and the recent Soviet demands relative to Trieste.

"None of this presents a happy prospect; but the cold war is not a happy circumstance. The only satisfaction that I can personally derive from the situation lies in the fact that our own Military Establishment is well on the road to becoming a stronger and more powerful organization, and one which, as circumstances require, can utilize increased appropriations in a manner which will provide substantially increased combat effectiveness, whereas, even as recently as 1 year ago, large sums of money out of any

increased appropriations would have been drained off in the form of unnecessary overhead. It is particularly important that the Armed Forces maintained by the United States shall at all times provide a sound base on which can be built a military establishment of increased size, should circumstances so require."

Gentlemen, circumstances do so require. That is my reason for being here today, in support of supplemental appropriations in the amount of $10,500,000,000.

I know that all of you are familiar with the contents of President Truman's message of last Wednesday. That document presents, better than anything I might say, the reasons for our request for this supplemental appropriation. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, the Honorable CARL VINSON, said of the President's message that it was a "firm message which will be heartening to all Americans." In making this statement, Chairman VINSON added:

"I want especially to say that I am delighted to know, from the President's message and from my own contacts with the Defense Department, that what has been recommended has the complete and unstinted support of all the civilian and military leaders of the Defense Department. This is a splendid example of teamwork and efficiency in the Defense Department."

I am extremely grateful to Chairman VINSON for his generous support. It is entirely accurate to state that this supplemental appropriation has the unanimous approval and support of the civilian and military leaders of the Department of Defense.

The appropriation problems with which this committee, the Congress, and the Department of Defense have had to deal in recent months have not been easy ones. I know of no better summation of these problems than the one which Chairman GEORGE MAHON of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee made on the floor of the House in support of that committee's recommended budget for 1950. You will recall that on that occasion, Chairman MAHON said: "If war comes soon, we are appropriating too little. If we have miscalculated the dangers, if the threat of war is just a deceptive mirage on the horizon, we are appropriating too much."

The dilemma described by Chairman MAHON was a dilemma which confronted not only this committee and the Department of Defense, but also the President and the people of the United States. It was not a new dilemma. My predecessor as Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal, outlined this dilemma very aptly in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 21, 1948, about a year prior to the time that I became Secretary of Defense on March 28, 1949. On that occasion, Secretary Forrestal quoted the following excerpt from a memorandum he had received from the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

"Based solely on military considerations, it is the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the administration should advocate a balanced Military Establishment commensurate with the 70-air-group program for the Air Force. * * * The Joint Chiefs of Staff recognize, however, that the phasing (of this balanced Army, Navy, and Air Force program) must be made responsive to such other factors as the capability of the aircraft industry to expand, the impact of the cost of the program on the national economy, and the calculated risk which can be accepted in the light of changing world politico-military situations."

After quoting the foregoing memorandum from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Secretary Forrestal then went on to make the following statement:

"I think that I can say to you, therefore, that the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force—as well as the Senate and House of Representatives, I feel sure—are all in agreement, as a military matter, on the desirability of what the Joint Chiefs have described as a balanced Military Establishment commensurate with the 70-air-group program.

"The Joint Chiefs * * * have also reported to me that a force of the recommended size would require, in fiscal 1949, additional appropriations in excess of $9,000,000,000. * * *

"In my opinion, the Joint Chiefs were entirely correct in addressing themselves exclusively to the military considerations. That is their job. But they were equally correct in pointing out that other considerations—the impact of the cost of the program on the national economy, for example—are factors which the Pesident and the Congress must consider.

"The impact on the economy of an additional $9,000,000,000 program is a matter that deserves—and will, I am sure, receive—the most careful attention by both the President and the Congress.

"My insistence, throughout the consideration of these matters, has been that they must be considered in a rational and organized manner—and not on a basis of emotional reaction. * * *

"If the Congress and the President should ultimately decide that the military considerations, at this juncture in world history, outweigh the fiscal considerations then we should, by all means, embark on the $9,000,000,000 additional program. But if the Congress and the President should ultimately decide that a program of somewhat lesser magnitude is required—in the interest of national solvency and in the interest of avoiding, so far as possible, allocations, rationing, price controls, and a host of other restrictions—then we should proceed in such a manner that we will get the most national security for each dollar we spend. * * *

"Bearing in mind over-all considerations such as those I have just been discussing, and after receiving the Joint Chiefs' $9,000,000,000 recommendation of April 14, 1948, I asked the Joint Chiefs this supplementary question: Granted the military desirability of the $9,000,000,000 program, what program would the Joint Chiefs recommend—in the general vicinity of $3,000,000,000—as the most effective military program within the limits of the funds that will probably be available to us?

"Yesterday, I received the unanimous reply of the Joint Chiefs—and I again emphasize the unanimity of the reply. Their specific recommendation—on the more limited basis envisioned by my more recent question—was that the $3,000,000,000 program should be increased by $481,000,000. * * *

"The program I am here discussing, therefore, is a program which would increase the original 1949 budget request by $3,481,000,000."

The $3,481,000,000 which Secretary Forrestal recommended, when added to the 1949 budget as originally submitted, gave a total recommended military budget of $13,507,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949. In other words, the dilemma presented by the competing military and economic considerations was resolved at the $13,500,000,000 level.

The President, his advisers in the executive branch of the Government, and the Congress solved the dilemma at that time by deciding that the fiscal considerations were equally as important as the military. The substance of that decision has been repeatedly ratified by the President, his advisers in the executive branch of the Government, and the Congress, all of whom reflected the will of the people of the United States.

At the outset of my remarks today, I quoted from my testimony of April 26. You will recall that my concluding remarks on April 26 dealt with the same dilemma I have just been discussing. On that occasion, I said:

"This year's budget for the Military Establishment, with very little variation, has received the approval of the Executive Office of the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, and other responsible persons such as General Eisenhower. In other words, there has been substantial unanimity of opinion on a vital point—namely, the fact that the world in which we live requires military expenditures of approximately the amount which the President submitted to the Congress last January. Consider for a moment how unusual it is to find that all of the responsible authorities who have spoken to this subject have been in complete agreement on more than 95 percent of the military budget. The House Appropriations Committee has suggested some reductions; General Eisenhower has suggested the possibility of some increases. But even taking the maximum of these suggestions—both on the minus and on the plus side—there has been no suggested variation which would affect the military budget in an amount greater than 4 percent. I call this fact to your attention * * * because I think that it constitutes the best argument that I could possibly present as to the fundamental soundness of the budget."

One month ago the Republic of Korea was invaded. The action of the United Nations, supported by the United States, called for the use of troops, ships, and aircraft to repel this criminal aggression which threatened the peace of the world and the security of our own country. In the light of the actual fighting that is now in progress, we have reached the point where the military considerations clearly outweigh the fiscal considerations.

However, in our efforts to get the most efficient use of our military appropriations we have not had to deal with the same sort of competing considerations as those I have just been discussing. For all of us were equally determined to get maximum preparedness out of every dollar appropriated—and this determination to get the maximum return on the defense dollar will continue to govern our actions.

In enacting the National Security Act amendments of 1949, the Congress added language specifically addressed to this point, and required the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Congress, twice each year, "itemized statements showing the savings of public funds and the eliminations of unnecessary duplications and overlappings that have been accomplished pursuant to the provisions of this act."

Carrying out this congressional mandate has been the steadfast policy of the Department of Defense, and a prime condition of our efforts in this regard has been the elimination of unnecessary overhead, with a simultaneous improvement in the combat potential of the Armed Forces. Indeed, the over-all combat potential of our Armed Forces was at a higher level on June 25—the day the Republic of Korea was invaded—than had been the case at any time since postwar demobilization was completed.

I realize that the foregoing sentence could be regarded as a fine, glittering generality, so I would like to make it concrete. For that purpose, I will use specific illustrations.

In the case of the Navy, what the fleet is doing today would not have been possible 2 years ago. In March of 1948, just after the Communists staged a coup in Czechoslovakia, Secretary of Defense Forrestal was gravely concerned about the readiness of the active fleet. In a memorandum which he received on March 23, 1948, the following significant statement appears: "As of 22 March, there are 111 vessels of the active fleet immobilized and 66 reduced to limited operations (or a total of 177) by insufficient personnel. * * * In addition, most of the operating active fleet vessels are under peacetime allowance."

The situation was one of the factors which led Secretary Forrestal to request the supplemental appropriation of $3,481,000,000, which I have already discussed above. This situation was also one of the factors which has led the Department of Defense to advocate a greater fighting strength for each ship, even at the expense of reducing the total number of ships in the active fleet. The ships we need are ships that can float and fight. A ship that only floats is a liability instead of an asset. On June 25, when the Republic of Korea was invaded, every ship in the active fleet was capable of getting underway and moving into action. Off the shores of Korea, we are being provided with daily illustrations of the readiness of the ships in our active fleet.

In the semi-annual report which I recently submitted to the Congress, I discussed the general situation I have been describing above in these words:

"Over-all, the readiness of the Navy has been improved and the active fleet is 'ready to go'. It is manned at 67 percent of wartime strength with trained personnel who seek to make a career of the Navy. This represents a substantial improvement over the situation 18 months ago when a larger active fleet in number of men and ships was manned at only 61 percent of wartime strength with many of the ships either immobilized or in a reduced operational status because of heavy turnover of personnel and a serious imbalance in the skills and occupations represented."

In the case of the Air Force, there has been a substantial increase in our actual combat potential. In chapter IV of the semi-annual report which I submitted to Congress last February, I discussed this point in the following words:

"It is worth noting that on January 1, 1948, the Finletter Commission recommended 70 groups manned by 401,000 men. On that date the report also noted that the Air Force stood at 337,000 men for 55 programed groups. * * *

"The size of a 'group' is subject to change. As President Truman has pointed out, 'The number of groups is a somewhat misleading measure of airpower since the character, size, number of aircraft, and other elements of the group are not fixed but constantly change as conditions require'. An example of the type of change to which the President referred is the programed size of each B–36 heavy bombardment group—which stood at 18 planes per group less than a year ago, and which stands at 30 planes per group today. In this connection it should also be noted that the programed size of nine groups which stood at 30 B–29's or B–50's per group 2 years ago, stand at 45 today. In addition, these groups include 20 B–29 type tankers which increase the effective range of each individual bomber.

"In our Air Force of today and as planned for 1951, we have 416,000 men manning 48 groups, but due to the organizational changes noted above, these 48 groups according to Air Force estimates, are equivalent to 52½ groups of the size envisaged in the previous concept of the 70 group program."

I should also like to comment briefly on the situation with respect to the Army. In March of 1948, the Army's strength was 542,000. The Army's budgeted strength for the current fiscal year was 630,000, prior to the supplemental request which the President submitted to Congress yesterday. In addition to this increase in numbers, there has been a further increase arising out of the fact that proportionately more men are now in combat units, and proportionately less men are in noncombat categories. In my seminannual report, I pointed out that "this increase in combat effectiveness was made possible by savings in the use of undue numbers of personnel for administrative and overhead purposes". Between March 1948 and June 1950 the actual manpower strength of the Army's mobile striking force in the continental United States—the general Reserve—has increased by 165 percent.

As this committee knows, all of the top officials of the Department of Defense—both civilian and military—have been seriously concerned lest even the increased strengths I have been describing should be inadequate to meet the needs of world conditions. In order to do everything possible to meet this situation, we set up a Defense Department Management Committee, immediately after the enactment of the National Security Act amendments of 1949. To assist this committee in carrying out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission with respect to the Department of Defense, we employed the management engineering firm of Robert Heller and Associates. The first paragraph of the directive of the management committee reads as follows: "Pursuant to the authority vested in me by the National Security Act of 1947 as amended, I have established a Defense Management Committee. The mission of the committee is to bring about progressively better use of defense dollars through elimination of nonessential expenditures, and through improved management, in order to release funds for increasing combat effectiveness, and to provide opportunities to curtail over-all costs."

The expanded program which the President submitted to Congress Monday makes it all the more necessary that we obtain the maximum return for every dollar that we are investing in our national defense. This gives added point to a matter I mentioned here on April 26, when I said: "Our mobilization in time of emergency depends for its success upon the soundness of the forces in being which constitute our mobilization base".

The forces in being which make up our Army, Navy, and Air Force constitute a sound base. To that base, we recommend that you now add a total active duty strength in the neighborhood of 600,000 men—making a total of some 2,100,000 men.

Earlier this year this committee considered requests for a program covering all activities of the Department of Defense, approximating $13,300,000,000. Monday the President submitted a supplemental estimate in the amount of $10,500,000,000. The recommended revised budget, in the aggregate amount of $23,800,000,000, would accomplish the purpose of financing the costs of the Korean campaign, as well as providing for the earlier expansion of the military forces to cope with the present international situation.

The supplemental estimate includes $3,063,000,000 for the Army, $2,649,000,000 for the Navy, $4,535,000,000 for the Air Force, and $240,000,000 for establishment-wide activities of the Defense Department.

About 59 percent of the supplemental request, or $6,200,000,000, has been included for guns, tanks, ships, aircraft, ammunition, and other major procurement items. (Of this total about $3,344,000,000 is for aircraft—$40,000,000 for the Army, $620,000,000 for the Navy, $2,684,000,000 for the Air Force—and $185,000,000 is for shipbuilding.)

About 24 percent, or $2,500,000,000, would go for the operaiton and maintenance of the facilities and equipment for the regular operations of the Armed Forces, including the sharply increased demands for consumption-type matériel in the Korean campaign. (About one-half of the $2,500,000,000 would go for consumption-type matériel.)

About 13 percent, or $1,350,000,000 would go for the pay and allowances of military personnel, including their food, subsistence, and travel.

Of the balance, $174,000,000 is for military construction—$4,000,000 for the Army and $170,000,000 for the Air Force.

Exclusive of costs for Guardsmen and Reserves on active duty, $33,000,000 has been provided for the National Guard, Officers Reserve Corps, and the ROTC program of the Army.

One hundred and twenty million dollars has been included for research and development, $70,000,000 for industrial mobilization, and $50,000,000 has been allocated for contingencies.

As the President stated in his message transmitting the supplemental request, certain program changes will undoubtedly be necessary in order properly to prosecute the campaign in Korea. For this reason authority is being requested to adjust by 10 percent any single appropriation by transfer from other appropriations. This would permit the necessary adjustments either in the Korean support or in the build-up phase contemplated by these estimates. I have instructed Assistant Secretary McNeil to keep this committee currently informed of all such actions which we find necessary.

I want to emphasize that this is not a call for full mobilization. It is a call to increase our strength in being, in order to enable us to support the United Nations action in Korea and to build up our strength elsewhere to meet the threat to world peace.

The supplemental request before you rests on two principal factors: First, the requirements for land, naval, and air forces needed by General MacArthur successfully to prosecute the campaign in Korea; and second, the need to build up the strength of our forces over and above those committed to the Korean campaign.

The plans covering the build-up of our forces are based upon studies which began immediately after the President's announcement of the Soviet atomic explosion last September. You will recall that I discussed these studies when I testified here on April 26.

Because of the events in Korea the minimum desired forces which these studies showed to be required—normally a matter that would have been provided for in next year's budget—are being requested at this time.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff are in complete agreement and fully support the forces planned for the build-up in our strength, and are also in complete agreement as to the forces to be provided in support of the Korean campaign.

The action in Korea is a battle of supply and the distances involved are great. As a result, we must expect difficult problems and slow progress. The Military Establishment which we are asking you to expand, however, is a sounder mobilization base than the United States has ever had before. By reason of the groundwork laid by my predecessor and the efforts of officers and civilians in all the agencies of the Department of Defense—the spirit of teamwork within the Department has grown tremendously. We have today a closely-knit team of land, naval, and air forces. The swift decisions during

the past 4 weeks to coordinate the combat efforts of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Far East are striking examples of the benefits of unification in an emergency.

Our military establishment has been geared to provide a sound mobilization base and a swift striking force in case of a third world war. In addition, we have had to be prepared to meet, to the extent that we could, the first shock of an act of calculated, local aggression. The latter test has been met with unprecedented speed in Korea. We are now in the process of backing our shock troops with the necessary reinforcements. We are asking you to supply the men and equipment to replace those being used in the Far East, and additional strengths to prepare for the possibility of future emergencies. I am sure that all of us will meet the challenge of the aggressor with the same undaunted spirit as that shown by our fighting men in Korea.

The witnesses who follow me will give the details of the program we recommend. It is a program designed to bring the action in Korea to a successful conclusion; it is also a program designed to promote world peace by deterring further aggression. It is the sort of program to which I referred on April 12 this year when I gave the founder's day speech at my alma mater, the University of Virginia.

Speaking in Charlottesville that day, I said:

"I have every confidence in our ultimate success. We shall face facts as they are and shall fit our defense plans and our manpower and munitions requirements to meet them. Our defense plans, however, are not rigid. They are not the laws of Medes and Persians. They are flexible and adaptable to changing conditions. They are under constant study and review. If we become convinced that our present means are insufficient to meet the exigencies of the day and the probable threats of tomorrow, we shall not be too humble to ask for more; and if we find them more than adequate, we shall not be too proud to ask for less. We shall always seek the truth and we shall take fitting means to meet the truth."

Gentlemen, I shall be glad to attempt to answer any questions you may have.

THE PHILIP SPORN PLANT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago there was dedicated in my section of the country one of the largest steam-electric power plants in the world. I refer to the Philip Sporn plant directly across the river from Racine, Meigs County, Ohio. This plant has been constructed by the Ohio Power Co., one of the subsidiaries of the American Gas & Electric Co. It has been constructed without one single dollar of Federal or public funds of any kind.

We hear so much these days about the production of power by public owned and operated power plants. This Philip Sporn plant will produce more power than that produced by the great Hoover Dam. It will produce more than 6,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, which is about a billion more than the annual generation at Hoover Dam.

We hear so much from some sources about the wonderful production by the 36 plants that constitute the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Philip Sporn plant will produce 40 percent of that furnished by the whole 36 plants of the TVA.

Mr. Speaker, this plant will be expanded so as to almost double its present capacity. This plant will guarantee a continuation of the progress that has been made in the Ohio Valley in the past few years. With plenty of water and plenty of power, the Ohio Valley will be one of the great manufacturing sections of the country.

URGENT AND IMPORTANT—POLITICS, THAT IS

Mr. JENSEN. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that while American boys are fighting and dying on Korea, the Truman administration has delayed an all-important meeting to stimulate a much needed minerals and metals production program so that a high Government official can travel around the country making political speeches.

The Associated Press reports that Interior Secretary Chapman has delayed from August 1 to August 3 a meeting of the Department's National Minerals Advisory Council because Crow Girard Davidson, the Department's Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources, is off on a political junket and will not be in Washington on August 1.

Mr. Chapman notified the 44 members of the Advisory Council that the meeting is urgent and important. I agree that such a conference is urgent and important. But despite the urgency of the situation and the need for wartime speed up in the development of vital minerals and metals now needed on the Korean front, Chapman delays the meeting in the interest of politics, as usual.

I believe that the Members of this House and the people of the Nation want Government officials, particularly those concerned with the war effort, to remain on the job in Washington in these serious days. I believe the people of the country are getting sick and tired of the double shuffling of the Truman Deal, fighting a war with one hand and playing politics with the other.

A delay of 2 days in a program for the development of critical materials is not only shocking, it is criminal.

The boys in Korea cannot take 2 days off from the bombs and the fire of the blazing Red tanks. They must stay on the job every second, fighting for the principles of freedom and liberty while the Washington bureaucrats delay the war effort with a political junket on the taxpayers' time and money, speaking at Democratic rallies in Montana, Idaho, and other points.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAHON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

(Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include two letters from the State Department.)

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE CONTINUES TO IGNORE ITS PLEDGE

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, it was just about a year ago now, August 8, 1949, to be exact, that I called the attention of the Congress to the unjustified treatment accorded the farmers of the Imperial Valley, Calif., by our Department of State. Today I rise again to say that another year has passed and the situation remains unchanged—the rights of these farmers are still being denied to them.

For another year, the Department of State has failed to keep its word whereby Imperial irrigation district—the organization of the farmers of the valley—may proceed to construct the Pilot Knob hydroelectric power plant and operate the All-American Canal, the right to do which was granted by the Congress in the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 1928 and confirmed by the Federal Government in its contract of December 1, 1932, with the district. Since 1944, the district has been trying to carry out this contract but has been prevented from doing so by the combined refusal of both the Secretary of State and Secretary of Interior to honor the contract.

In my statement of a year ago I gave a brief description of the background of this matter which I will not repeat at this time. In November 1947 the district submitted a proposal to the State Department dealing with the operation of the All-American Canal, development of the Pilot Knob power site, by and at the expense of the district, and several alternatives as to properties of the district located at Andrade, Calif., to be used in connection with the carrying out of the water treaty with Mexico which became effective in November 1945.

In August 1948 the State Department notified the district by letter that, as to its proposal dealing with the All-American Canal and Pilot Knob power development, this was accepted in principle, subject to clarifying amendments, and that a draft of a proposed agreement would be submitted to the district at a reasonably early date. The record will show that this acceptance was made after the State Department had consulted with the Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior. No such draft of a proposed agreement has as yet been submitted to the district. Two years have gone by.

As to the district's Andrade properties, the letter of August 1948 stated that the Department of State had selected from the alternatives proposed, that of acquiring and operating them directly by the Federal Government since it was believed that such was required by the treaty. It is interesting to note that, in this connection, a bill is

now before the Congress giving the authority for such acquisition. The record will show that Imperial irrigation district has not only endorsed this bill but will cooperate in carrying out its provisions; Imperial will stand by its proposal despite the fact the State Department has failed, so far, at least, to make good on its acceptance of the district's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the record will show that a draft of contract was prepared by the State Department and submitted for comment to the Secretary of the Interior in November 1948, and that, despite the fact he had previously endorsed the district's proposal, he reversed his position, due no doubt to the strong political pressure adverse to the district's interests brought to bear on him and refused, or at least failed to submit, comments on the draft. This same source of political pressure started to work on the then new Secretary of State and as a result the matter was taken up for review by the latter. That is where the matter rests today.

At this point let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the outstanding feature of the opposition from this source of political pressure is that no one knows or can determine any logical reason for such opposition or what interest such opposition has in the manner one way or another.

Not only had this continued refusal on the part of our Government to honor its word to its people been grossly unfair and caused damages amounting to many hundreds of thousands of dollars to my people in the Imperial Valley, but now our country is at war again. Mr Speaker, we need to conserve our petroleum supply for war needs. This Pilot Knob power development, which the district is anxious to construct at its own expense, and which was endorsed and urged by the War Production Board in 1944 because of its minimum requirements of strategic materials, should be in operation now. It is not in operation, and, as a result, over 250,000 barrels of fuel oil a year are being consumed to produce the electric power which the Pilot Knob plant should be producing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to remark that this is not a good example of conduct by our Government nor is it in the best interests of efforts to do all we can to win the war.

As a matter of record, I wish, Mr. Speaker, to place in the RECORD at this point the letters from the Department of State. The first is the simple acknowledgment of the receipt of a tear sheet from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 8, a year ago, which I sent the Secretary of State, after making my report to the Congress on the delay in carrying out the Department's promise to the farmers of the Imperial Valley. I shall, of course, send the Secretary of State a copy of the RECORD of today, calling his attention to the report I am now making to the Congress; that another year has passed without this promise being kept. I hope, Mr. Speaker, this is not to become an annual event.

AUGUST 15, 1949.

Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. PHILLIPS: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated August 10, 1949, relating to the operation of the All-American Canal facilities by the Imperial irrigation district.

This matter will receive prompt consideration and a further reply to your letter under acknowledgment will be made in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

The second letter, dated October 5, 1949, goes into the matter more fully. I call attention to several sentences. Although the Imperial district's proposals were submitted to the Department of the Interior, by the Department of State, on November 10, 1948, the Secretary of State says on October 5, 1949, that—

No definitive reply has been received from the Department of the Interior.

I also call attention to the fact that the Secretary of State discussed this matter, which is entirely a California matter, with the Senators from our neighboring State, Arizona, and agreed to discuss it with the Senators from my own State, California; but that to this date the California Senators and the Representative from the Twenty-second District are still waiting for the suggested conference.

OCTOBER 5, 1949.

The Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. PHILLIPS: Further reference is made to your letter of August 10, 1949, relating to the operation by the Imperial irrigation district of the All-American Canal facilities.

The views which you expressed and the summary of the situation which you gave before the House of Representatives on August 8, 1949, have been carefully studied. The summary of this matter which you gave is substantially correct. However, in respect to your statement that the Imperial irrigation district submitted its proposals pursuant to the request of the Department at the Los Angeles conference in September 1947, the record shows that it was as a result of a suggestion made by a representative of the Department of Justice that the district submitted proposals for the operation by it of the All-American Canal facilities in conformity with provisions of the water treaty of February 3, 1944. The representative of the Department of State agreed that it would give consideration to whatever proposals the district might submit. The proposals were, of course, submitted in December 1947 and supplemented in January 1948.

The Department, after consultation with the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, and the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, reached the view that under the provisions of the treaty of 1944 a Federal or a State or a local agency might perform the actual operation and maintenance of the All-American Canal facilities. In accordance with this view the Department replied to the district on August 4, 1948, to the effect that the proposals were acceptable in principle provided that certain clarifying amendments were made.

Thereafter, following consultation with the United States Section of the Commission, the Department prepared a draft of contract amending, in keeping with the proposals of the district, the All-American Canal contract of December 1, 1932, to bring it in conformity with the provisions of the Water Treaty of 1944. This draft of contract, as you noted in your speech on August 8, was submitted on November 10, 1948, to the Secretary of the Interior for comment. Under the same date this draft was also submitted to the Attorney General for his views.

Since November 10, 1948, the Attorney General has replied briefly, but no definitive reply has been received from the Department of the Interior.

However, during the early part of this year it was urged upon the Department that the testimony of its representatives before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations when the Water Treaty of 1944 was before the Senate for advice and consent to ratification, supported the views that the facilities in reference were to be operated solely by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior and that the Senate, in voting on the treaty, relied upon this interpretation by the Department of State.

Subsequently, Secretary Krug also indicated his view that the statements of witnesses during the Senate hearings on the Treaty amounted to assurances to the Senate that the Bureau of Reclamation would operate and maintain the facilities in reference and, further, that as a practical matter it was not feasible for the United States to permit any agency except a Federal agency to operate and maintain the All-American Canal works.

Pursuant to these representations, the Secretary personally reviewed the testimony and subsequent developments and as a result he was impressed by several points. He agreed to discuss with Senators HAYDEN and MCFARLAND the procedure which should be followed by the executive branch before reaching a final decision in the matter. He has also agreed, at the request of Senator KNOWLAND, to confer with the Senators from California. The Secretary would, I am sure, welcome you to a meeting with the California Senators. No date has been set for such conferences and in the meantime action has been suspended.

Because of his interest in the matter, we are transmitting a copy of this letter to Senator KNOWLAND for his information.

We shall be glad to keep you advised of further developments.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAHON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TAX THE UNTAXED BEFORE HEAPING ADDITIONAL TAXES UPON THE OVERTAXED

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has asked for an additional $10,500,000,000 to spend in tooling up for the war in Korea and to prepare for any other wars that soon may be in the cards for us—and this request will be granted. Senator TAFT has said that we should place the war in Korea on a pay-as-you-go basis, that we should raise whatever money we may need for war purposes by tax increases now. President Truman recommends a $5,000,000,000 tax increase in a "quickie" or emergency tax increase bill, the balance needed, to be provided by passing a regular tax increase bill after January 1, 1951. Whether to raise the additional billions needed for war now, as Senator TAFT recommends, or part of it now and part of it later, as the President suggests, should be an easy question to settle. We know additional billions are needed; we know addition billions will be

spent; and we know the additional billions must be raised in taxes sometime. I say we should do the job now, and adopt a pay-as-you-go war program.

Mr. Speaker, in facing emergency war needs it is the duty of Congress today to see to it that every individual and every business is taxed at full rates and upon all earnings. There should be no exceptions. The war tax load should rest upon all alike and should be equitably spread. We failed to see that this was done in World War I, and also in World War II. So far as taxation was concerned, we played favorites in both those wars. Are we going to do the same again?

When the emergency war tax bill is written, the American people expect—and they will demand—that the Congress write a tax bill that will require everybody and every organization to pay their just share of the tax load, including the present tax-exempts. This we should do. Neither political fears nor political threats must keep us from doing our duty in this respect. No one should be allowed to make a tax-free profit out of the war needs and the war emergency. It is our job to increase the tax burden to take care of the increased needs, and also to make sure that the increased tax burden is properly and equitably spread. This can be done by closing all present tax loopholes, whether legal or illegal loopholes. By closing all tax loopholes we can raise an extra billion dollars a year to help pay the war costs.

Mr. Speaker, in 1916, just before World War I, co-ops were given their first legal tax exemption. The tax rate at that time upon business organizations was only 1 percent of their business profits. However, that 1 percent tax upon business profits was raised during and after the war until it was 12 percent by the end of the 1920's, becoming a real tax advantage for the co-ops and a serious threat to taxpaying businesses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about World War II?

Careful research by Mr. Homer E. Marsh of the National Associated Businessmen of Washington, D. C., and by Mr. Lovell Parker, former Chief of Staff for the Joint Committee on Taxation, reveals that during the four war years, 1942 through 1945, co-ops did a total volume of business amounting to $33,000,000,000, the profits of which, at wartime rates, would have paid into the Treasury—had they been taxed—$855,200,000. Their taxpaying business competitors had to pay taxes. The untaxed paid nothing and thereby profited enormously.

The following table shows these figures broken down by years:

Total business volume of co-ops:	
1942	$5,484,000,000
1943	7,175,000,000
1944	9,615,000,000
1945	10,818,000,000
Total during World War II	32,818,000,000

The amount of income tax that was not paid on earnings by co-ops during those war years was as follows:

1942	$135,100,000
1943	197,200,000
1944	259,800,000
1945	263,100,000
Total	855,200,000

This total of unpaid taxes would have bought a lot of guns and tanks and planes at a time when our armies were fighting for their very lives.

Mr. Speaker, since the war, tax-exempts have sprung up like mushrooms all over the country. Before World War II, no colleges were operating macaroni factories, pottery factories, or luggage factories. The sale and lease back of stores, wheat farms, cotton plantations, and other commercial properties to tax-exempt organizations as a scheme for avoiding the payment of taxes is a recent concoction. And the present giant co-ops, co-ops organized like great holding companies controlling and monopolizing whole industries, have just begun to be organized and to get established financially.

It was the untaxed earnings of these co-ops during World War II, while other businesses were paying taxes up to 90 percent of their profits, that provided the funds for expansion and started their tremendous growth. Had they been required to pay taxes like their business competitors, they would have had to turn over to Uncle Sam during the war years almost $1,000,000,000 in taxes. Instead, they were permitted to retain that amount to plow back into business expansion or to buy out their taxpaying competitors. No wonder co-ops mushroomed so rapidly during and since World War II.

By 1948 the total volume of business done by co-ops had risen to $17,000,000,000 per year—and it is still growing rapidly. The Nation needs the money that can be raised by taxing these organizations; and, if the proposed 45 percent corporation tax rate is levied upon regular corporation profits, there is no good reason why it should not be levied upon corporations organized as co-ops.

Mr. Speaker, the following table indicates the handicap that corporations and taxable commercial enterprises have been laboring under because of the tax-free status of co-ops and the tax-free status of the unrelated activities of educational institutions, religious institutions, charitable trusts, labor organizations, and various other tax-free enterprises, all competing with taxpaying ones:

TAX RATES APPLICABLE TO CORPORATIONS AND TAX PAYING BUSINESS ENTERPRISES FROM 1916 TO THE PRESENT TIME—NOT APPLICABLE TO CO-OPS

Nineteen hundred sixteen, 1 percent (year co-ops were exempted); 1918, 12 percent, normal tax rate upon profits; 1935, 12½ to 15 percent, normal tax rate upon profits; 1941, 40 percent, normal tax, plus 90 percent excess-profits tax; 1945, 80 percent overall rate (normal tax plus excess-profits tax); 1946, 38 percent, normal tax rate upon profits; 1950, 38 percent, normal tax rate upon profits.

Is it any wonder that taxpaying enterprises—with a peak war tax load of 40 percent normal tax plus a 90 percent excess profits tax—have been losing ground, while their tax-free cooperative competitors have been expanding by leaps and bounds?

Mr. Speaker, the question often arises concerning the extent that our economy has shifted to nonprofit ownership and to a tax-exempt or semi-tax-exempt status during recent years. Some idea can be ascertained by a comparison of the total wealth of the United States with the resources of mutuals, cooperatives, and other nonprofit organizations, including Government corporations and trust funds earmarked for special groups.

A study made by the National Industrial Conference Board, New York City, placed the total wealth of the Nation in 1938 at $309,000,000,000. The value of the dollar has declined approximately 43 cents since that date. If we assume that the national wealth has increased proportionately, it would be approximately $542,000,000,000 today. Of this total, $157,500,000,000 is held by the various tax-exempt and semi-tax-exempt organizations. This is 29 percent of our total national wealth. Their total resources are as follows:

Life insurance companies (Most all are mutuals and pay some income tax)	$50,000,000,000
Foundations	2,500,000,000
Mutual savings banks	20,000,000,000
Building, savings, and loan associations	12,000,000,000
Government pension trust funds	35,000,000,000
Educational institutions	2,500,000,000
Federal Government Corporations	23,000,000,000
Cooperatives	2,500,000,000
Mutual fire and casualty insurance	2,000,000,000
State and local retirement funds	2,500,000,000
Municipal and REA utilities	2,000,000,000
Postal savings	3,500,000,000
Total	157,500,000,000

Such a large part of the Nation's wealth should not go untaxed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about world war III? How long will it last? When will the conflagration break out in other places besides Korea, Indochina, and Formosa? How much will it cost in money? In "blood, sweat, and tears"?

Congressman VINSON says:

> All the world is a tinderbox. Global war can begin at any time. * * * In the international arena there is dynamite everywhere. We can have a world explosion at any time. No one knows what may happen tomorrow. * * * It is a situation that demands the utmost concentration of effort, the greatest forbearance, the greatest willingness to sacrifice we have ever had.

Mr. VINSON's words present a grim picture. The picture is not overdrawn. We must prepare thoroughly for whatever is before us. As a part of that preparation we must—whether we like it or not—increase the tax load upon our people. In so doing Congress should see

that the total tax load is spread equitably; that every individual and every business organization is required to carry their fair share of the tax load; that no group and no organization is allowed to go tax free, thereby piling up war profits to plough back into business expansion at the expense of taxpaying competitors. We must, Mr. Speaker, tax the untaxed before heaping additional taxes upon the overtaxed.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the spokesman for the Civil Defense Director, Mr. Paul J. Larsen, yesterday made a statement which is reminiscent of the statement made several months ago by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson, that if the enemy strikes at 4 o'clock in the morning we will be ready at 5 o'clock. The statement of this spokesman, speaking for Mr. Larsen is—

If an atomic bomb attack comes tomorrow we could give the cities pretty good guidance on what to do to protect themselves.

According to this spokesman, and I am reading from today's report of his statement in the New York Times, current plans call for a rounding out of the defense set-up, Federal, State, and local, in 18 months to 2 years. This, however, he goes on to say, could be reduced to 6 months if necessary. It is planned within a few months to get out a handbook for the guidance of our people in target areas.

Last Thursday Collier's magazine printed a feature article by its writer John Lear, blasting the neglect of United States civilian defenses. I quote a paragraph from the Washington Post of last Thursday summarizing that article:

"Washington bureaucrats are saying there will be a lot of double talk about fear of a garrison state instead of organizing the Nation's civil defense," a Collier's magazine article charges in its current issue entitled "Hiroshima, U. S. A." The article by John Lear paints a dramatic picture in both words and color drawings of the dropping of an atomic bomb on Manhattan with a resultant death toll of at least 180,000 persons.

In this article Mr. Lear emphasizes after a study of home defense in England that only the British are prepared in the ways of civilian defense.

Going back now to our reports of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy we find that this is not true; the Soviet Union of Russia is prepared perhaps more than the British in the art of civilian defense, having trained thousands of squads in protection against possible atomic bomb attack.

I have been hammering away at this problem for almost a year, back in those months when the National Security Resources Board charged with jurisdiction over civilian defense had no permanent Chairman, only an Acting Chairman, Dr. John R. Steelman, the President's alter ego, who, as everyone knows, was too busy with other matters on the home front to do a real job for civilian defense. Now after many months we have the able W. Stuart Symington as the head of that agency, and things are being done, but belatedly.

Speed is of the essence. Mr. John Q. Public is beginning to ask questions. He wants to know the ABC's, he is anxious to know where he fits in the picture. He does not go for the idea that he will be informed in detail after a bomb hit and he is among the surviving. He wants to know the score now and he will do his stuff when his Government lets him in on the know. Mr. Spokesman, tell Mr. Larsen to rush the handbook.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. BYRNE of New York) indefinitely on account of illness in family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the Vindicator, and also to revise and extend the remarks he made in committee and include various letters and telegrams as well as a communication previously inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. WHITE of California) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper item.

Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARRINGTON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he made recently.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two excerpts from speeches of the Minister of External Affairs of Australia as to relations with the United States of America; and in another instance to insert in the RECORD a letter of J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America, which appeared in the New York Times.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3906. A bill to amend the War Contractors Relief Act with respect to the definition of a request for relief, to authorize consideration and settlement of certain claims of subcontractors, to provide reasonable compensation for the services of partners and proprietors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. 157. An act authorizing the Department of Justice of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 28, 1950:

H. R. 4390. An act to authorize the conveyance, for school purposes, of certain land in Acadia National Park to the town of Tremont, Maine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6073. An act to amend section 501 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. J. Res. 512. Joint resolution making further temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 513. Joint resolution to authorize the burial in the National Cemetery at Nashville, Tenn., of the bodies of members of the Tennessee Air National Guard killed in a plane crash near Myrtle Beach, S. C., July 23, 1950.

On July 31, 1950:

H. R. 702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett;

H. R. 1022. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del.;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.;

H. R. 1626. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. H. Hill;

H. R. 1697. An act for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Kenneth Everard Hadfield;

H. R. 2196. An act to authorize the elimination of lands from the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana;

H. R. 2264. An act for the relief of C. H. Bolling;

H. R. 2462. An act for the relief of Miju Iseri Tsuda;

H. R. 2535. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall;

H. R. 2588 A act to confirm title in V. LeBlanc and C. Riccard to certain lands in West Baton Rouge Parish, La.;

H. R. 2753. An act to amend section 2 of the act of April 23, 1904 (33 Stat. 527; 43

U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries;

H. R. 2808. An act for the relief of Grace G. Walker;

H. R. 2851. An act for the relief of Carl L. Sexauer;

H. R. 3169. An act granting permanent residence to certain Spanish physicians residing in Puerto Rico;

H. R. 3284. An act to authorize grantees of recreational demonstration project lands to make land exchanges relating to such properties, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3305. For the relief of the estate of Jose Salgado Santos;

H. R. 3316. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Francisco J. Cordova;

H. R. 3330. An act for the relief of Therese Hohman;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of William A. Cross;

H. R. 3906. An act to amend the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act, as amended;

H. R. 3994. An act for the relief of John D. Lange;

H. R. 4041. An act for the relief of Parish Bros.;

H. R. 4141. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Shockley;

H. R. 4309. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nellie K. Marlow;

H. R. 4343. An act for the relief of J. P. Acker;

H. R. 4364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth B. Moore; John Robert Lusk III; John R. Lusk, Sr.; Mrs. Minnie P. Pruitt; and Mrs. Billie John Bickle;

H. R. 4386. An act to amend section 2 (a) and section 7 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to make failure of registration a continuing offense, and to continue the obligation of officers, directors, and persons acting as such, to comply with the act despite dissolution of a foreign agent;

H. R. 4601. An act for the relief of Jeannette Passayanni-Capodistria;

H. R. 5003. An act to provide for the exchange between the United States and the State of New York of certain lands and interests in lands at Manhattan Beach, Kings County, N. Y.;

H. R. 5110. An act for the relief of Janos (John) Treber and Mrs. Katalin (Katherine) Treber;

H. R. 5221. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietra;

H. R. 5252. An act for the relief of W. M. Tindal;

H. R. 5470. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Haddad;

H. R. 5526. An act to authorize the President to provide for the performance of certain functions of the President by other officers of the Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5628. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land to the State of Rhode Island;

H. R. 5799. An act for the relief of the Acme Finance Co.;

H. R. 5849. An act for the relief of Samuel M. Kornegay;

H. R. 5947. An act for the relief of Alfio Batelli;

H. R. 5990. An act to provide for the construction, development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in the State of Maryland and its extension into the District of Columbia as a part of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and other purposes;

H. R. 6013. An act to amend an act fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 6018. An act for the relief of Lubomir Mikulik and Viliam Krajcirovic;

H. R. 6198. An act for the relief of the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 6247. An act authorizing transfer of land and improvements thereon by the Secretary of the Interior to New Mexico State Fair;

H. R. 6270. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Winnebago Indian Reservation, Nebr.;

H. R. 6292. An act to provide that payments to States under the Oil Land Leasing Act of 1920 shall be made biannually;

H. R. 6482. An act for the relief of Antonio Artolozaga Euscola;

H. R. 6644. An act for the relief of Edwin F. Rounds;

H. R. 6697. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Howard H. Moran;

H. R. 6699. An act to authorize the sale of certain land on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak., allotted to Susan Eagle Dog;

H. R. 6703. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Ed Howard Russell;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Ralph E. Brown;

H. R. 6971. An act to authorize the transfer of funds allocated for expenditure in cooperation with the New Jersey State Highway Department on State Highway Route No. 100 to State Parkway Route No. 4;

H. R. 6994. An act for the relief of Karen R. McAndrews;

H. R. 7016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret O'Donnell and Mrs. Arlene R. Shannon;

H. R. 7046. An act for the relief of C. W. Jacobs;

H. R. 7072. An act for the relief of Mrs. Young Ja Kim;

H. R. 7074. An act for the relief of Hiroko Fujiwara Matsuoka and Mimiyo Matsuoka;

H. R. 7078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eiko Yamada Nagatoshi, Edward Takeo Nagatoshi, and Frances Yoko Nagatoshi;

H. R. 7079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gin Shibasaki Okafuji;

H. R. 7204. An act for the relief of Maria Cristina D'Angelo;

H. R. 7219. An act to authorize acquisition by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and the improvements thereon in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7260. An act to provide for the holding of court and the furnishing of quarters at Rock Island for the United States District Court for the Southern District, Northern Division, of Illinois;

H. R. 7314. An act for the relief of Yukie Nishimura Okubo;

H. R. 7339. An act to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein, as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7392. An act for the relief of Columbus Finley;

H. R. 7414. An act for the relief of Teresa Gentile and Galliano Gentile;

H. R. 7428. An act to admit Mrs. Erna Tvedt to the United States for permanent residence;

H. R. 7564. An act for the relief of Maria Margareta Ries and Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries;

H. R. 7608. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Morita;

H. R. 7629. An act for the relief of Fumiko Arakawa and her child, Rie;

H. R. 7667. An act directing the transfer to the Department of the Interior by the General Services Administration of certain property in Boise Barracks, Boise, Idaho;

H. R. 7675. An act to authorize the addition of certain land to Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the State of Tennessee;

H. R. 7706. An ct for the relief of Ayako Kurihara;

H. R. 7779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stamatia Lymberopoulos and Leonidas Stavrou Limperopoulos;

H. R. 7783. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald Rafter;

H. R. 7810. An act for the relief of M. S. Davis;

H. R. 7815. An act for the relief of John Yee Horn;

H. R. 7820. An act for the relief of Keiko Uchida Doane and her minor child;

H. R. 7899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Nogami Cotter and Katsumi Cotter;

H. R. 7916. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to execute an oil and gas lease on a certain tract of land in Park County, Wyo.;

H. R. 7944. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Chandler;

H. R. 7961. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Yano;

H. R. 7970. An act for the relief of Mrs. Regina Anderson and her minor child;

H. R. 7977. An act to authorize the city of Buffalo, Wyo., to make additional uses of certain lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7982. An act to abolish the Wheeler National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8055. An act relating to the collection, payment, and dishonor of demand items, and to the revocation of credit for, and payment of, such items, by banks in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8067. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yup Boon (Joan) Kim Skanes;

H. R. 8098. An act for the relief of Teruko Ishikawa;

H. R. 8119. An act for the relief of Midori Ohta (also known as Mary Stephen);

H. R. 8125. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hisae Kawauchi Kelly;

H. R. 8155. An act for the relief of Chiyo Furumura Yoshida;

H. R. 8180. An act for the relief of Parue K. Tsugami;

H. R. 8183. An act for the relief of Asako Tsuchia;

H. R. 8287. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicate of William Gerard's script certificate No. 2, subdivision 13, to Lucy P. Crowell;

H. R. 8289. An act for the relief of Yee Blanche Yee;

H. R. 8361. An act for the relief of Toshiko Murai;

H. R. 8381. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joseph C. Grant;

H. R. 8382. An act for the relief of Mrs. Misao Hatanaka Deskins;

H. R. 8451. An act for the relief of Yoshie Nozawa;

H. R. 8500. An act for the relief of Hatsuko Torikai;

H. R. 8514. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain sound recordings imported by the Department of State, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8519. An act for the relief of the estate of Archer C. Gunter;

H. R. 8581. An act for the relief of Yasuko Higuchi Thomson;

H. R. 8583. An act for the relief of Hisako Shimizu;

H. R. 8600. An act for the relief of Yuriko Aoyama;

H. R. 8604. An act to provide for the conveyance of the Percy Jones General Hospital Gull Lake Annex, Gull Lake, Mich., to the

W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.;

H. R. 8617. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard";

H. R. 8709. An act to change the designation of Health Officer and Assistant Health Officer of the District of Columbia, respectively, to Director of Public Health and Assistant Director of Public Health;

H. R. 8722. An act for the relief of Jun Hin Lum;

H. R. 8958. An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress; and

H. J. Res. 461. Joint resolution to provide that South Parkersburg, W. Va., shall for the purposes of the seventeenth decennial census be treated as a part of Parkersburg, W. Va.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 1, 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:

1598. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of $818,670.30 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 667); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1599. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of $18,000,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 668); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1600. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 in the amount of $600,000,000 for the General Services Administration (H. Doc. No. 669); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1601. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a report of expenditures made and activities carried out pursuant to section 1008 of Public Law 402 (80th Cong.), the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, during the 6 months ended December 31, 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1602. A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Eighth Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1603. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1604. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "Rates of Return for 529 Identical Companies in 25 Selected Manufacturing Industries, 1940, 1947–49"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1605. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Secretary of Commerce to undertake security measures relative to the regulation and control of air commerce when authorized by the President in times of national emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1606. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to revise, consolidate, and codify the navigation laws relating to admeasurement, documentation, entry, clearance, coastwise trade, foreign trade, and United States fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 9176. A bill to establish a system of priorities and allocations for materials and facilities, authorize the requisitioning thereof, provide financial assistance for expansion of productive capacity and supply, strengthen controls over credit, regulate speculation on commodity exchanges, and by these measures facilitate the production of goods and services necessary for the national security, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2759). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Seventh intermediate report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, pursuant to Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2761). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 9219. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes and other Indians of eastern Oklahoma, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2762). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 740. Resolution for consideration of and waiving all points of order against H. R. 9176, a bill to establish a system of priorities and allocations for materials and facilities, authorize the requisitioning thereof, provide financial assistance for expansion of productive capacity and supply, strengthen controls over credit, regulate speculation on commodity exchanges, and by these measures facilitate the production of goods and services necessary for the national security, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2763). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 741. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9129, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2764). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 742. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8396, a bill to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2765). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9236. A bill for the relief of H. Halpern & Bro., Inc., of Boston, Mass.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2760). 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. RANKIN:

H. R. 9271. A bill to protect the American home front against subversive activities, constituting a part of the world Communist movement, which threaten the existence of free, representative self-government in the United States; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 9272. A bill to amend the act of October 5, 1949 (Public Law 322, 81st Cong.), so as to extend the time of permits covering lands located on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 9273. A bill to extend the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, to persons in active service in units of the Armed Forces employed in the Korean theater, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 9274. A bill to prevent profiteering and protect the welfare of the American people by limiting to $25,000 the net income of individuals after the payment of other Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9275. A bill to extend the benefits of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, to the members of the armed services as of June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9276. A bill to prevent further price increases and to reduce present prices to price levels consistent with a stable economy and the welfare of the American people; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 9277. A bill to tax excessive profits, to provide revenue, and to reduce the incentive for profiteering; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9278. A bill relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress; Public Law 129, Eightieth Congress; and Public Law 31, Eighty-first Congress; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 9279. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain temporary war housing to the Housing Authority of Clackamas County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 9280. A bill to establish a system of priorities and allocations for materials and facilities, authorize the requisitioning thereof, provide financial assistance for expansion of productive capacity and supply, strengthen controls over credit, regulate speculation on commodity exchanges, authorize the institution of price controls, and by these measures facilitate the production of goods and services necessary for the

national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 9281. A bill to provide for the dissolution of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, for the transfer of its functions, to otherwise amend the Renegotiation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 9282. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 9283. A bill to protect the national safety and security from the consequences of price and credit inflation, to facilitate the production of goods and services necessary for the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 9284. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. J. Res. 516. Joint resolution authorizing the President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, to conclude and give effect to agreements for the settlement of intercustodial conflicts involving enemy property; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Res. 739. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 323; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 9285. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tomiko Shinjo Gushiken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 9286. A bill for the relief of Maria Manfrini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 9287. A bill for the relief of Haruko Ogata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 9288. A bill for the relief of the Duncan Coffee Co.; 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:

2291. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, providing that the Congress of the United States be petitioned to pass legislation authorizing the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in recognition of the outstanding service to the Nation of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2292. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Drury M. Knott, secretary, Orlo Vista Townsend Club, No. 1, Orlando, Fla., requesting that emergency legislative measures be taken in dealing with the vital social-security problem; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2293. Also, petition of Edward J. Meyers, secretary, Townsend Clubs and Senior Citizens, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting that emergency legislative measures be taken in dealing with the vital social-security problem; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2294. Also, petition of Mrs. Genevieve B. McGowan, secretary, Townsend Clubs of Hillsborough County, Tampa, Fla., requesting that emergency legislative measures be taken in dealing with the vital social-security problem; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2295. Also, petition of Mrs. Mervin Henry, secretary, Orlando Townsend Club, No. 2, Winter Park, Fla., requesting that emergency legislative measures be taken in dealing with the vital social-security problem; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2296. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2297. Also, petition of H. Vernon Ferster, president, Jaycees, Pennsylvania Junior Chamber of Commerce, Hanover, Pa., requesting the enactment of legislation to draft not only military manpower but also the goods and materials of war and labor necessary to produce those goods, and taxes in relation to the increase in expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.