

283. By the SPEAKER: Petition of National Society Daughters of the American Colonists, Washington, D. C., relative to resolutions unanimously adopted at the Thirtieth (National) General Assembly of the Daughters of the American Colonists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 15, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

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

Dr. A. J. McCartney, D. D., LL. D., Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Once more, our Father, we would begin the legislative day with Thee. As we pause for this reverential moment may we be still and know that Thou art God. We invoke Thy blessing upon the Members of the Senate whether present or absent. Give strength for our burdens; equipment for our tasks; wisdom for our responsibilities; insight for our times; clarity of our thoughts; charity for our speech; courage for our convictions; and unfaltering faith in Thy divine purpose for our national destiny. So may the safety, honor, and general welfare of our Nation be advanced that happiness, peace, and prosperity may be established upon the sure foundation of truth and justice, virtue and piety.

In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 14, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3957) to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 588. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho;

H. R. 656. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for

the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery;

H. R. 849. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry W. Savidge;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Clarke; and

H. R. 3297. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the First Guam Legislature, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Resolution 4

Resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and the Governor of Guam to change section 10 of the Organic Act of Guam to provide a different method of electing members of the Legislature of Guam

Whereas section 10 of the Organic Act of Guam provides among other things that "The legislative power of Guam, except as otherwise provided in the 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"; and

Whereas the election of members at large tends to work a hardship on those residents of Guam who live in rural or sparsely populated areas by depriving them of representation in the Guam Legislature: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Guam Legislature, That the Congress and President of the United States are hereby respectfully petitioned and memorialized to amend the Organic Act of Guam so as to provide for the election of the

21 members of the Guam Legislature in accordance with the laws of Guam or as the Guam Legislature shall provide; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of Interior and the Governor of Guam are hereby respectfully petitioned and memorialized to assist, plead, and exert all possible efforts toward the accomplishment of the purpose and intent of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive secretary of the Guam Legislature be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a copy of the resolution to the House of the Representatives of the United States, the Senate of the United States, the President of the United States, and to the Governor of Guam.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF MICHIGAN JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, LANSING, MICH.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Michigan Junior Chamber of Commerce, strongly endorsing the immediate commencement of the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project as essential to our national defense effort, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas the immediate commencement of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is essential to our national defense effort; and

Whereas the immediate commencement of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is indispensable as a measure of national security and defense to insure access through protected waterways to the only substantial source of high-grade, open-pit ore in the North American Continent outside of the Lake Superior area; and

Whereas the seaway is essential to insure the flow of such basic metal to the great industries located in the Great Lakes region at a reasonable and economical cost; and

Whereas the seaway will provide power facilities to domestic and industrial users in a power deficit St. Lawrence area; and

Whereas the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is the only sound economical and practical approach to the problem of transporting raw materials into the great industrial areas in the Great Lakes region and the shipment of finished products to world markets: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Michigan Junior Chamber of Commerce at its board of directors' meeting held March 11, 1951, go on record as being unequivocally in favor of immediate action by the Congress of the United States on enabling legislation, and such incidental legislation as shall insure the realization of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all local organizations affiliated with the Michigan Junior Chamber of Commerce and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce with the request that these organizations pass similar resolutions; further, that a copy of this resolution be sent to all Michigan Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and that the Honorable HOMER FERGUSON be requested to read this resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EUGENE ANDERSON,
President.
JAMES J. COHOON,
Secretary.

DECLARATION ON FOREIGN POLICY— PETITION OF WISCONSIN PUBLIC LEADERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by 72 leaders of Wisconsin public opinion, constituting a declaration on foreign policy, and I ask unanimous consent that a press release and the petition, including the signatures, together with a statement prepared by me in connection therewith, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the press release and petition were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with the signatures, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE

Seventy-two Wisconsin leaders released today a "call to action" calling for establishment of a UN Armed Services Committee to integrate armed forces of UN members as Eisenhower is now uniting those of the Atlantic nations.

The statement also called for revision of the UN charter to give the UN "powers necessary to compel settlement of international disputes by means other than war."

Dr. J. Martin Klotsche, chairman of the sponsoring committee, pointed out that the UN does not now have any means of directing military efforts undertaken in its behalf, but must turn that responsibility over to member nations. "We cannot expect other nations to make significant contributions to UN military efforts unless, through a UN Armed Services Committee, they have a share in determining the use of those forces," stated Dr. Klotsche.

The Wisconsin call to action asked that, through Charter revision, the UN be given the right to control armaments through laws applicable to individual offenders, to maintain armed forces for meeting aggression, and to raise dependable revenue sufficient for its task of halting aggression and preserving the peace.

"Even though the Soviet Union or others may refuse," the proclamation stated, "the UN should be established on the basis of the revised, veto-free charter as soon as a majority of the nations ratify. A strong UN government, preserving to the nations full jurisdiction over domestic affairs, is the only sure protection against recurring wars."

WISCONSIN CALL TO ACTION

Our country and the entire world stand on the knife-edge of disaster.

The UN, because of Charter limitations, has been unable to prevent aggression or to unite the world in the face of aggression. We are now called upon to choose whether to discard the UN because of its limitations, or to keep the UN and remove its limitations. To discard the UN is to resign ourselves to war as the final arbiter of world disputes. It is surely the better part of wisdom to keep the UN and endow it with the power it must have to halt aggression and preserve the peace.

Therefore, we, the undersigned citizens of Wisconsin, urge President Truman, in cooperation with the leaders of Congress, to press for immediate adoption within the UN of the following proposals:

1. Establishment of a UN Armed Services Committee under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly. A civilian leader of world-wide stature should head the committee and act as commander in chief of the UN armed forces. To insure full and

proportionate sharing by each nation in the burdens of defense, the committee must be empowered to integrate and direct the armed forces of the participating nations. The military powers of the various UN members would then be united to meet aggression anywhere in the world as the armed forces of the Atlantic nations are now being united to meet any aggression in Europe.

2. Revision of the UN Charter to include these carefully limited powers necessary to compel settlement of international disputes by means other than war: (a) The right to make enforceable laws to control armaments; (b) the right to apply those laws through UN courts to individual offenders rather than entire nations, thus stopping aggression at its source; (c) the right to maintain effective, tyranny-proof, armed forces to meet aggression; (d) the right to raise dependable revenue.

The necessary revisions might well be drafted by a Charter Review Commission appointed under article 22 of the Charter. The revision must include a more adequate method of UN representation than the present system of "one nation—one vote."

The UN should be established on the basis of the revised, veto-free charter as soon as a majority of the nations ratify, even though the Soviet Union or others may refuse. A strong UN Government, preserving to the nations full jurisdiction over domestic affairs, is the only sure protection against recurring wars.

The cataclysm of war may still be prevented, should our Nation follow this policy immediately and vigorously. If full-scale war does again overtake us, this course of action will unite the free world and conclude the conflict with the enduring peace which alone can redeem the terrible cost of victory.

SIGNERS OF THE WISCONSIN CALL TO ACTION

Rev. Merrill R. Abbey, First University Methodist Church, Madison, Wis.; M. B. Atkinson, editor, Eau Claire Leader and Telegram, Eau Claire, Wis.; Rev. Dwight Moody Bahr, Waukesha Baptist Church, Waukesha, Wis.; R. L. Bangsberg, editor, La Crosse Tribune, La Crosse, Wis.; Catherine Behrens, president, Wisconsin Education Association, Kenosha, Wis.; Elston L. Belknap, M. D., Milwaukee, Wis.; Maude E. Blackstone, board member of United Council of Church Women of America, Waukesha, Wis.; Charles Broughton, editor, Sheboygan Press, Sheboygan, Wis.; Marshall F. Browne, Madison printer, Madison, Wis.; R. G. Chamberlin, principal, Rufus King High School, Milwaukee, Wis.; R. E. Chesebro, president, Handknit Hosiery Co., Sheboygan, Wis.; Mrs. F. H. Clausen, State commander, American Cancer Society, Horicon, Wis.

Ellis H. Dana, executive vice president, Wisconsin Council of Churches; Bill Dodds, regional educational and political action director, UAW-CIO, Milwaukee, Wis.; Helen R. Doege, Marshfield, Wis.; Sarah C. Ettenheim, president, Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations, Milwaukee, Wis.; Jerome Fox, chairman, Democratic State Central Committee, Madison, Wis.; J. F. Friedrich, regional director, Wisconsin American Federation of Labor, Milwaukee, Wis.; C. E. Garton, president, Garton Toy Co., Sheboygan, Wis.; Bernhard Gettelman, State senator, Milwaukee, Wis.; W. Giese, superintendent of schools, Racine, Wis.; Dorothy Gill, treasurer, H. H. West, Milwaukee, Wis.; Robert Gordon, chairman, Post-Zeidler Chapter, American Veterans Committee, Milwaukee, Wis.

O. L. Hall, president, Bank of Sheboygan, Sheboygan, Wis.; Francis A. Henson, director of educational and political action, International Union, UAW-AFL; Fred R. Holt, superintendent of schools, West Bend, Wis.; T. J. Jenson, superintendent of Shorewood schools, Shorewood, Wis.; William V. Kelley, director, Urban League, Milwaukee, Wis.; Michael S. Kies, county superintendent of

schools, Safety Building, Milwaukee, Wis.; Harvey Kitzman, regional director of Wisconsin and Minnesota, UAW-CIO, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Norbert Klein, Wisconsin club woman, Milwaukee, Wis.; Dr. J. Martin Klotsche, president, Milwaukee State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rev. Anthony Knackert, Holy Name Parish, Sheboygan, Wis.; G. H. Koenig, editor, Waukesha Daily Freeman, Waukesha, Wis.

Mrs. L. A. Leadbetter, Rhinelander, Wis.; Robert Lewis, education director, Wisconsin Electric Cooperative, Madison, Wis.; J. P. Mann, superintendent of schools, Appleton, Wis.; Roy Matson, editor, Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis.; Henry Maier, State senator, Milwaukee, Wis.; Edward Mesheski, chairman, Milwaukee County Democratic Organizing Committee, Milwaukee, Wis.; Frank Meyer, managing editor, Shawano Evening Leader, Shawano, Wis.; Bishop I. Richard Mewaldt, president of Western District Executive Board of Moravian Church, Madison, Wis.; Gaylord Nelson, State senator, Madison, Wis.; Rev. Jess H. Norenberg, superintendent, Wisconsin Congregational Conference, Madison, Wis.; Rabbi Murray Peiman, Racine, Wis.

Llewellyn Pfankuchen, professor of political science, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Carl Prange, chairman of the board, Prange Department Stores, Sheboygan, Wis.; Paul A. Pratt, vice president, Borden's Gridley Division, president, Milwaukee Association of Commerce, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rev. Charles A. Puls, Luther Memorial Church, Madison, Wis.; Rev. Ensworth Reisner, First Methodist Church of Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.; Hugo J. Ripp, vice general chairman of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks and State chairman of the Wisconsin State Legislative Committee; Nelson Vance Russell, president, Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis.

Rev. E. P. Sabin, rector, St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, Madison, Wis.; Sidney H. Sayles, director, Milwaukee Anti-Defamation League, Milwaukee, Wis.; Judge L. H. Schlichting, Sheboygan County judge, Sheboygan, Wis.; Jennie T. Schrage, chairman, WFWC department of public affairs, Madison, Wis.; Mrs. Ed Schulenberg, chairman of international relations, eighth district, WFWC, Sheboygan, Wis.; Christ Seraphim, former Milwaukee County commander of the American Legion, now chairman of housing committee of American Legion; Mr. S. F. Shattuck, former member, board of directors, Kimberly-Clark; Robert A. Straughn, M. D., Jackson Clinic, Madison, Wis.; A. A. Suppan, vice president, Wisconsin Federation of Teachers, professor, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wis.; Manfred Swarsensky, M. D., Rabbi Temple Beth El, Madison, Wis.

Maurice Terry, director, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Milwaukee; Mrs. Konrad C. Testwuide, former chairman, Council of Social Agencies, Sheboygan, Wis.; Mrs. George Thompson, Hudson, Wis.; Clifford G. Times, publisher, the Rhinelander News, Rhinelander, Wis.; Earl W. Villmow, commander, General Charles King Post, American Legion, Milwaukee, Wis.; Lester Washburn, international president, UAW-AFL, Waukesha, Wis.; Karl Werwath, president, Milwaukee School of Engineering, Milwaukee, Wis.; M. O. Withey, M. D., dean of College of Engineering, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Stuart B. Wright, general manager, American Automobile Association, Wisconsin division, Madison, Wis.; Charles Zadok, 7748 North Club Circle, Milwaukee 1, Wis.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

All over our Nation there is a tremendous ferment as men and women of good will probe their own consciences and confer with their neighbors in an effort to think out what

they feel to be the best approach toward the grim problem of preventing war.

My own State of Wisconsin, long a leader in political and social progress, is a splendid case in point. I have the text of a press release sent out last Sunday on the subject of strengthening the United Nations Charter. This release describes the signing of a declaration on foreign policy by some 72 leaders of Wisconsin public opinion. I am profoundly interested in this call to action even though I do not agree with all of the points which it has included.

I see in this call, however, another constructive and encouraging sign of the tremendous search among our people for ways and means to stave off a third world holocaust. The people at the grass roots of America are deeply desirous that their Congress shall know that they, the people, want to play the most helpful possible role in this gravest of all problems.

I congratulate these men and women, among whom are numbered some of the outstanding private citizens of my State.

Represented among them are some of our ablest newspapermen, labor leaders, spiritual thinkers, women leaders, educators, veteran leaders, welfare workers, and others.

I personally wholeheartedly believe as those folks who signed this petition do, that the United States must continue to place her faith in the United Nations. We dare not discard the UN. We must ever seek to strengthen it so that it may fulfill the prayers of mankind. I do, however, want to mention this:

In 1950, I personally served on a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which considered numerous specific proposals to revise the UN Charter. It was our decision following lengthy hearings that it was not so much the questionable organizational procedures and limited powers of the United Nations which have brought us to the present impasse, but rather it was the imperialistic tendencies of the Soviet Union. Even with a flawless international mechanism, perfect in its structure, perfect in its form, we would not be further along the path to peace if the Soviet Union persisted in her present menacing policies. So, it is my judgment that it is the spirit of the international organization rather than the substance, that is, the form, the outward manifestations which will really determine world peace.

If the Soviet Union were to change its policies, if there were to be a genuine change in the Kremlin's heart (as inconceivable as that seems today) and not merely another deceptive so-called peace offensive cloaking warlike actions, then it is my judgment that the world would breathe a lot easier.

However, insofar as this Wisconsin declaration is concerned, I feel that those folks who have gone to the trouble of thinking out and preparing this petition and collecting other signatures should be commended, and I should like to do so publicly at this time.

With many of the individuals on this petition, I have agreed practically uniformly; with others, I have disagreed just as frequently, but to all of them on this occasion, I extend my heartiest good wishes. Partisan differences, personal differences matter as naught in the face of the problem of world peace.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1484. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1485. A bill for the relief of Luigi Dini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 1486. A bill to amend the statute relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces and the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. WHEAT):

S. 1487. A bill authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station, Fort Robinson, Dawes County, Nebr., to the city of Crawford; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1488. A bill for the relief of Asaf Antreassian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 1489. A bill to prevent the entry of certain mollusks into the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1490. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Hartley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1491. A bill to extend the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System in the case of veterans who served in the active military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 1492. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Fifty-second Annual National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to be held in New York, N. Y., from August 26, 1951, through August 31, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MILITARY LEAVE FOR SUBSTITUTE POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would grant to substitute employees of the Post Office Department the same right with respect to pay during periods of active-duty training in the Reserves as are now enjoyed by regular employees in postal service. Under present regulations, regular classified employees are entitled to military leave without loss of pay for training periods of not to exceed 15 days, but classified substitute employees are denied this right. My bill would simply give substitute employees the same right to military leave.

The bill (S. 1486) to amend the statute relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces and the National Guard, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED CEREMONY IN HONOR OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. PASTORE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee, composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members. It shall be the duty of the committee to prepare plans for and to hold an appropriate ceremony in honor of Constantino Brumidi, the artist who spent many years decorating the Capitol Building of the United States and died as the result of a fall while working on the rotunda frieze, his last assignment in the Capitol. Such cere-

mony shall be held in the rotunda of the Capitol on July 26, 1951, the one hundred and forty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, or on such other day as the committee herein provided for may designate. The committee shall extend invitations to attend the ceremony to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Ambassador of Italy, and such other public officials and persons in private life as the committee may select.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA—AMENDMENT

Mr. AIKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1397) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3957) to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sixteen postmasters.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HUNT:

An address on the subject The Coal Industry in the Modern Crisis, delivered by Senator O'MAHONEY, before the American Mining Congress Coal Show, in Cleveland, Ohio, May 14, 1951.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

A statement prepared by him in tribute to the Finnish maritime industry.

By Mr. HILL:

An address on the subject Collective Bargaining Today, delivered by Paul L. Styles, a member of the National Labor Relations Board, at the Thirty-ninth Convention of the American Federation of Hosiery Workers,

in Philadelphia, Pa., May 7, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.

By Mr. NEELY:

Letter regarding the commutations of the sentences of 79 German war criminals, addressed by Frederick C. McKee, Chairman of the Committee on National Affairs, to the Christian Science Monitor.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "The British," written by Bruce Barton, and published in the Palm Beach (Fla.) Post-Times of April 15, 1951, discussing the attitude of the British toward America.

Letter, dated May 10, 1951, addressed by Charles Scott Williams, to the editor of the Williamsport (Pa.) Sun, discussing the effect of planning of our foreign policy.

By Mr. THYE:

Article relating to conditions in agriculture, written by Henry T. McKnight, and published in the May issue of the Breeder Stockman.

Editorial referring to the beef-price rollback, published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of May 12, 1951.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Editorial entitled "The Seaway and the Waterway," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 3, 1951, relating to the effect of the St. Lawrence seaway on Chicago plans for developing traffic on the Illinois seaway.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

A discussion between Senator BRIDGES and W. Averell Harriman, special assistant to the President, on the subject The Basic Issues of Our Foreign Policy, broadcast over the American Forum of the Air on May 13, 1951.

Statement by Elise Hatt Campbell (Mrs. Dudley Rhodes Campbell), of Birmingham, Mich., entitled "Young Lithuanian DP Serves in American Army."

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations was on page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President during the period ending December 31, 1951, sufficient funds to provide not in excess of 2,000,000 long tons of food grains and to provide for such administrative expenses as are not covered by local currency furnished by the Government of India in accordance with sections 4 and 5 of this act: *Provided*, That the expenditures authorized hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of meeting the emergency need in India arising during the period ending December 31, 1951.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. The assistance hereunder shall be for the sole purpose of providing food grains, or equivalents, to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of flood, drought, and other conditions existing in India in 1950.

SEC. 4. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby authorized to be made available to the President during the period ending June 30, 1952:

(a) Not to exceed \$47,500,000 for assistance on a grant basis, which shall be immediately available from funds heretofore appropriated by Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended; and

(b) Not to exceed \$47,500,000 to be made available from funds heretofore appropriated by Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out provisions of

the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$95,000,000 for use during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That not more than one-half of such amount shall be for assistance on a grant basis and the balance for assistance on credit terms in conformity with the provisions of section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to support S. 872, a bill to furnish emergency food aid to India. I support this bill for humanitarian reasons. I believe that if we pass this bill with this basic thought in mind, it will bolster the ultimate security of the United States. It will make the inroads of communism into India more difficult. I do not approve many of the policies of the Indian Government. If I permitted my reactions to some of the positions taken by the Indian Government to dominate my thoughts, I could not be in favor of this bill. But I do not want to see people go hungry if I am in any position to help them. Hungry people are not friendly people. Hungry people are not thoughtful people. Hungry people think only of their immediate physical needs. The purpose of this bill is to authorize the shipment of 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India.

There are 350,000,000 people in India. That is a population two and one-third times as great as ours. The Indian Government reports that the total 1951 requirement for food grains is approximately 50,000,000 tons. Of this amount, 44,000,000 tons come from local production, 4,000,000 tons has to be purchased by India and allocated and transferred under the International Wheat Agreement. Included in this is 680,000 tons of wheat and milo directly purchased in the United States. The United States has the only remaining sufficiently large available supply of wheat to make up the 50,000,000 tons which is necessary to feed India. If there is to be any assurance given by the Indian Government to the Indian people that they are not going to starve, the best estimates call for 2,000,000 tons more of food grains.

On the basis of 50,000,000 tons a year, 2,000,000 tons is approximately a 2 weeks' supply. What we will do, therefore, if we pass this bill is to give India's ration system a minimum grain supply for 2 weeks out of a total of 52 weeks in a year. The Indian people live so close to the margin of subsistence that even a slight reduction in the amount of food available means death to thousands. The Indian caloric intake is about one-half that of the average American citizen. To reduce it further means famine. India knows famine, but I do not believe that it is wise or helpful to us in the United States on a humanitarian basis and on the basis of our own security to permit famine in India, if we can avoid it through making available 2,000,000 tons of our surplus supply of wheat.

The question has been raised as to whether there is a surplus supply of wheat in the United States in the amount of 2,000,000 tons. A million tons of wheat is 37,500,000 bushels of wheat.

On April 12 Secretary of Agriculture Brannan appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. At that time he estimated that our carry-over including the 1951 crop would be 425,000,000 bushels. He told the committee that the minimum safe carry-over was 325,000,000 bushels. Two million tons is equal to 75,000,000 bushels. But we are only planning to send initially 37,500,000 bushels.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. On what date was the crop estimate made to which the Senator from Massachusetts has just referred?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That crop estimate was made on April 12. I know there has been a new and a lower estimate, which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know by what amount the estimate as to winter wheat is off, as shown in the last crop report?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that the estimates were read into the RECORD and appear on page 5269 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday.

Mr. WHERRY. Are the figures set forth on that page of the RECORD the same as the Senator has just given?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I read from the statement of the United States wheat outlook, supplied by the United States Department of Agriculture, as it appears on page 5269:

The preliminary forecast of the 1951 spring-wheat crop indicates a year of about 309,000,000 bushels, as compared to 276,000,000 bushels harvested in 1950.

Are those the figures to which the Senator from Nebraska referred?

Mr. WHERRY. The figures in the statement from which the Senator just read, which were placed in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], are, I am sure, identical with the figures for the winter-wheat crop the Senator from Massachusetts has just quoted. I simply wanted the Senator to state for the RECORD whether he had heard that the estimate of winter wheat for this year, as indicated by the last crop report, already shows a decrease of 44,000,000 bushels.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will agree with the Senator from Nebraska that the estimate for the wheat crop is off; that there is a later estimate than the estimate from which I read. I used the estimate because that was the figure given by Secretary Brannan to the Committee on Appropriations on April 12, and I knew it to be accurate. I agree with the Senator that the figures are off since that time.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. It so happens that I have the figures for the May 1, 1951, crop report. The winter wheat estimate is 682,196,000 bushels. In 1950 we produced 750,000,000 bushels. This will be the smallest crop since 1943, when we raised 537,000,000 bushels of winter wheat.

If the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me to make a brief statement of my opinion on the wheat situation, let me say that we are threatened with a greatly reduced surplus. Of course, the surplus is one of the problems which the wheat growers of the United States watch very closely. We have had surpluses or carry-overs as high as from 500,000,000 to 600,000,000 bushels. We are now down to 420,000,000 bushels or less.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a carry-over.

Mr. CARLSON. That is the estimated carry-over on July 1. With a reduced estimated production this year, the carry-over probably will decrease to 300,000,000 bushels on June 30, 1952, which is a dangerously low surplus.

I bring up this point for this reason. The Midwest is the great winter wheat-producing area of the United States. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will not object if I state that Kansas raises normally one-fourth of the winter wheat of the Nation. Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, and portions of Nebraska are seriously hurt this year so far as wheat production is concerned. In this great wheat-producing area a new disease, called mosaic, has appeared. This plant virus inoculates the roots, moves up through the plant when it begins to come out of the dormant stage in the spring. So far we have no definite method of control. Our wheat production has been decreasing for the past 2 years.

I think that is a matter which should be given serious consideration by the Senate when it comes to allocating a large amount of grain to any other country. We should consider the future reserves of the United States. If we have a short crop in 1952, there will be a clamor from the people of the Nation because of the shortage of grain. We have had eight very bountiful years in the wheat belt. It seems that now we may be entering a cycle of lower production.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say most respectfully to the Senator from Kansas that, coming as I do from Massachusetts, I would not for one moment attempt to compete with him on information concerning the problem of the wheat grower. When the Senator's predecessor in the Senate, the late distinguished Senator Reed, of Kansas, was here, in the war years of 1945 and 1946, we used to discuss the problem of the carry-over. I relied on him to a great extent, and upon his prognostications.

I agree with the Senator from Kansas that we are getting down toward the lower limit. The Senator will agree with me that during the war years and immediately after the war, we were down to a much lower carry-over than we will have, as nearly as the estimates now indicate, even if we send 2,000,000 tons of wheat to India. The Senator will agree with that, will he not?

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator from Massachusetts will further yield on that point, following the drought years of the early 1930's, we were down to a carry-over of 83,167,000 bushels in 1937, which was the lowest in the Nation's history.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What was the carry-over in 1945?

Mr. CARLSON. I do not happen to have before me the figures for 1945, but I have the figure for 1947. In 1947 the carry-over was 83,813,000 bushels. In 1949 it was 307,952,000 bushels. In 1950 it was 420,018,000 bushels. This year it is estimated at 420,000,000 bushels.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator that the carry-over has reached a low level; but I hope it will not get so low that we cannot do what is proposed by this bill and still be safe in the United States.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, as a part of the colloquy between the Senator from Massachusetts and myself, some figures or tables which I received from the Department of Agriculture with reference to United States wheat production and the carry-over of wheat stocks.

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

(In thousands of bushels)

	Wheat production		All corn	
	United States	Kansas	United States	Kansas
1941.....	941,970	173,332	2,651,889	55,980
1942.....	969,881	200,101	3,068,562	82,415
1943.....	843,813	144,241	2,965,980	77,308
1944.....	1,060,111	187,700	3,088,110	97,598
1945.....	1,108,224	207,939	2,890,933	68,563
1946.....	1,153,046	212,977	3,249,950	63,231
1947.....	1,367,186	286,702	2,383,970	40,443
1948.....	1,313,834	231,368	3,681,793	81,304
1949.....	1,141,188	164,208	3,379,436	73,196
1950.....	1,026,735	175,000	3,151,009	93,188
1951.....	1,036,000	152,218	3,030,000	—
Apr. 1 winter wheat.....	1,726,512	—	—	—
May 1 winter wheat.....	682,196	—	—	—
Conditional Mar. 1.....	1,309,000	—	—	—

¹ Combination of Apr. 1 winter wheat and Mar. 1 conditional spring wheat.

² March intentions.

Carry-over wheat stocks July 1

(In thousands of bushels)

	United States	Kansas
1937.....	183,167	—
1947.....	83,813	6,295
1948.....	195,991	44,355
1949.....	307,952	47,868
1950.....	420,018	80,091
1951.....	(¹)	—
Peak.....	—	—
1942.....	830,775	—
1943.....	818,897	—

¹ Lowest.

² 400,000,000 to 420,000,000 bushels. Estimated on basis of expected utilization and exports.

³ Wheat feeding program.

Carry-over corn stocks Oct. 1

(In thousands of bushels)

	United States	Kansas		
		Off-farm	Farm, all	Total
1946.....	172,926	283	6,479	6,762
1947.....	285,594	617	5,432	6,049
1948.....	125,386	134	2,502	2,636
1949.....	825,306	817	17,084	17,901
1950.....	860,470	8,964	7,449	16,403
1951.....	(¹)	—	—	—

¹ 675,000,000 to 700,000,000 bushels. Estimated on basis of expected utilization and exports.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say, if the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me, that I called the Department of Agriculture a few minutes ago, and a new carry-over figure was given to me within the past 30 minutes, by telephone. It is not over the signature of anyone. The carry-over now on hand of winter wheat is estimated at 408,000,000 bushels.

I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he knows what the carry-over of corn was in 1950, as of October 1?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I could not compete with the Senator from Nebraska on that question.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know what the anticipated carry-over is for October 1, 1951?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to have the Senator tell me.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know whether the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has these figures or not; but while I will take off my hat to Kansas when it comes to producing wheat, I will not take my hat off to Kansas when it comes to producing good cattle and good corn, because it is from those commodities that we in Nebraska make our living.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one of those representing the State of Massachusetts, I will not take my hat off to any other State when it comes to good poultry and dairy products, provided the farmers of Massachusetts can get the corn.

Mr. WHERRY. That is subject to debate. However, I shall not argue the point now.

I suggest to the distinguished Senator that these figures also came from the Department of Agriculture: The carry-over of corn as of October 1, 1950, was 860,000,000 bushels. That is not a terrific carry-over, although we have had some wonderful crops. When I asked the question I learned that we are now using more corn than we are producing, regardless of what our crops are.

However, what alarms me is that the estimate for the 1951 carry-over has dropped to 665,000,000 bushels. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is a cattle feeder. He once told me that he fed out some steers. Corn has a definite relationship to meat.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the Senator questioning me now?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I ask the Senator that question. Does he feed his cattle corn?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Corn has a great deal to do with the quality of meat. Mr. WHERRY. In order to obtain prime meat, one must feed cattle on corn.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the best thing to feed them.

Mr. WHERRY. On the one hand, we are putting price ceilings and roll backs on beef. On the other hand, we take out of the market thirty-seven and one-half million bushels of wheat when we are facing one of the lowest carry-overs—if the crop continues to deteriorate—we have had in a number of

years. We are also facing a corn carry-over which will be depreciated nearly 25 percent.

With those figures in mind, does not the Senator feel that the tendency of all prices for grains and meats will be upward? How can we control the price of meat and reduce it if the price of the commodity which makes the meat becomes higher? It will become higher as the crop estimates show that the crop is short in supply.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not question the fact that controls on prices of the scarcer grains will be extremely helpful, and probably necessary. I do not pretend to have the knowledge regarding meat which the Senator from Nebraska has. I do pretend to have equal knowledge with him as to the need to assure security in this country.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not questioning the Senator's desire to feed hungry people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Nebraska concurs in that desire, does he not?

Mr. WHERRY. I think we are all glad to feed hungry people elsewhere if we can feed them without injury to our own people. I think everyone goes along with that premise. That is another matter.

My point is this: Halfway through the Senator's remarks he made mention of the fact that, according to reports from the Department of Agriculture which were placed in the RECORD yesterday, 2,000,000 tons of wheat could be taken out of our supply without apparently causing any particular difficulty in our grain market. I wish to point out to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that my feeling is that it will have an effect upon the market. We are facing shortages of supply. In order to keep prices down we are now putting on rollbacks and beef ceilings. Does not the Senator feel that it will be increasingly difficult to reduce meat prices 10 percent—which I think is the goal of Mr. DiSalle by October—if we are in a market in which the supply of grain is decreasing, which has a tendency to force prices up? As an agricultural man, speaking from a selfish viewpoint—and I believe I speak the sentiments of the Senator from Kansas—the more I can get for grain the better I like it.

On the other hand, we are called upon to put controls and price ceilings on meat, when we are taking away a source of supply of grain, which will result in driving prices upward. As the price of grain goes upward, the price of meat will rise. If the price of meat does not rise, it will require a degree of enforcement which we have never had to keep meat prices at a level where the people can afford to pay.

I did not want to let the statement stand that in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture we could afford to send this wheat to India without its having any effect upon the market. My judgment is that it would have a tremendous effect on the market. It is not the total yield that makes the market.

It is the surplus that makes the market. It is proposed, first, that we send to India 37,500,000 bushels. That would have an effect, of course. Then the second 37,500,000 bushels will have a decided effect upon the carry-over. I suppose that would happen within about a year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The first 37,500,000 bushels would be authorized by the pending bill. The second 37,500,000 bushels would be the subject of further consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. It would be considered within the year. If we approved the first 37,500,000 bushels, we would probably be obligated morally to commit the second 37,500,000 bushels.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not commit the second 37,500,000 bushels to be sent if there were a serious shortage in this country at the time.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, then, why we should not commit the first 37,500,000 bushels and then wait to find out what we can do with respect to the second 37,500,000 bushels?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer to the question is that we are doing our best at the present time, as I see it, to permit the Government of India to make plans on a minimum-subsistence basis.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator think we too should make plans in the United States?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, we should make our plans. However, at the moment, while we may cut our reserves more than we would like to for safety, we still can make our plans to authorize the second 2,000,000 tons.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to assure the Senator from Massachusetts of my sympathetic understanding so far as hungry and starving people are concerned. However, I think it is proper that it should be called to the attention of the Senate that in a year, or perhaps 2 years, our wheat and corn prices and other commodity prices will be increased because of a shortage of such commodities. Senators may then rise on the floor of the Senate and complain bitterly about it. Therefore, I think the matter should be called to the attention of the Senate at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I believe that what the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Nebraska have said is of great value. It calls to our attention certain problems within our country with relation to food, as well as the problems that exist in other countries.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am very happy to yield to my colleague and friend from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is my friend, too. On that point we are dealing on a reciprocal basis. Does the Senator know what the outlook is for the oats crop?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have stated that I am from Massachusetts, and I do not pretend to have the knowledge the

Senator from Nebraska has with respect to food grains.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the compliment of the Senator from Massachusetts. It is a fact that we must look into the situation. The outlook for oats is one of the poorest we have had in years. The weather was too dry to begin with, and then it was too wet. Proper planning has not been undertaken. I asked the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture what he expected to do. He said, "We will try to raise more corn." However, in that respect we are working under an acreage limitation. The way to produce more corn is by means of better fertilization, or something of that kind. The acreage has been fixed.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the production of oats helps out the wheat crop. All such commodities are substitutes for wheat. Whatever affects corn affects wheat. Whatever affects oats affects wheat. I am not saying how the situation may develop, but I am pointing out to the distinguished Senator that our reserves of winter wheat are rapidly falling to a new low. The oats outlook is bad. Corn will be up 25 percent, according to the best estimates. We are using more corn than we are producing.

When we add these facts together and try to translate the result into the production of meat, and consider the housewife going to the corner store to buy meat for the family, it will be increasingly difficult to maintain the price of meat on the basis of the present supply. All such factors are interrelated, and they must be considered in planning for the people of this country, just as such factors must be considered in planning by other countries on behalf of their citizens.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I believe we should keep our eyes on the ultimate goal, which is the security of our country, as it is involved with other countries of the world. Hungry people and starving people are not thoughtful people. We must keep our minds on that thought and rely on the best estimate we can obtain. We must keep our reserves above a proper level for subsistence purposes in the United States. If our reserves begin to fall below a safe and proper level, I shall be the first one to say that the second 37,500,000 bushels should not be sent to India.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to read a few paragraphs from this morning's newspaper, as a basis for my question:

House taxmakers yesterday voted to hit consumer pocketbooks for another \$607,000,000 a year on a wide variety of items, including cigarettes, automobiles, radio and television sets, jewelry, household appliances, and sporting goods.

The article goes on to say:

The tax on passenger automobiles and motorcycles would be raised from 7 to 10 percent of the manufacturer's price, a total of \$196,000,000 more in taxes. The Treasury had requested an increase to 20 percent.

The article continues:

The committee decided to leave the Federal tax on gasoline unchanged, at 1½ cents a gallon, but voted to impose the same tax on Diesel fuel oil used on highways, to yield \$7,500,000 additional.

Automobile trucks, busses, and truck trailers would be taxed 8 instead of 5 percent of manufacturer's price, to yield \$61,000,000 more, under the committee proposal.

The committee voted to boost the manufacturer's excise tax on radios, television sets, phonographs, phonograph records, and musical instruments from 10 to 15 percent, producing \$55,000,000 more revenue. The Treasury requested an increase from 10 to 25 percent.

The junior Senator from Nevada agrees wholeheartedly with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that we should feed all the hungry people we can feed.

Our difficulty, it seems to me, is that we have a too perfect tax system in our country. Apparently the Senate believes that because we can sell bonds to our people on the basis of deficit financing, and because we have a perfect taxing system which can reach the last stenographer farthest away from Washington to make her pay \$10 or \$15 a week out of a very small salary, we have money with which to buy wheat to give away.

The junior Senator from Nevada believes that taxation has about reached the saturation point. We are now close to the point where the law of diminishing returns takes over. The Government bonds we are selling have reached a point where they are now no longer so attractive to the people of our country. If we pulled the support from under the bonds, many believe they would go as low as 83, the point reached following World War I, and they might go much lower. The banks are full of Government bonds. If they were to go to 90, it could break most of the banks in America. Under the deposit-insurance law we would give the depositors greenbacks worth about 40 cents on the dollar today as compared to 10 or 12 years ago.

I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts whether he believes that we should now issue bonds for the value of 2,000,000 tons of wheat. Of course, we would have to do so, because the wheat must be paid for by someone at the going price on the farm.

We would give the wheat to a country which has undeveloped raw materials we need. The junior Senator from Nevada visited India, where he discussed such raw materials with Nehru, who is the Prime Minister of India. India is willing to give only a 1- or 2-year, and, at a maximum, a 3-year lease on its manganese deposits. A deposit of manganese can hardly be explored in that length of time. They are not mining manganese themselves. Is the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts aware of the fact that there is a virtual embargo on manganese shipments from India to the United States above a certain amount? Is the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts familiar with the fact that India contains amounts of manganese not only sufficient for her

own needs, but enough for the needs of the United States for the next 50 years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator from Nevada, first, that I believe we should balance our budget to the best of our ability.

My answer to the second point the Senator makes—and I believe I am correct in giving the figures from memory; I do not say that I am absolutely correct, but I believe I am substantially correct—is that I understand that the largest block of Government bonds ever sold on a nonnegotiable basis was sold in April. It amounted to approximately \$13,000,000,000 worth, I understand, of Government bonds of the longest term.

In answer to the third point the Senator from Nevada has made, I would say that I do not think we can undertake this transaction with India on a barter basis. If we should go into it on a barter basis, then we would run into the problems of blocked sterling, and so forth, which I do not think should enter into this particular transaction.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that we are running into the sterling bloc aspect very acutely in connection with the bill which will be before the Senate on Monday, namely, H. R. 1612, which continues the authority for the continual lowering, in haphazard fashion, of tariffs and import fees without any regard to the differential between living standards in foreign nations and in the United States.

We shall have to consider the sterling bloc because the countries in that bloc refuse to give up their imperial preference tariffs, but will get the benefit of all of the Torquay bilateral agreements to lower tariffs which were made by us on the basis of the most-favored-nation clause of the Geneva agreement. Furthermore, every agreement we have made for the lowering of tariffs or import fees on a bilateral basis, contained the most-favored-nation clause, thus extending to every nation in the world, including the British Empire countries the benefits of our duty reductions without the other nations giving anything in return.

Mr. President, If the Senator from Massachusetts will yield further, I would like to ask him if he is aware of the fact that Pakistan, which is on the doorstep of India, has wheat for sale.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall take up that point later; I am prepared to give the figures in that connection during the course of my remarks.

Mr. MALONE. Then I shall be very glad to read the Senator's speech as to the reasons why India should not buy wheat from a country which is adjacent to it. As a matter of fact, Pakistan was a part of India until Britain surrendered rule over India and saw fit to have her divided into two countries, with a part of Pakistan on one side of India and a part of Pakistan on the other side of India, the two parts being approximately 400 or 500 miles distant from each other, which, of course, makes it practically impossible for the two to survive.

I should like to be informed by the Senator as to the details in respect to why India should not buy the wheat which is available in Pakistan. That question is important, because those two countries are now on the verge, if not war, at least of a serious diplomatic rift. Therefore, we should inquire why normal trade relations have not been established between those two countries, so that they can utilize the food supplies there available.

Our taxes are reaching the saturation point—our public debt is almost beyond the imagination, the annual interest being more than was required to finance the entire Government 20 years ago.

We are running our Government on an emergency basis—deficit financing for subsidies and contracts to keep the economy afloat. Will it stand the continual pressure?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall try to answer that question. Perhaps my answer will not be satisfactory to the Senator, but at least I shall try to answer it.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has already covered this point in his speech, but I wonder whether a plan is being made for the distribution of the wheat on the basis that it is to be a gift for the relief of hunger. Is there any plan whereby this particular wheat will reach the hungry people without charge?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is in charge of the bill. I was originally in favor of the half-grant-half-loan basis. I believe that the House bill, somewhat changed in form by the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, would put this transaction on a loan basis. I have no authority for saying so, but I believe that those in charge of the committee report will accept the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, so that the transaction will be on a loan basis entirely, and not on a half-loan-half-grant basis. Therefore, I have stricken from the few remarks I have to make any comments in favor of sending the wheat to India on a grant basis.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield, in order to permit the Senator from Iowa to answer that specific question.

Mr. GILLETTE. I did not hear the specific question, but I heard the answer of the Senator from Massachusetts, which indicates that the Senator from Iowa, in charge of the bill, is prepared to accept such an amendment.

Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa, of course acting for the committee which has reported the half-loan-half-grant measure, would not feel that he was in a position where he could accept the amendment, representing, as he does, the committee and its findings.

The Senator from Iowa was informed that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and his cosponsors in the introduction of the bill are ready to accept the

amendment which has been offered; but I would not be in a position to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, my remark, then, to the Senator from Nebraska should follow out the suggestion the Senator from Iowa has just made.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further, so that I may ask a further question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I preface my question with the following remark: In making a trip around the world with a congressional delegation in 1946, we visited places where UNRRA relief was being delivered in the Orient. I wonder whether a similar situation might arise at this time. In the case of UNRRA, we found large harbors which were completely filled with UNRRA vessels which had been loaded in the United States by crews which worked at night, overtime, in order to get the cargoes to the Orient very quickly so as to relieve hunger. We were surprised to find harbors filled with vessels which had been in the harbors anywhere from 1 month to 3 months, and still were either completely unloaded or partially unloaded, so it was believed. However, when the vessels reached the dock to be unloaded, so that the food which had been sent by UNRRA might be used to relieve hungry people, the vessels were found to be either completely unloaded or partially unloaded by that time.

So, Mr. President, if a gift is made at this time, I hope arrangements will be made to follow it through so as to see that the relief reaches the people it is intended to reach, namely, the hungry people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think that is to be done. It is believed that the wheat going to India under the provisions of this bill, if the full amount of wheat is sent from the United States to India, will be only a 2 weeks' supply for India. It will be only a small part of the entire amount needed in India, but will allow India to plan in such a way that the grain sent from the United States can be used with the larger supplies of grain India will obtain from other sources, and thus make it possible for the people of India to have sufficient grain for a minimum subsistence, namely, under 2,000 calories, and enable India to have sufficient grain to carry its people until the next year.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. There was another item in connection with the distribution of UNRRA relief which did not satisfy me very well. It was that it became a relief to governments, rather than a relief to people, because the governments receiving the relief sold the material which we had sent for relief, and the returns went into the treasuries of the governments. I hope nothing of that sort will occur at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This grain will be sent to India on a loan basis, if the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is adopted. So the Government of India will buy the grain on an easy-term basis, extending over a period of years.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Is there any assurance that the Indian Govern-

ment in handling the grain in that way will not make a profit on the deal?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I sincerely hope not, but I have no assurance that it will not.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I may say, for whatever interest it may be to Senators who now are on the floor, that the principal export of India, I believe, is jute, or what we call burlap. Great quantities of it are used in the United States. It is a very essential product for us. At the present time it is bringing, in the world market, a price which is about 500 percent higher than the price normally is. An ordinary jute bag which used to sell for a nickel, or up to a dime in some instances, now brings anywhere from 60 to 75 cents. It would appear to me that, with an export business of that kind, the Indian Government should be able to finance the purchase of the food grains which are needed for its people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I am wondering whether the Senator will agree that it would not look very well for the Government of the United States to reject this request for wheat to be sent to starving India, in view of the fact that since the end of World War II, we have already given to the small country of Greece nearly \$2,000,000,000. Is that not true, particularly at this time, when we have had a surplus of wheat, in fact, a burdensome surplus, until our present short crop developed? It now appears that even after supplying wheat to India, we will still have a carry-over of about 400,000,000 bushels as of July 1 next. Comparing that with the carry-over which we had shortly after the war, of about 80,000,000 bushels, it would seem to me that we could well afford to give this wheat to India.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to have that opinion expressed by the Senator from North Dakota, who comes from a State which supplies so much of our grain.

Mr. YOUNG. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that, if we need more wheat, I believe we are in a position to raise more. Our problem with wheat over the years, has been one of surpluses, not shortages.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

I should now like to continue with my statement, very briefly.

The figures I gave as to the carry-over would bring Brannan's estimate down to approximately 388,000,000 bushels, or 63,000,000 bushels above the safe carry-over. However, on May 7 the estimate of the 1951 crop stated in the New York Times was as follows:

Prospects now are that the crop will be the smallest since 1943.

This may make Brannan's estimate slightly lower. However, I remember very well the testimony to the Appropriations Committee several years ago when it was estimated by responsible

public officials that we could get along on a carry-over of only 150,000,000 bushels. In fact, the figures then given were even lower. So that I believe that we can safely say that we will have a sufficient supply of surplus grains to provide this 37,500,000 bushels, and later in the year, if the second million tons is needed, we can determine the wheat supply at that time when the facts as to the 1951 crop are known.

I have offered an amendment in conjunction with the senior Senator from Michigan—and I should like to have the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] join with us—to require the Secretary of Agriculture to certify that there is sufficient food grain to satisfy the needs of our American people before this wheat is sent to India.

The question will be asked: Why do we send this wheat to India? I think it is helpful for us to picture just where India lies in the world today—of her position in the continent of Asia between the east and the west. We can well recognize the tremendous potentialities of India in the world of today and the future. Just recently we have seen millions of Chinese disappear behind the iron curtain. There are 350,000,000 men, women, and children living in India. Can we take any chance whatever of seeing them disappear behind the iron curtain? Unquestionably it is clear that our objective today and in the years ahead is to strive unceasingly not only to gain new friends in this troubled world, but especially to hold those we now have. Starving people create unrest and feed easily upon the ideologies of Communist leaders are even now urging upon India. India today is one of the tremendous uncertain and unknown quantities in this world. We want to live on peaceful and friendly terms with the people of India. We want to help them to triumph over communistic theories and pressures. There is little doubt that the Government of India could find sufficient resources in one way or another to pay for all of the grain that is shipped. But if our primary objective is one of humanitarian interest and to remain friendly with India and increase that friendship, then it is our goal to keep the Indians from starving and at the same time make it possible for India to build herself up so that measures like the one now contemplated will not have to be taken in the years to come. We do not want to be in the position of having the Government of India or any of its leading citizens say that we in the United States drove a tough bargain when they in India needed grain for their starving millions. I not only desire that hungry people be assisted, but so assisted that they feel we have performed an act of friendship, and not driven a heartless bargain in their time of need.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much wheat India at this time is buying monthly from the United States?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have those figures in my prepared statement, which I shall come to later, if the Senator will permit.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that we are now providing India with about 100,000 tons of wheat a month. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We are supplying a very substantial amount. What the exact figure is, I am unable to say.

Mr. WHERRY. If this additional wheat is to be supplied on the basis of a loan, why are we expecting that we shall then be in a more favorable position than we are at this time, when we are selling India 100,000 tons of wheat a month, on a loan basis?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We are doing that on a strictly business basis.

Mr. WHERRY. What would be the difference between doing it on a strictly business basis, and doing it the way now proposed? Is the loan to be a straight loan, or are there to be loopholes in it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The loan is to be made on the basis of ECA conditions, as I understand. That statement will be made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield, I should like to ask a further question, inasmuch as he has taken a great interest in this matter; and I can understand that he would. The Senate is entitled to know precisely the kind of loan which is to be made to India, to enable her to buy this wheat. We are already supplying 100,000 tons a month. What kind of loan is this to be? Has anyone described it? Is it to be strictly a business transaction? Is the money we loan to be repaid, or will the loan be coupled with numerous conditions and loopholes? If the Senator will permit me to say so, the ECA loans have been considered in the Senate to be more or less in the nature of grants, as I understand. It has been said the loans will never be repaid. What is the difference between an ECA loan and the presently proposed loan to India? It is proposed that we loan the money. If so, what kind of loan is it to be? Is the money to be repaid, or are we merely making a nominal loan, which, in fact, is in the nature of a grant?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope we shall get the money back. As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, I certainly believe that the ECA funds were advanced on a grant basis and on a loan basis. This loan to India is to be made in a similar manner, and the conditions which are applicable to ECA loans, as I understand the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, are to apply to the loan to India. I would hope that the loans will be repaid.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator from Massachusetts tell me whether any ECA loans have been repaid?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am unable to say to what extent they have been repaid. They extend over a period of time.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether any of the loans have been repaid?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am unable to answer that question affirmatively, of my own knowledge.

Mr. WHERRY. If the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will yield further, I should like to suggest to him that I think the Senate is entitled to know now whether this money is to be advanced on a loan basis. If so, what kind of loan is it to be? Is it to be a loan similar to loans which are made by the Government to our own citizens? Is it a loan which has loopholes in it, so that, in the event of certain contingencies, the loan will become a grant? If the transaction is to be in the nature of a straight loan, we ought to know it. If it is to be a loan with loopholes, as the result of which the money would never be repaid, it would be in the nature of a grant. I think the Senate ought to know the basis upon which the money is to be advanced.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that I hope the ECA loans will be repaid over the years. As I understand, under the terms of the ECA program, no payments are yet due. That has just been called to my attention.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator from Massachusetts tell us how much money we have loaned foreign countries during the past 10 years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer the question without first investigating the facts.

Mr. WHERRY. If I were to suggest that loans, grants, and credits amounted to more than \$100,000,000,000, would the Senator feel that that figure was out of line, for the period of the past 10 years?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator refer to advances made by way of loans or by way of grants?

Mr. WHERRY. I refer to advances made on a loan basis. I consider that many of the loans were grants, though they are supposed to be loans. I speak not only of ECA, but also of the Export-Import Bank, of the Bretton Woods Agreement, and of all agencies which are loaning money to foreigners.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator's figures are perhaps high.

Mr. WHERRY. I would not want to make an excessive statement to my distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, but I am satisfied that if the Senator will undertake a little research, he will find that during the period of 10 years the United States has made foreign loans, grants, and credits in excess of \$100,000,000,000. The Senator from Massachusetts, is one of the able members of the Committee on Appropriations, and I compliment him on his industry. But I happen to have examined into those figures. Does the Senator know how much of that large amount has been repaid?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Nebraska obviously knows the answer, or he would not ask the question.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know, and that is what I am endeavoring to ascertain. I have been unable to find that any of it has been repaid. I hope that some of it has been. I share the hope of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and other Senators in that respect.

The only agency, so far as I know, which would know anything about it, would probably be the watchdog committee; or, we might inquire of ECA. During all these months, I have been unable to ascertain how much of the loans has been repaid if anything.

The only point I raise is this: When anyone takes exceptions to statements which are made about this matter or even asks questions regarding the validity of the proposed loan, immediately he is said to be against feeding hungry children. I am as anxious to feed starving people as is the Senator from Massachusetts. No Senator is critical of such a generous impulse. I know the Senator from Massachusetts feels that way about it. We are all in the same corner, so far as the desirability of the project is concerned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that the questions he raises are eminently proper and eminently practical. I shall be glad to endeavor to get some of the answers, and, later in the debate, if they are still pertinent, I shall try to present them. I am sorry I was not fully prepared to answer the questions asked. I did not anticipate that I would be asked how much of the money loaned to foreign governments during the past 10 years had been repaid.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts sits with the junior Senator from Nebraska on the Appropriations Committee, I am sure the Senator has not been surprised by the questions I have asked, for I dare say he feels he might expect anything from the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would expect anything that was practical and intelligent.

Mr. President, during the war India ran her economy at a rate which did not allow for proper or adequate depreciation and renewal. As a result, today India finds her whole economic machine badly in need of repair. To make those repairs and to put the machine in working order, she has laid out a long-range program to try to rehabilitate herself and go forward with ever-increasing ability to look after herself. This cannot be done without heavy additional outlays of capital. If we take away too many of the funds which India proposes to use as capital for this rehabilitation to pay for the grain, then we may well be faced with an entirely different question, which is just this: How much might it be wise to give to India to help her rehabilitate herself, just as we have given through the ECA to other countries? We want to try to work out a program for the benefit of India that will help assure that great country that it can go ahead with the internal development of its economic resources with the hope that the development of these sources will avoid possible famines in the future and help bring to the people of India some of the comforts of life which we know in this country.

I personally joined in introducing the original bill which would send this 2,000,000 tons of wheat half on a loan basis and half on a grant basis. I believe there is a good argument for the reasons in support of that view which I have just briefly stated. I understand, however, that though the terms of the original bill were well-warranted, those sponsoring the bill have agreed to accept an amendment which would put the action entirely on a loan basis substantially similar to the terms of the House bill. I, therefore, have not attempted to debate this part of the bill, but will go along with the idea of furnishing the wheat on a loan basis in accordance with ECA lending facilities.

From all that I can gather I believe that the population of India is fundamentally favorably inclined toward the United States. I believe it is an axiom in advertising that it is far easier to push and accelerate a trend than it ever is to reverse it. If the trend is in our favor, as I believe it to be, then we should try to accelerate that trend before it has become too late. I believe the time has arrived when we can deal with India on a humanitarian basis without necessarily getting into some of the questions which have been raised as to why and how India got to the point of needing these two million additional tons of food grain.

It has been suggested that we require India to ship us various strategic materials in return for any grant we may make. Today there are various strategic materials that we are receiving from India. In 1950 nearly 585,000 tons of manganese and 260,000 tons of mica were shipped by India to the United States; from January 1 to March 3 of this year, 110,000 tons of manganese. Without going into other shipments of strategic materials, I should like to point out that certain manganese is an exceedingly important strategic material and is essential to our economy. Why, then, not swap United States wheat for Indian manganese? The answers are the same as those which I have been endeavoring to make, namely, if India is to develop and become self-sufficient, and take an increasingly active part in the affairs of the world, it must earn dollars. If it uses its strategic materials simply to buy wheat to tide over an emergency, it will not earn any dollars; the dollar balance which would result if we paid directly for the manganese will be non-existent, and the building up of India's economic machine will suffer accordingly. The furnishing of raw materials is one of the assets to which I referred when I stated that the Government of India had resources with which it could meet payments for the food grain. But I believe the prudent method of operating is not to force India to do this at this time, as I do not believe it is conducive to the friendship which we must continue and to the basic purpose of allowing India to build its economic strength. The stronger friend India is, the greater is our need to have its friendship.

Allegations have been made that the food shortage resulted from failure in India to buy wheat in Pakistan, which was available, and also to the diversion from food grains to jute and cotton.

While I do not condone in any way any action of India that would fail to keep it on a friendly basis with Pakistan, while I do not condone in any way the disagreements which exist about Kashmir, I should like to discuss briefly these allegations.

As to the first point: In early 1950, India's imports were based upon estimated requirements to keep the rationing system functioning properly. Had India then bought Pakistan wheat, it would have correspondingly reduced its purchases from other sources. During the course of the year Pakistan sold its grain elsewhere. By the time the natural catastrophes made it evident that more grain was needed, the Pakistan grain was not available.

As to the second point: India increased its jute acreage only some 150,000 acres in 1950. Not all of this increased acreage was at the expense of food grains, and the total decrease of food-grain production resulting from this diversion probably did not exceed 175,000 tons. The foreign exchange value of these cash crops made it possible to buy grain abroad equivalent to all that could have been produced on this land—and more, too.

India's financial difficulties have been attributed to the almost complete stoppage of legal trade with Pakistan during 1950. There is no questioning the fact that both countries suffered from this trade impasse. Had normal trade occurred, the two countries would have been in a better general economic position as 1951 began. However, it is highly doubtful that India would have had larger foreign exchange resources available to buy food grain, as it normally runs a deficit in its trade account with Pakistan.

In any case, India and Pakistan signed a comprehensive trade agreement on February 25, 1951, and the reestablishment of normal trade patterns can be expected. Under the terms of the agreement, India is to receive 325,000 tons of food grain from Pakistan in 1951. This grain will be included in the Indian purchase program of 4,000,000 tons. It will not reduce India's need for the 2,000,000 tons requested.

India has taken certain steps in the United Nations with which I totally disagree, but I reiterate that I believe that the compelling reason that transcends all others why this bill should pass is the humanitarian heart of America. I have studied all the reasons which have been brought to my attention as to why the bill should not pass. I have studied the question of foreign exchange, and the question of the blocked sterling which is owned by the Indian Government. I have looked into the question of the amount of currency and gold which is needed to underlie the Indian currency. I reiterate, I am fully aware that there are resources in India which, if it were deemed advisable, could be forced out to meet immediate payments for this grain. But let me add again that the whole purpose back of this bill, the whole purpose for which I joined the other Senators in introducing the original version, was because our stake in the peace of the world—east and west—is too vital and

too grave for us to fail to do our utmost to live and work on a friendly basis with the great Republic of India.

In closing, I would like to quote from an editorial in the *Christian Science Monitor* of April 4, 1951, which I think sets forth very clearly the point which I have endeavored to stress:

In the state of Bihar in India the grain ration has been reduced below 9 ounces a day and is considered less than enough to assure survival for long of those who depend on the ration alone. Relief of such conditions takes weeks even after shipment of grain is authorized, and other provinces are approaching similar distress.

In such circumstances discussion of ideologies becomes academic, but Communist incitement and agitation thrive. So great an American as Senator Borah, an authority on the United States Constitution and its importance, said in 1934, "The people can't eat the Constitution."

The people of India cannot satisfyingly fill their stomachs with preachments on freedom and opportunity if they have not the opportunity to eat.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Massachusetts yields the floor, will he yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have in my hand Report No. 373, to accompany House bill 3791, a bill whose title is: "To furnish emergency food relief assistance to India." I wish to read from page 5 of that report a paragraph which is numbered "4." Reference is made in the report to the fact that the Export-Import Bank shall make loans, and to the credit terms on which they shall be made. Paragraph 4 reads:

If at any time or from time to time the parties hereto determine that it would be to their common interests because of adverse economic conditions or for any other reasons to postpone, or provide for the postponement, of any instalments of interest or principal or to provide that such instalments or any part thereof shall be made and received in local currency—

This particular agreement, Mr. President, was with Iceland—

of Iceland at a rate of exchange to be agreed upon, or to modify the aforesaid promissory note in any respect, they may by mutual agreement in writing, provide for any such postponement, or payment in local currency, or other modification hereof. Any agreement for payment in local currency may specify the purposes for which such currency may be used.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator again to state from what he is reading?

Mr. WHERRY. From the report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the India Emergency Assistance Act of 1951. The report accompanies House bill 3791. The committee is citing the different methods by which loans have already been made. I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts what the agreement with India is and to call his attention to the fact that under the agreement with Iceland the promissory note can be altered in any way desired, by mutual consent. To my way of thinking what I have read shows the loan to be a type of loan entirely different from straight loans by this Government to a foreign country such as have been made in the past, or to individuals

in this country who borrow money from the Government.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What it amounts to is that it is subject to renegotiation.

Mr. WHERRY. No, it is not subject to renegotiation, in the sense that taxes will have to be paid in connection with it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It can only be altered with our consent.

Mr. WHERRY. With our consent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Only with our consent.

Mr. WHERRY. With our consent, yes.

TELEVISION AND EDUCATION

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to two stories which have appeared within the past week in the New York Times. They bear on a crucial problem, which the Congress has so far largely neglected. They present views on that problem which are in startling contrast. The first story, headed "Regents propose State TV network to aid education," under the byline of Jack Gould, radio and television editor of the Times, was carried on the front page of last Tuesday's Times. The second, also by Mr. Gould, headed "Commercial TV stations oppose holding channels for education," appeared in last Thursday's Times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles by Jack Gould, which were published in the New York Times of last Tuesday and Thursday, may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I shall take a few minutes to point a moral from these two articles. Less than a month ago, together with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I submitted a resolution, Senate Resolution 127, calling for a study by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which the present distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair] is chairman, on what the Federal Government can now do to help realize the magnificent potentialities of television for education and public service. A portion of that resolution covered the issue raised by these two stories in the Times. The issue cannot wait. In March the Federal Communications Commission, announcing its plan for ending the freeze on the assignment of new TV channels, tentatively reserved 209 station allocations for education, or about 10 percent of the total. The freeze has existed since September 30, 1948, and the failure of the FCC to allocate any frequencies during this 2½-year period has been called a freeze by the trade.

Within the coming weeks the FCC will hold hearings, and will begin to make its present tentative allocations of last March definite and final, after the testimony is in. Then we shall see, I fear, Mr. President, a new kind of freeze—a kind of "freeze in reverse"—with all or almost all available TV channels finally

assigned. Yes, this freeze will set the pattern of American television for decades and even generations to come.

Let me touch first on the story describing the opposition of the commercial TV stations to the FCC's proposal to assign these 209 channels for education. The story reports that the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, the great commercial trade association in this field, is demanding these channels largely for entertainment and advertising. The association protests the proposal of the FCC to set aside even 10 percent of the new facilities for education and public service. The National Association of Broadcasters contends that educational reservations are reservations for a special class of applicants. The National Association argues, according to the Times, that the educational reservations may be wasted through nonuse, or limited use, or use for the benefit of a limited audience.

Let me contrast that story with the story in last Tuesday's Times dealing with the action of the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, which has supervisory authority over 8,000 educational institutions. This board is prepared to ask the State Legislature of New York for \$3,500,000 to build 11 transmitters for educational television in New York State. Mr. Jacob L. Holtzmann, chairman of the regents committee on the subject, said:

It is as important for the educational system to have television channels as schoolhouses, and I don't know in the future which will be more important. The television channels are the most valuable natural resource the people possess today. We, the regents, maintain we have a first mortgage on those channels and we're going to fight for them.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to contrast Mr. Holtzmann's statement with that of the commercial broadcasters, who claim that the educational channels will be wasted, or used on limited audiences. When Mr. Holtzmann calls these channels the most valuable natural resource the people possess, he is not conceding that Bing Crosby is more important than education because his audience is more unlimited. This is the credo of the advertiser, but not of the educator. Mr. Holtzmann knows that if we are to save the world from catastrophe and damnation, we must rely on education to play its great role. Mr. Holtzmann knows that TV is the greatest potential educational instrument ever devised.

I ask the Senate to consider which is the greater waste, using the new channels largely for entertainment and advertising or using as many and as much of the new facilities as possible for education and public service? I do not contend the former is in any sense wasteful, but surely neither is the latter. I ask: Are the educators not indeed a very "special class of applicants"? Do our schoolhouses have to be kept open 24 hours a day in order to be great national assets? Can we indeed judge adversely the potential value of television to all American citizens because as much as 10 percent of its channels are

to be "limited" to educational institutions?

Let us take a very extreme example, an example which I will not defend, and which no one would defend. But let us suppose that by reserving all television channels exclusively for the young—every single available channel to be used for formal education for the young, and only for formal education—let us assume we could educate the next generation to the level of our best university graduates today. I do not even suggest that that is possible, but let us suppose it might be. This indeed outdoes the American dream. It is not only the expression of the dream of Jefferson that each of us receive the best education we can absorb, but it assumes each of us can absorb a college education. Now, would not the fathers and mothers of America cheerfully give up television for themselves, and clamor to give it up, for such a goal as this for their children? I call this a very extreme example. I use it to show that Americans are prepared to make sacrifices for an important educational goal. However, one reason my example is extreme is that the potential use of television in the field of adult education is far, far greater, though perhaps less self-evident, than in the field of formal education. Mr. Holtzmann and the board of regents of New York State are addressing themselves only to formal education, and not at all to the major field in which television can achieve its greatest potential public use, which is the field of adult education.

Last Thursday evening, when I addressed 1,800 radio and television educators meeting at Columbus, Ohio, I pointed out that one of the taunts which has been hurled at the small number of hopeful educators who are aroused to the potential educational importance of television in the contest for channels is, "Where is the money coming from?" That is the taunt of 100 years ago, then hurled against the dream of free public education for all children.

My comment is now, as was the comment at that time of the defenders of free education for all children, that the American people believe in education. They have fought for it and will continue to fight for it. They will find the money, and they will not deny educational television to themselves or their children once they have seen its power continually exerted, as we all saw it so dramatically in the Kefauver hearings.

In the past 3 months three private foundations have appropriated a total of more than \$1,000,000 for educational radio and educational television. No one could have anticipated that action even 6 months ago. Now comes the action of the New York regents. This is the most dramatic action so far. I congratulate the New York Times for featuring that story on its front page. I should like to hope that this action may serve as a model for the entire Nation.

Far from failing to apply for the educational channels which the Federal Communications Commission has tentatively allocated, the New York regents have asked for three more channels for their own use—three more channels than the FCC tentatively reserved in its March

rulings for education in New York. Yet the charge has been made that the FCC reserved too many frequencies for education.

Mr. President, New York's example is one which I should like to see studied and emulated by State boards of education in every other State of the Union. I am today writing to the board of education in my own State of Connecticut. I do not know how many other instances there may be, or how many may develop, in which the number of educational reservations made by the FCC will prove to be inadequate for a given State. In my own State of Connecticut there is only one such reservation; and the station, if it materializes, will be able to reach parts of only three of our eight counties. It will not reach the other five counties at all.

In Massachusetts there is only one educational reservation. In New Jersey there is not a single educational reservation. Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Jersey are States not without some fame and background and history in the field of education.

Yet the commercial broadcasters have now challenged even the 209 reservations already made. Further, I think all will agree that the commercial broadcasters have shown that they can exert very heavy pressure in Washington. Their challenge is thus high cause for alarm.

As another example of this same kind of pressure, I invite the attention of Members of Congress to a resolution adopted by a national convention of the Television Board of this same association, the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, at a meeting in Chicago on April 17. I do not know whether this resolution has been called to the attention of my colleague the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], with whom I sponsored the resolution to which this resolution refers. The resolution of the Television Board singles out Senator HUNT's and my resolution for the singular honor of condemnation.

Copies of this resolution, by the Television Board of the NAB, were sent to the present distinguished Presiding Officer, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado] and to all other members of that committee, as well as to Mr. Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I do not know how widely the resolution has been distributed.

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

Mr. BENTON. I am happy to yield to my cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut a question. Are the interests sponsoring television outlets and those owning television companies approximately the same as the interests which now own and control radio?

Mr. BENTON. Yes, I think that is a fair generality.

Mr. HUNT. Is the Senator from Connecticut aware of the fact that in the early allocation of radio channels and frequencies five of the most favorable were allocated to the city of New York,

clear across the United States to the Pacific coast? I think the Senator is aware of the fact that no radio station has sufficient capacity, or ever will have, to use any frequency in the broadcast band for the entire distance across the United States.

Mr. BENTON. I have recently been reminded of that fact by the able Senator from Wyoming. Of course, in referring to the allocations to the city of New York, the Senator means allocations to private corporations of New York City, does he not? The Senator does not mean allocations to the city itself.

Mr. HUNT. Not to the city government.

Mr. BENTON. To private corporations located in the city of New York.

Mr. HUNT. Yes. Is the Senator from Connecticut further aware of the fact that even though the radio frequencies which have been assigned are useful only as far as the central States, and are of no use at the present time to anyone so far as concerns reaching the area toward the Pacific coast, those of us living in the Rocky Mountain area who have made application to be allocated those same frequencies have not had that privilege, and have been denied the use of unused frequencies simply because a monopoly was obtained in the early days of radio by companies in New York City?

Mr. BENTON. I greatly appreciate the contribution of the able Senator from Wyoming. One thing I am pleading for today, as I shall try to bring out still more clearly in a moment, is the passage of some time before the FCC allots all these TV frequencies, so that we shall not freeze television into a monopolistic pattern in the way the Senator from Wyoming suggests that radio was frozen in its early days.

The resolution to which I refer from the Television Board of the NAB protests because such an investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as the Senator from Wyoming and I have called for, would require a period of not less than from 6 to 12 months.

I do not necessarily agree that the kind of investigation we have in mind would require from 6 to 12 months.

The Federal Communications Commission itself plans holding hearings which involves some delay. Some part of the alleged period of from 6 to 12 months will be consumed by the FCC itself. But let us assume that our proposed Senate investigation would involve the FCC in a delay of as much as from 6 to 12 months. Yes; let us contrast such a small delay with the next two decades or the next 50 years, which is what we are talking about if we allow the television pattern to freeze and harden if the FCC now allocate all available channels.

Instead of reading further from this resolution of condemnation, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. BENTON. I now remind again the Senate of the nature of the resolution sponsored by the Senator from Wy-

oming and myself, the amendment to which the resolution from this trade association is opposed.

Our resolution seeks to explore the impact of television on America's children—home life, education, sports, public affairs, rival forms of communication and entertainment, reading habits, language, and morals. It seeks to direct Congress and its appropriate committees toward this end, an end wholly devoted to the public interest, and not the private profit of any group.

The Federal Communications Commission, which faces immense problems, showed both enlightenment and courage in making tentative educational reservations. However, the reservations may be too few. Further, the FCC has given no assurances as to how long it will hold them open. I would hope that one result of a Senate study would be the adoption of a resolution or the passage of a bill strengthening the hand of the FCC in this matter, and guaranteeing to education the full time and full chance it deserves.

I submit, Mr. President, that educators throughout the country should be given time and encouragement to study the impact and the implications of the action taken by the New York regents. This does and will take time and it does and will take encouragement. The far-flung implications of the leadership of the regents are such as to stagger the imagination. Yes; consideration of them will take more than a few months; and because education moves so slowly, I fear more than a few years.

When the FCC allocates new channels at this time surely the least that we can ask of the FCC is that a sufficient number of channel allocations be held up until the National, State, and local educational boards have had time to determine the need and extent of their potential requirements. Other institutions devoted to public service should also be given time.

Furthermore, I believe that time is needed for a new commercial development. It is the development of the so-called subscription method, carrying no advertising, by which the customer pays for the service, instead of the advertiser. Such a system, in the opinion of those who have studied it, would greatly stimulate the development of educational, informational, and public-service programs.

Moreover, I suggest that before the FCC allocates its new channels to commercial broadcasters, it define more clearly the famous phrase "public interest, convenience, and necessity" as applied to television.

I congratulate the FCC on requiring annual reports from TV licensees, when they apply each year for renewal, instead of every 3 years, as is the practice in radio. Let us now, for the granting of licenses and for their review through annual reports, establish far higher standards than have ever applied to radio. Indeed, before we allocate any further TV frequencies, let us get some measure of agreement on the standards.

I believe one great area for agreement is in the field of good listening time for public-service programs. When we de-

termine what programs can fairly be deemed "educational" or "public service," let us see that they get a good percentage of good listening time. Let us put such programs on at hours when people can hear them, in good evening hours, not merely in the nonsalable hours in the morning or late at night.

It would take chapters to review my own personal experience in my dealings as an officer of the University of Chicago, in my efforts to secure reasonably good listening times for the University of Chicago Round Table and other university programs.

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

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut if it is not a fact that radio and television are in a different category entirely from a newspaper, for example, with respect to the right of personal expression either by an editor or a writer for a newspaper, because in reality radio and television are in effect controlled by Government-owned channels, which are acquired by license from the Government? In that respect, does not the Senator feel that there is a difference between the right to freedom of speech which a person has in a newspaper or on the stump or in a park, as compared with his right to exercise free speech under a Government license?

Mr. BENTON. There is a very great difference, because channels are limited, and they are allocated by the Government. No one can open up a radio station, in the same way, let us say, as he can print a pamphlet or make a speech in the park.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. That is my position, and I think it is the position of most people. There does exist a further difficulty, however. The distinguished Senator is talking about education. We ought to have a great deal of sympathy for his view, especially as education may be disseminated through television.

Mr. BENTON. And public-service programs in general.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Does it not extend even beyond education? There are a great many worth-while programs that ought to be put on the air over radio or television. I am not complaining about the Senator's idea. What I am trying to express is that it must be done by license. Many good features and many fine programs which ought to be put on the air by radio and television are foreclosed from going on the air because it is impossible to meet the expense involved, or because of this, that, or the other reason. In other words, it is impossible to get that right, because of the fact that the channels are licensed.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished minority leader up to his last phrase. But it is not merely because of the fact that channels are licensed that restrictions are encountered. It is also because of the commercial dominance of key listening hours.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I was about to make. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to make one further observation. Certainly I do not

wish to detract in any way from his speech. Let us assume that a radio commentator makes some comments with respect to a Member of the Senate. It is very difficult for the Member of the Senate to get time on the radio or on television to debate, discuss, meet, amend, or correct the remarks. He does not own a channel and he has no license. On the other hand, such a comment could be dealt with in a newspaper, on the stump, or in a speech in a park.

What I am inquiring about is whether the Senator from Connecticut feels—and I understand he may offer a resolution, or another Senator may do so after reading his remarks or listening to them—that it may be about time when, in the interest of freedom of speech and in the interest of television channels, as well as in the interest of radio wave lengths, for the public to have a greater right than they have now, if I may express myself in that way, to acquire and have the use of such facilities, so that any cause, whatever may be, can be conveyed to the American people?

Mr. BENTON. I could not agree more wholeheartedly with the distinguished minority leader. I should like to address a question to him if I may. I found in my recent campaign in Connecticut the most difficult, embarrassing, and perplexing problem of my entire experience in politics. It was the problem of raising money to finance the campaign. The problem in recent years has been greatly intensified by the constantly mounting cost of radio and television time. Would the distinguished minority leader agree with me that it would not be unsuitable for the Senate, in allocating these very valuable frequencies, for which thousands of people are clamoring, and in which thousands of people see potential fortunes, to examine the possibility of having licensees provide major candidates of both parties, when they run for office, with a certain fixed amount of free television time? Would not such an understanding greatly relieve the strain that is placed on candidates, and increasingly so over the years? Indeed, I am told that political campaigns in Connecticut now cost three, four, or five times what they cost 20 years ago. Radio, and increasingly, television, lie at the heart of that problem of rapidly rising costs.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say that I certainly agree that television is most important as a means of communication in connection with campaigns. Certainly in the future the political campaigns will change in nature to a great extent in cases in which television can be used and where the reception warrants its use.

Mr. BENTON. Yes; campaigns will continue to change in that way, and will continue to grow more expensive.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and television time will be prohibitive in cost under such circumstances, unless arrange-

ments are made to provide for its use in the campaigns. In fact, the inability, because of the expense, of prospective candidates to obtain television time would be very likely to completely foreclose many of them from entering the campaigns.

Mr. President, when I asked my question, I really did not have political campaigns in mind, although I think the point is well taken.

My question is this: Does not the Senator from Connecticut feel that it is time to make some arrangements whereby radio and television time will be available to those in public life who find that false charges of a serious nature have been made against them over the radio or the television?

I do not know how such arrangements could be made. At the present time we scarcely have sufficient Members of the Senate to conduct all the investigations which are going on and still have some Members of the Senate available for attendance on the floor of the Senate. However, I feel that the question of allocating time on the radio and the television has become a serious one. Certainly when false charges are made against persons either in public life or elsewhere, an opportunity to answer them should be available. Time on the radio or the television should also be available to worthy programs for school or church purposes. Why is it necessary that persons who wish to handle such programs are faced with competition from businesses and sponsors which can afford to spend tremendous sums of money in obtaining time on the radio or the television at times when people generally would like to see and hear such great issues discussed?

So I wish to ask whether the Senator has in mind an investigation in that connection? Does he expect to submit a resolution on that subject, or does he feel that we can handle the matter by considering all its angles and phases?

Let me state why I am interested in this question. Not long ago a certain commentator said a very vicious thing about the junior Senator from Nebraska. Up until now it has been my theory that the best way to get along is for one just to live his normal life and let his record answer any such vicious accusations. Perhaps that is always the best treatment to give to those who would attempt to involve one in debate about such vicious and scurrilous remarks. Nevertheless, there comes a time when certainly a person has a right to defend himself, or there comes a time when a worthy cause should be presented. That cannot be done now, because the time on the television and the radio is almost always allocated to great enterprises or business which can afford to pay large sums for the time.

It seems to me that somewhere along the line time must be allocated so that those who are falsely charged by radio or television or about whom unfair remarks are made will have an equal opportunity to reply, just as they have an opportunity to do by speaking in parks today or by inserting statements in the newspapers. However, of course, it

would be impossible for me to hire 15 minutes' time on a national broadcasting system. The Senator from Connecticut knows that very well.

On the other hand, if false information or scurrilous statements go out over the radio or the television, should not those about whom such remarks are made have an equal opportunity to reply? Yet today that is not possible, not only because of the great cost, but also because the time on the radio and the television is controlled under license arrangements. The result is that such persons do not have the opportunity they otherwise would have to defend themselves. That is only one point. I could give the Senator hundreds of examples why I think the question of control by the license of Government-owned facilities has become a very serious question in connection with both television and radio.

I wonder whether the Senator feels that a complete investigation of all phases of the question might be a good thing and might be of great aid to the Federal Communications Commission and to other Government agencies as they allocate such time.

Mr. BENTON. I concur, Mr. President.

However, I do not have the answer to one of the questions which has been asked by the distinguished minority leader, to wit, how to make it possible satisfactorily to provide a forum to answer such charges. That is a difficult question. It requires much analysis and study, and this is a good time to precipitate both. I think the question should be examined, and that proper standards should be established.

I know that, as applied to television, today, before frequencies are allocated to the commercial broadcasters, now is the time to try to clarify the matter and to provide the kind of standards which are needed. For instance, an applicant for a television station in my State—one who shall be nameless, for he is in a competitive situation now—is eager to get a television frequency available in his city. In talking to him, I asked him, "Would you agree, in order to get this station, to give up the time from 6 to 8 p. m. three evenings a week—on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, let us say—so that time could be used for public-service programs?"

This distinguished and able businessman replied, "Certainly."

That is what he is now willing to do in order to persuade the FCC to assign the frequency to him. However, Mr. President, I think that same attitude would be too much to expect of human nature 5 or 10 years hence.

The best estimate that has been made indicates that a billion dollars a year will be going from advertisers into television within 5 years. When we reach that situation, considering the enormous commercial pressures which will then exist in connection with television, as they now exist in connection with radio, it certainly will be too much to expect any corporate executive then voluntarily to say, "I give up the time from 6 to 8 p. m. three nights a week"—program time which may be worth several thou-

sand dollars in revenue to a local station. So, in my opinion, the time to explore this matter is before the Federal Communications Commission hands out the frequencies now so eagerly sought.

I have high regard for the Federal Communications Commission and its officials. Many of them have worked for industry, and many of them will, in the future, work for industry. These men are, moreover, subject to constant and tremendous pressure from the radio and television industries. No comparable support comes to them when they adopt policies other than those which fall into line with the standards fostered by the radio industry.

Even a day or two of hearings on this matter by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, not to mention the comments just made by the able Senator from Nebraska on the floor of the Senate, may prove to be encouragement to the Federal Communications Commission to help establish standards which will encourage educators and applicants and station owners to make renewed efforts to arrive at far higher standards.

Mr. President, last week I told a group of television educators in Columbus that—

Except for those who are responsible for the formulation of our foreign policy, I do not know any group which could have a greater impact on our country's future; you are poised at the threshold of a great, new mansion for the human mind.

Mr. President, in my judgment that was not an overstatement. I feel that we in the Senate should help them cross that threshold. I feel that all Senators should assist these men of good will, and others like them, who appreciate the vast potentialities of television, and who wish to see this great new medium devoted to the welfare of mankind.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the most interesting and constructive editorial on this subject I have seen printed by any newspaper or magazine. It comes from a small and not too well-known Catholic newspaper published in New Haven, in my State, the Catholic Transcript, of May 10, and it is headed "Television's future."

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

TELEVISION'S FUTURE

Where is television going? The question is not unimportant. It concerns every man, woman, and child in this country. For television, despite the fact that it has by no means attained its full growth, is already a tremendous power. How influential it is was brought out recently in a Senate speech by the Honorable WILLIAM BENTON, Senator from Connecticut.

The occasion of the Senator's speech was the televising of the public hearings of the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Crime in Interstate Commerce. This committee might have done its work in relative obscurity if it were not for one of the most astonishing phenomena this country has ever seen. Senator BENTON describes it.

"In half a dozen big cities—but most particularly in New York City—there was no rush at the rush hour," says Senator BENTON. "Stores were empty, office work was at a standstill, theater seats were vacant. It was

not merely that the secretaries were late; the bosses did not even show up. The housework did not get done. All this was not the result of any freak of the weather nor of any stimulated outburst of the carnival spirit. This required no Hollywood publicity men, no high-powered promotion, not a line of advertising."

What was going on? "As all of us now know it was the result of televising the public hearings of the Special Senate Committee." And it gives reason for earnest and serious thought, not only to Senator BENTON but to the rest of us. The Senator, widely experienced in the field of radio, was amazed at the tremendous impact of the new medium of communication. And he was moved to suggest action.

"Because the Kefauver hearings have now dramatized for all of us the astonishing power of television to serve good ends, as well as trivial or bad ends," he said, "I believe that the Congress should at once take a sharp look, 'new look' at television in relation to our national life. No one who has read, even superficially, the newspapers and magazines in the last few months can doubt the widespread public concern about this new medium. The discussion rolls on: the effect of TV on children, on home life, on education, on sports, on public affairs, on rival forms of communication and entertainment, on reading habits, on language, on morals."

Where is television going? Will it arrive finally at a status similar to that of the radio, where give-away programs are the outstanding features of an industry devoted mostly to entertainment and advertising features, an industry in which cultural presentations have less and less time devoted to them and where religion is relegated to a very minor position? Nobody knows. But surely, as Senator BENTON intimates, television, that great medium of mass communication, which is so much more forceful than radio in its impact upon the public mind, should not be allowed to drift into futility. Certainly the public interest has a right to be served by television in the fields of education, of religion, of objective news and commentary, of politics and public service.

EXHIBIT 1

REGENTS PROPOSE STATE TV NETWORK TO AID EDUCATION—BOARD WILL SEEK \$3,500,000 FROM LEGISLATURE TO BUILD STATIONS IN 10 AREAS—CHANNELS ASKED OF FCC—HEAD OF SPECIAL UNIT STUDYING PLAN SAYS AIRWAYS ARE AS VALUABLE AS SCHOOLHOUSES

(By Jack Gould)

A plan for a State network of 11 educational television stations, under which the resources of colleges, schools, museums, art galleries and libraries would be used to provide special video programs for both school children and adults, was announced yesterday by the board of regents.

The board revealed that it would ask the legislature for \$3,500,000 with which to construct two transmitters in this city and one each in Buffalo, Rochester, the Albany-Schenectady-Troy area, Binghamton, Ithaca, Syracuse, the Utica-Rome area, Poughkeepsie and Malone.

Disclosure of the plan, by far the most comprehensive yet suggested for educational use of the television medium, was made in a document filed in Washington with the Federal Communications Commission, which was asked by the board to set aside the channels necessary for the project's success.

FREEZE ON CONSTRUCTION NOTED

Actual operation of the network could not begin for a year or two, it was noted, because of the governmental freeze on the construction of new stations.

John P. Myers, chancellor of the board of regents, and Dr. Lewis A. Wilson, State

commissioner of education and president of the University of the State of New York, agreed that the proposed network would provide unlimited opportunities to extend the State's educational program.

The board's approval of the plan was based on recommendations made by a special committee of regents appointed to study television, including Jacob L. Holtzmann, chairman; Vice Chancellor Edward R. Eastman and Roger W. Straus.

Mr. Holtzmann said that he viewed with "extreme criticism some of the bad things made available to children on television" and that he personally disapproved of children being told about the pleasures of beer drinking while they watched the Brooklyn Dodgers.

"Whether a laxative works or not or perspiration disappears under your arm, that is a matter of taste," he continued. "We wouldn't say, 'Don't do that.' What we want to do is to provide an alternative."

WILL FIGHT FOR CHANNELS

Mr. Holtzmann acknowledged that the regents might run into conflict with commercial interests that also sought the limited number of television channels available, but made it clear that the regents were prepared for any contest that might develop.

"It is as important for the educational system to have television channels as schoolhouses, and I don't know in the future which will be more important," he said. "The television channels are the most valuable natural resource the people possess today."

"We, the regents, maintain we have a first mortgage on those channels and we're going to fight for them."

The regents, who have supervisory authority over more than 8,000 public and private educational cultural institutions in the State, filed its plan with the FCC only a matter of hours before the deadline for comment on the Commission's proposed allocations of new channels for video outlets.

For the most part the regents endorsed the Commission's proposals for educational outlets in New York State, but in the case of several cities proposed further changes, some of which were expected to elicit protests from prospective commercial broadcasters.

In the cases of Buffalo and Rochester, the regents suggested that their educational stations receive channels in the present receiving band known as the very high frequency, which could be picked up on existing sets. The Commission originally had suggested that the two educational stations be in the new band known as the ultra high frequency. To receive the new band present set owners ultimately will have to have sets equipped with converters or internally readjusted.

WOULD RESERVE HIGH BANDS

In the case of New York City, where all available channels in present band are already in use, the regents endorsed the Commission's reservation of one channel in the new high band, but thought that two would be needed. They also proposed the reservation of new-band channels in Poughkeepsie and Malone.

Should the Commission not reserve the additional channels in New York City, Malone, and Poughkeepsie, the regents proposed a sharing of television facilities in those areas as between commercial, educational, and other television services.

Mr. Holtzmann said that he could not as yet outline specific programing proposals but did offer several typical examples the regents had in mind. For one, he said, expert teachers with a special knack for giving instruction in a subject could be heard and seen by students all over the State as a supplement to the guidance that the young-

sters normally received from their own teachers.

A child in a comparatively remote rural area up-State, he added, could see for himself the treasures of the Metropolitan Museum of Art on Fifth Avenue. With all of the State's cultural organizations cooperating, Mr. Holtzmann explained, there was virtually no limit to the possibilities for further child guidance, both as part of their regular curriculum and in other programs they might see at home.

Another possibility, according to Mr. Holtzmann, would be to have prominent figures in the news, such as General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, speak directly to perhaps millions of children during school hours.

SEEN SUITED FOR ADULTS ALSO

Mr. Wilson envisioned the proposed television network as being ideally suited to the conduct of an adult educational program, especially in clarifying international affairs and the conflicting ideologies that separate the Western World and Communist Russia.

According to Mr. Wilson, the major merit of the plan of the regents is to "stake out a claim" to channels that would be of use to perhaps hundreds of educational institutions. Without some such centralization of operation, he said, the Federal Communications Commission would face a hopeless task in choosing which universities should have stations. For one college to operate a TV station alone, he said, might prove financially onerous.

Both Mr. Holtzmann and Mr. Wilson acknowledged that it might cost upward of \$2,500,000 annually to maintain a chain of 11 stations, which would be equipped to originate programs locally and feed them to the network. They believed that many educational institutions and communities might be willing to bear a share of the total cost in exchange for the added service received, but they noted that the legislature might prefer to keep the whole project under State financing.

Program costs would run extra, Mr. Holtzmann and Mr. Wilson agreed, but they said that they would not be nearly as high as for commercial stations. He believed that many prominent artists would cooperate if they knew their services were benefiting school children.

EXHIBIT 2

COMMERCIAL TV STATIONS OPPOSE HOLDING CHANNELS FOR EDUCATION (By Jack Gould)

The National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, representing the majority of commercial stations in the country, went on record yesterday in opposition to the blanket reservation of television channels for noncommercial and educational institutions.

The association, in comments filed in Washington with the Federal Communications Commission, charged that the educators would waste the channels either through not using them at all, using them only on a limited basis, or reaching only limited audiences.

The formal position of most of the commercial television industry became known only 2 days after the New York State Board of Regents proposed a plan for establishing a network of 11 educational stations throughout the State. The regents had asked the FCC to reserve the necessary channels.

ONE INDUSTRY HEAD APPROVES

The action of the regents did draw approval, however, from one industry source. Benjamin Abrams, president of the Emerson Radio & Phonograph Corp., one of the larger set manufacturers, congratulated the board on its "forward-looking step."

He pointed out that such a plan would aid the manufacturing industry through "a tremendously expanded market for the sale of television from the standpoint that television now may become standard equipment in the classroom."

In a statement prepared by its counsel, Thad H. Brown, Jr., the association of television broadcasters said that it objected to the reservation of channels for "a special class of applicants."

"The assignment of a noncommercial educational channel in a specific community should be arrived at only on a case-to-case basis founded upon a bona fide showing of public interest, convenience, and necessity," the association maintained.

The association contended that recent hearings on the matter of educational channels, which led to a tentative FCC decision to set aside roughly 10 percent of spectrum space for such broadcasting, had not justified a blanket reservation.

Arguments advanced by the Joint Committee on Educational Television, representing many leading national educational groups, the association declared, were "vague, confused, and generally contradictory."

The broadcasters' group also argued that the educators took an "unrealistic view" as regards the cost of television operations and had not advanced a feasible plan upon which stable utilization of noncommercial channels could be effected.

EXHIBIT 3

RESOLUTION RE SENATE RESOLUTION 127 OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTERS

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission is conducting a hearing in Dockets No. 8736 et al., concerning the allocation of television channels and the revision of Standards of Good Engineering Practice with regard to television broadcasts; and

Whereas in order to accomplish this hearing and its objectives, the Federal Communications Commission has been unable to grant construction permits for new and additional television stations since September 1948; and

Whereas in view of this necessary action by the Commission only a minor percentage of the communities of the United States can receive television broadcasts at this time; and

Whereas many States are presently without any local television service; and

Whereas the peoples of many communities and rural areas, now unserved, are deprived of a television service now available to the residents of the larger cities of the Nation; and

Whereas this unserved public deserves and is clamoring for television service within the immediate future; and

Whereas thousands of pages of transcript have been taken by the Federal Communications Commission and months of hearing have occurred with regard to these dockets; and

Whereas the Commission is now entering the final phases of hearing on these comprehensive issues; and

Whereas opportunity to be heard has been and is being provided to interested parties, including the public, the commercial television industry, and educational institutions and agencies; and

Whereas an investigation, as contemplated in Senate Resolution 127, would encompass a duplication of the past 3 years of effort on behalf of the duly appointed Federal Communications Commission; and

Whereas such an investigation would entail the receiving of expert engineering, programing and allocations testimony; and

Whereas such an investigation would require a period of not less than 6 to 12 months; and

Whereas such an investigation would unnecessarily delay the termination of the so-called "freeze" and would continue to deprive the presently unserved public of a television service; and

Whereas the licensing provisions of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, including the criteria public interest, convenience, and necessity, as reviewed from time to time by the courts of the United States, furnish the bases of licensee qualifications and responsibility: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the membership of the television board of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters be recorded as unalterably opposed to Senate Resolution 127; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be provided by the chairman of the television board to the Honorable EDWIN JOHNSON, chairman, and other members of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and to the Honorable WAYNE COY, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. SNADER, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 77. An act for the relief of Mircea Grossu and his family;

S. 119. An act for the relief of Joseph Girardi;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen;

S. 822. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg; and

S. 824. An act for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 756. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Giulia Pontrelli;

H. R. 1722. An act for the relief of Louise Leitzinger and her daughter; and

H. R. 1823. An act for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to direct my remarks toward the pending business, Senate bill 872, a bill to furnish emergency aid to India. First of all, I wish to express my full support and my commendation of the remarks and the general program as outlined by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The arguments in support of S. 872 were then supplemented and expanded by the principal sponsor of Senate bill 872, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I was very much pleased to have had an opportunity to listen to a portion of the address by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. All these Senators are sponsors or cosponsors of Senate bill 872. I am proud to be a sponsor of the bill and to be associated with these Senators.

Mr. President, I am sure that most of the argument as to the necessity for this proposed legislation has been fairly

well developed. It is my purpose to summarize the points and to assist in the documentation of the importance of the immediate and speedy passage of the bill.

First of all, let me direct my attention to the background of this entire program of grain for India. I do not approach this subject as a Johnny-come-lately. I have been interested in America's relationships with the Republic of India ever since the first day I became a United States Senator. In fact, I recall that within the past year and a half, on several occasions I have addressed myself to the over-all political and economic relationships with the free nation of India, the greatest free nation in the Asiatic area. I have been concerned over the fact that we may not develop the kind of wholesome, friendly, cooperative relationships which we vitally need on the Asiatic mainland. I recognize that there has been justifiable concern on the part of the Senate and on the part of officials in all branches of our Government over what has happened in China.

If there is one thing which I can emphasize in my remarks today, it is that the time to prevent, in another area, namely, India, a repetition of what has happened in China is now. Instead of worrying about and discussing the reports which come from India as to her alleged friendship toward the Soviet Union and as to indications that she may be moving into the Communist fold, the time for the United States of America to act before that nation has been destroyed, either from within or from without.

I recall the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as to certain of the attitudes expressed by some of the political leaders of India, their hesitancy, for example, to give us the all-out support which we need in Korea, the fact that the Prime Minister of India on several occasions has stated that he wished not to associate himself either with the East or the West, that he would like to preserve a position of neutrality.

I think those of us who are students of American history, even cursory students, recognize that this once happened in our own national development. It is not unusual for countries which have just obtained their own freedom and independence to desire to steer a middle course, to keep away from the storms of great powers. India has attempted, in her few years of independence, to steer down what she calls a middle path. I am afraid she will discover that that is not possible, because in this complex world I am quite confident that the day will come when men and women and nations must make up their minds where they stand.

But, Mr. President, any student of the history of any nation will find that there has been a time in its history when its leadership said, "No foreign entanglements." How many times have you and I, Mr. President, heard the remarks read from Washington's farewell address, warning the American people in the early days of the Republic to avoid foreign entanglements? It was a natural

course of development for our own Nation. I only mention that because we, as a people, in this Nation, the United States of America, ought to be most understanding and most tolerant in our attitudes toward other peoples who are aspiring to what we have in terms of national independence.

It should also be noted that India is a country which has lived under the domination of a foreign power for over 300 years. Today she is jealous of her independence. She exemplifies a great sense of national pride. I think it fair to say that wherever a spirit of nationalism is born anew and has crystallized into national independence, the leaders of any such country speak out very strongly, and they often make statements which may be misinterpreted. Again I say that our history is filled with instances when our national leaders have again and again stated things in critical hours of history which were often subject to misinterpretation.

There was a time in our own history when those beyond the seas did not know whether we were for England or for France, in the days when the French and the British were constantly at war. Our leaders were trying to steer our country in a course which would protect our own national security. I am sure the leaders of India are doing that now.

It is not our responsibility to settle all the internal difficulties, nor to try to chart the course of political action, of a friendly nation, but, Mr. President, whether or not the Republic of India has done all that she should have done, she has done some things which have surely helped us.

First, she has preserved her own independence. India is dominated neither by the Soviet Union nor by the United States or any other power. India is her own master.

Second, the Republic of India associated itself with us in the Korean crisis. I would remind the Senate that had she not done so, we could well have found ourselves involved in hostilities in the Asiatic area, without a single Asiatic power on our side. That surely would have played into the hands of the Kremlin propaganda masters, who would have said, "Here, again, is a western Occidental power intruding into the Asiatic area. Here is a new type of imperialism." But all of that was set aside because our friends in the Asiatic area, led by the Republic of India and its Prime Minister, associated themselves with the resolution to stop aggression in Korea. I wish that India would do much more, but at least, on the moral side and on the political side she has associated herself with those nations dedicated to the principle of the United Nations and resisting aggression.

I think it equally important that India's constitution has been patterned along the lines of the American Constitution. I think it very important that in this area which has long been a colony, with all that comes from a colonial status, with exploitation, with others governing her, draining her resources, India which for hundreds of years was a colony, is today a self-governing country. She has a government based upon the

right to vote, a government dedicated to the traditional democratic freedoms in which we so strongly believe. The constitution and the Government are dedicated to freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and freedom to assemble and to petition. It is not easy to establish a free government, particularly in an area of the world where freedom has not long lived.

I have given all this as background. Furthermore, I want to point out a background which I think is characteristic of every nation in which communism succeeds. Make no mistake about it, if we lose the Republic of India to Communist aggression from without, or to infiltration from within, we shall have suffered a major defeat; and when I say "we," I mean the freedom-loving people of the world. Here is a nation of more than 350,000,000 people, a nation which has potentially rich resources which can be developed; a nation which has the beginning of an industrial system; a nation which strategically is of vital importance to the security of the free world. All one need do is to look at the map to see that India, which literally comes up under the underbelly of the Soviet Empire, Siberia, has control of the entrance to the Near East and into the Pacific. Her boundaries, her coast line, her ports are all important to the free world.

Mr. President, nations are destroyed from within by Communist infiltration where there is famine, where there is economic chaos, where there is a breakdown of economic institutions. Make no mistake about it, Mr. President, if India is unable to survive the vicissitudes of economic disturbance for the next few years, it may well fall into the lap of the Communist aggressors. The time to stop that is now. I, for one, am convinced that if the Republic of India were attacked by the Soviet Union, or if she were attacked by any other power, we would immediately give food with which to feed her people. I feel confident in my own mind that we would supply her with military assistance. In other words, we would do everything we could to see that she survived as a free nation.

The record of our country is one of always helping those who try to defend themselves. Our history in foreign policy is one of assisting nations that are struggling to maintain their independence. The only question is, When shall we start the assistance? Shall we wait to put out the fire after it has started, or shall we practice a little fire prevention before fire breaks out? Shall we resist the attack of the Communist subversion before it literally consumes the body politic, or shall we wait until the system is malignant with the cancerous growth of communism, and then rush in to perform major surgery?

I have not the slightest doubt that had the Republic of India been attacked by Communist armies we would not be debating this bill; we would have found a way to give help immediately. It is time that the Congress and the representatives of the executive branch of our Government awaken to the fact that Russia is practicing a new form of aggression. In those areas in which she

thinks she can deliver a death blow with a military stroke, she delivers it. In many other areas she bides her time, and, like a malignant disease, eats away and finally consumes the vital institutions and the economy of a nation. I think the record is open and clear-cut that the method now being practiced is that of infiltration—moving from within.

Remember, too, Mr. President, that the Soviet Union has trained agents. It has a long-range program. Russia spent 25 years training the people who were to rob China of its freedom, and it has been spending 25 or 30 years training people who would like to rob India of her freedom. The Soviet Union has a system of libraries and reading rooms all over India; and while we debate as to whether we should broadcast a little more information through the medium of the Voice of America the Soviet Union acts. I happen to know from personal visitation on the part of eminent scholars in the field of far-eastern relations that all through India today there are hundreds upon hundreds of little information centers spreading the poison of communism to the villagers, the peasantry, the natives. All too often our country deals only with those who have elevated themselves to top positions. If we want friendly connections in any country we must get close to the hearts of the people, because prime ministers come and go, and cabinet members come and go. The element of the constituency that is important involves those that make possible the government. Particularly is this true of republican government.

So, Mr. President, my appeal today is that we do something not only for the Government, but for the people of India, so that they may understand that the heart of America is a good heart, a generous heart, an understanding heart. There are always those who say, "Why do not the peoples of the world know that we are generous? Have we not proved it?" Good deeds are harder to explain than are bad deeds. I think I can demonstrate my point. A man can live a perfectly good, wholesome, clean life; he can love his wife, his children, his neighbors, and his relatives; he can dedicate his life to Christian service 365 days in the year; but he may never get a headline. But if he should step out of line a little, have an accident with his car, or have a struggle with one of his friends or with a member of his family, his name will be printed all over the pages of newspapers.

We must get the people of the world to understand that the heart of America is not to be found in some of the remarks made by some Americans. Our task today is to get the people of the world to understand that the heart, mind, and spirit of the American people are full of generosity, peace, helpfulness, gratitude, and charity, and that we are not clothed in armor, waving sabers and swords, and wanting to conquer and to destroy.

Remember that our enemies are continuously telling of our weaknesses at the top level and down at the bottom, and continually driving the point home where it counts. For the life of me, Mr. President, I have never been able to un-

derstand why American politicians have not been able to see what is going on.

No one ever got elected to public office merely by knowing the president of the chamber of commerce. No one ever was elected to public office by knowing the so-called best people. There are not enough of them to elect anyone. The real people constitute the great mass of the constituency.

Mr. President, I am appealing today for the passage of Senate bill 872, which will affect the lives of millions of people; a measure which means the difference between life and death; a measure which can be interpreted in the simplest terms that people can understand. People understand hunger, and they understand those who answer the call to satisfy the simple needs of life, such as the requirement of food.

There is a great deal we could do to improve our relationships. Throughout the world the United States has a reputation for answering any request for arms aid. Whenever we talk about who our friends are, the first question that is asked is, "Will they fight Joe Stalin?" If they will fight Joe Stalin we will say, "You are our pals." I know one cannot afford to be too choosy when it comes to an all-out struggle; however, it is important to emphasize the fact that we must have a few other friends who have something more to offer than just being against Joe Stalin. If any country will give us the assurance that its bullets start to fly in a certain part of the world, it will fight for us, we say, "Just write out your grocery bill, give us your bill of particulars, and we will take care of it."

Mr. President, India is a nation which has been brought up in the philosophy of Ghandi. Ghandi was a pacifist. He was a great man who left an impression upon his people. It is good that people believe in and talk about the cause of peace. It is well that there are some people who are interested in the preservation of human life and who are to be peacemakers. All I am saying is, Let us not exclude from our orbit of friendship those who may feel that peace is a worthy goal, because this Nation is dedicated to peace, too.

Our methods of approaching the conditions of peace may be a little bit different from those of some of our friends. Be that as it may, our objective is world peace, and our task is to be able to explain to the family of nations that we are the agents of peace and not the agents of war. Our first job at home is to recognize that in the war of propaganda the Communist states are winning by being able to brand us time and time again as warmongers and as warriors.

I regret this, Mr. President. On the day before Good Friday I said on the floor of the Senate:

What a paradox! Here we are, by faith and religion and political background, the peacemakers, and yet the Communists brand us as being warmongers. Here we are, by our whole history, the liberators, the emancipators; and yet the Communists brand us as the oppressors, and take unto themselves the right of being called the emancipators.

What hypocrisy! Be that as it may, what is true does not always go forth as truth to the minds of the people. Frequently truth is what the people believe to be true, and in many areas of the world we have lost the minds of the people, we have lost their friendship, we have lost their cooperation, because they have been fed a stack of lies day in and day out, week in and week out.

We have watched that happen in our own country, and it can happen elsewhere. Hitler proved that the big lie pays off even if only for a short time. Our answer to Mr. Hitler had to be given on the battlefield, whereas, in fact, it is now quite well understood that had we answered him earlier, had we answered the challenge of Hitlerism before Hitler attained power, we might never have needed to go onto the battlefield. So I am appealing today that the great American Nation answer these great basic human needs before it is too late.

What India is asking for today is not 300 tanks. She is not asking for arms aid. She is not asking for money to develop atomic energy plants. What she is asking for is something we have in abundance. We do not have to retool a factory to produce what she needs. We do not have to give anyone the benefit of tax amortization schedules so he can rebuild or start up a new plant to produce what India needs. We do not have to recruit a whole new group of laborers to produce what India needs. We already have it. We have the millions of bushels of wheat that India needs. We have it in storage; we have had it in storage for a long time.

This is only to remind ourselves again that food is a weapon in the arsenal of democracy, and that particularly it is an effective weapon where people are hungry. We have an arsenal of democracy filled with food. In fact, we have had so much of it that it has hurt us. First of all, I suppose it has not done some of us any good at home, because we have overeaten. Second, it has hurt us propagandawise because more than 60 percent of the population of the world is living on a subsistence diet. 150,000,000 Americans are living on a diet of as much as can be consumed, and much of what is planted is left over. In fact, we are having to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars each year to store the extra food, and then we spend other hundreds of thousands of dollars to curtail the production of food.

What do the Communists say about this? They say to the people of Asia who are hungry and weary of war, they say to people who are new in their nationalism and their independence, they say to the people of Asia who have been dominated by the British, the French, and the Dutch for centuries: "Here is Uncle Sam in the United States. He is taking over now. The other countries are too weak to hold on. If you want arms, he will supply them. But if you ask for food—well, that will have to be debated for months."

Mr. President, I do not want my remarks to be misinterpreted. I am not saying that this is the truth. I am saying this is what some people believe to

be the truth. I think the facts are crystal clear.

Mr. President, I wish to read from a letter which I received from an eminent clergyman, who is presently in India, and who has written to me on many occasions. The letter I have is from the head of one of the Protestant missions in India. The letter points out that the Communists have been making tremendous progress in their propaganda because of our failure to act with dispatch upon the question of wheat for India. The letter is dated April 13, 1951, from 12 Boulevard Road, Delhi, India, and is signed by J. Waskom Pickett. Mr. Pickett is the head of one of the Protestant missions in India, as I stated.

Mr. President, I pay tribute to the missions of our churches that have been feeding these people, helping them, performing Christian service, while the Government of the United States has been dilly-dallying around, wondering whether a bill would ever be passed. The bill has been before us for 3 months. People who are hungry, who have an average caloric intake of 900 calories per day, can die of starvation before the bill is passed. When that happens, it is difficult to explain why there has been so much delay in shipping the wheat. The families of those who have passed away because of hunger, who know that food is available, do not look upon one who has stores of food as being a very charitable and kindly person.

What does my friend, the bishop, have to say? By the way, the bishop was here a little over a year ago. I took him over to see the President of the United States. I took him to the State Department to talk to the Secretary of State and to the Under Secretary of State. He met with some of my colleagues in the Senate. A year ago I was saying to my colleagues and saying to the President and to the Secretary of State, "The time to act is now."

Oh, yes, the Communists, the Russians, have come forward now with 50,000 tons of wheat. It does not amount to much, but they make a lot of noise about it. We could have given 50,000 tons a year ago and it would not have hurt us one bit. We wasted that much wheat because we had to store it. The farmers of America can produce more than they have been asked to produce. We had the wheat, but we did not have the will or the insight to make good use of it. I was, I suppose, talking in the wilderness, and the wilderness of politics, urging our Government and its representatives to do something before it was too late. Now we are coming in on the caboose. We are coming in late. China has already offered rice. Russia has already delivered some wheat. Oh, we have sold some. That is not an act of charity. We have sold the wheat. Other nations, regardless of whether they will continue to do so, have given some food.

What does the bishop have to say? I read:

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am very happy to have your letter of the 9th instant with copies of the newspaper release in which you quote my cablegram and of the earlier release on the subject of wheat for India.

The effect of the long delay in dealing with the wheat bill is really serious. The original proposal evoked gratitude in every Indian heart and had action been taken immediately it would have blunted all the efforts the Communists are making to create prejudice and hostility against the U. S. A. But we have given the Communists opportunity to organize and to hurt us and they have used it very cleverly.

Mr. President, this is not a letter from the State Department. This is not a letter from our Ambassador—a man whom I hold in high regard. This is not a letter from a Government official. This is a letter from a man who mingles with the people. This is a letter from a gentleman who knows what the people are thinking, because it is his job to convert people to the Christian faith. He is working with these people day in and day out. I spent many hours with this fine bishop. I have listened to his story. What he told me a year ago he has documented again and again in many letters to my office, letters I have read to my colleagues and to my friends. What does he say? "The original proposal evoked gratitude in every Indian heart."

Let me say to my colleagues that they should not go around complaining if it seems that some of the Indian people are beginning to believe that Russia is their friend. We had the chance. When we miss the boat we have no one else to blame but ourselves, particularly when we have the ticket. We had the ticket. We had the wheat. We were given the opportunity. Now we are saying, "The Indian Government seems to be a little more sympathetic toward Russia than it is toward us." I am not worried about the Indian Government. I am thinking about the Indian people, the hungry ones. We had an opportunity in the month of February. Why does it take from February until May to decide whether or not to feed someone who is starving? I ask any Senator if he would like to have the question of whether he was to live or die debated in the Congress for 3 months.

We missed the boat. What else does the bishop say?

We have given the Communists opportunity to organize and to hurt us, and they have used it rather cleverly.

Yes; they have used it cleverly. Do Senators know what they have been doing? They have been winning municipal elections. That is where political trends start, and not at the top. The trouble with Washington is that everyone is looking on top. Everyone is looking at the dome. We had better look at the foundations once in a while. Elections are not won on top. They are won down where the folks are. Communism does not take hold by getting on top. It takes hold down at the bottom, where the little people who are never heard from are. They are the ones who are never the subject of comment, either pro or con, in the editorial columns. No one ever talks about them on the radio. But they are the ones who spell either success or failure. They are the ones who turn governments upside down. They are the ones who do the

bleeding and dying in revolutions and in wars.

Mr. President, the hour is late. As a matter of fact, this may be too little and too late. When are we going to wake up? When will this Government find out that when human need is crying out for human assistance, the time to act is now? There is not the shadow of a doubt in the mind of any reasonable person that millions of people have been dying of starvation. No reasonable evidence has been presented by any person anywhere to disprove the fact that we could have met this need a year ago. At least we could have met it in January or February.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that more than a year ago the Senator from Minnesota tried to get aid for India?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did. My friend the Senator from Illinois knows that I went to the State Department, and, in fact, went to the President, more than a year ago. I referred to that fact just before the Senator entered the Chamber. I had been working on this project simply because I am interested in the welfare of my own country, as well as that of the Indian people. I was impressed by the fact that we have been doing all kinds of moaning and groaning about what is happening in China. I feel bad about it. We have lost the free people of China. Now we are beginning to lose the free people of India. That means 800,000,000 people. On the basis of a head count, we must do a great deal of converting before we can overcome that set-back.

So when we are talking about this bill, we are not talking about being jolly good fellows. We are not doing something to salve our own consciences. Consider the aim of the bill. It is directed toward the national security and common defense of the United States.

We have learned that we have some stakes in Asia. I remind every Member of this body that the hue and cry today is that we ought to be doing more in Asia. The thing we are being asked to do more of in Asia, however, is making war. The Senator from Minnesota wants to save a few lives. I believe that if we can save a few lives, we may not have to make war; or, if we must make war, we can win it.

But if we should lose India, which is today the leading power of the free areas of Asia, we shall have lost all. Next it will be Indochina, then Burma, then Ceylon, then Thailand. Then it will be the Philippines. Whether we like the Prime Minister of India or not, the fact of the matter is that he is the recognized political spokesman of the free nations of the south and southeast Asiatic area. Joseph Stalin knows that, even if we do not. Joseph Stalin is not giving him a political blood test every 15 minutes, either. He is playing for the long pull. He takes a long look and says,

"This seems to be a likely candidate. At least there is hope. I am going to work on him."

The Senator from Minnesota is saying that the man in charge of the Indian Government looks like a good bet for democracy, for the long pull. At least India has made a start along democratic lines. It is a republic. It has hope of maintaining its freedom. However, freedom does not live long in starvation. Freedom does not survive without a little bread. Freedom cannot long hold itself as a force to unite the people if the people are destroyed by malnutrition, disease, and poverty.

So what we are talking about is a great foreign relations program. We do not have to debate as to how many divisions we are going to send. No one is asking for divisions. We do not have to debate as to whether we are going to send 75-mm. guns or 105-mm. howitzers. We do not need to debate the question whether we have enough air power to do this or not.

What we are asked to give we already have. It has been lying around in storage tanks and ships. It is costing the Government of the United States hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to keep it. I speak of wheat and other cereal grains. The American farmer will produce a great deal more of them if he is given an opportunity. Farm folks do not have to be cajoled into producing. They know how to produce. They have to be cajoled into not producing. Our problem has been to keep them from producing too much.

As I stated earlier, no farmer will come here and ask for a special tax amortization plan to enable him to produce another bushel of wheat. He will not ask for the 5-year schedule, with 20 percent off each year. He will say, "Just give us the go-ahead sign, the market price, and we will produce the sinews of peace to fill the arsenal of democracy."

Lest anyone think I am giving this a partisan twist, which I would not do under any circumstances, let me say that when one is hungry it does not matter whether he is a Republican, a Democrat, or a Socialist; and when one is dead, he is dead for a long time, no matter what he dies from.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article by Harold E. Stassen, a former Governor of the State of Minnesota. Mr. Stassen is an eminent leader in the Republican Party. The article is condensed from his series of articles in the Ladies Home Journal.

What does Mr. Stassen say? He is 100 percent right. The caption on the article is "India: No. 1 Target of World Communism." That is a headline story. Mr. Stassen says:

It is my own view that the men in the Kremlin now look on India as the No. 1 target of world communism. I base that belief on the indications of heightened activity in the Communist cells in India. I base it also on the Tibet move. The march of Chinese Communist troops into Tibet does not make sense on any basis other than as a move by the Soviet Union to bring pressure on India.

Mr. President, this article is worth the attention of every American. I commend the reading of it to Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask to have the article printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

INDIA: NO. 1 TARGET OF WORLD COMMUNISM
(By Harold E. Stassen)

(Condensed from the Ladies' Home Journal)

My recent conference with Prime Minister Nehru in New Delhi confirmed my impression that this leader of 350,000,000 people on the subcontinent of Asia is a supporter of neither communism nor capitalism. He is a believer in neither Stalin's materialistic ideology of force, nor our western dynamic philosophy of liberty. He has not the slightest inclination toward transforming India into a satellite of the Soviet Union or of making it subservient toward the United States.

Nehru is India's prime minister, but more than that, he is unquestionably the true leader of the crowded millions of his nation.

The next 10 years will be difficult for Nehru, for India, and for the world. Some of the difficulty will be caused by Nehru's own hot temper, which smolders beneath the surface and at times breaks out in real turbulence. Kashmir is an example of that.

But this temper is by no means the most important thing we need to understand about Nehru. There is a very great need for a broad understanding of Nehru and India by America and its leaders, and an equally great need for a broad understanding of America and its leaders by Nehru and India.

We in America, by nature and by experience, always think of only two sides in any contest; we are always inclined to ask: "Which side are you on?" We are slow to realize that in the clash of ways of life between the Communist ideology of the Soviet Union's leadership and the free way of life which America represents, neither Nehru nor India can be properly placed on either side, and will not be so placed in the immediate years ahead.

They definitely belong in a third position, and they belong there by reason of their age-old religious and philosophic background, by reason of their geographic position, and by reason of their recent experiences.

It is well to keep in mind that Nehru, himself, spent many years of his life in jail, put there by the British in the course of the long struggle for Indian independence.

Nehru's three principal books were all written during his periods in prison. During these early years, Nehru was strongly attracted to the Soviet Union of Russia and to communism as it was practiced there. He expressed then the confident belief that India had nothing to fear from Russia and that British rule over minorities in India compared very badly with Soviet rule in Russia.

But after noting the developments in the Balkans after World War II and observing the violent and subversive role of the Communist Party in India and in other Asiatic countries following the Communist Calcutta conference of February 1948, Nehru was fully disillusioned.

Last December he said: "What I object to about communism . . . is the suppression of the individual, which I am convinced is bad for the individual, the race, and everybody."

In his visit to Indonesia in June 1950, he told the Indonesian parliament that Communists do not tend to build up anything but rather disrupt everything, producing chaotic conditions and evoking reactionary forces.

If anything, this attitude has stiffened. During my visit to New Delhi, I found him to be not only thoroughly alert to the evils of Russian Communist imperialism but fully aware that a campaign of passive resistance would be ruthlessly crushed by Russian communism. He well knew that passive resistance could be effective only against a nation such as the British, a nation with a moral code and a restraining public opinion. It is clear, therefore, that he, and India with him, intends to resist—actively and effectively—all Communist threats from within or from without.

India continues to hope, I think erroneously, that Chinese Communists leadership will not be aggressive and will take a benign turn. Nevertheless, India is concerned over Tibet, took forthright measures to stabilize Nepal on the Chinese border, and continues to take vigorous action against internal Communist activity. For instance, late in February of this year the national parliament, with only one dissenting vote, took firm action against Communists within India.

This change in Nehru's attitude toward Russian communism, and the effect of that change upon America's relations with him and the nation that he leads, raises the very important question of Nehru's integrity. Can we believe him? Is he a man of his word? Does he have inflexible personal honor? I believe the answer is "Yes."

This was Gandhi's appraisal:

"He [Nehru] is pure as the crystal. He is truthful beyond suspicion. He is a knight without fear, without reproach. The nation is safe in his hands."

Nehru's India has many serious problems, but if, under his leadership, it can successfully keep out of the clutches of Communist imperialism, maintain political stability, and slowly but steadily improve its standard of living, its success may mark the crucial turning point in the world Communist drive.

It is my own view that the men in the Kremlin now look on India as the No. 1 target of world communism. I base that belief on the indications of heightened activity in the Communist cells in India. I base it also on the Tibet move. The march of Chinese Communist troops into Tibet does not make sense on any basis other than as a move by the Soviet Union to bring pressure on India.

I believe India will feel more of these pressures. The Communists will try to keep the Kashmir dispute aflame. They will stir up other conflicts between Pakistan and India. They will constantly endeavor to divide Nehru and India from the west, and at the same time try to undermine Nehru at home by clamoring that he is subservient to the west.

I believe the seriousness of the situation will result in lessening the negative emphasis implicit in the religions of India and will substitute a more affirmative approach to national problems.

Much depends on such an evolution. For it will have a direct bearing upon India's progress in solving the problems represented by the words "land," "water," "babies," "cows," and "capital."

But in the solving of each of these problems, much will also depend upon the future relationships between India and America. Nehru must learn more of the truth about America. I believe he will. I strongly believe that if we in America once realize that Nehru and his country are and will be neither close friends to us nor distant opponents, neither an echo of America nor a voice of Moscow, and then develop a policy toward

them that accords full recognition of their third position, tremendous good will result for the people of both countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also bring to the attention of the Senate a lead article in the New York Times under date of April 23, 1951. The article is entitled "Famine Migration Indicated in India."

The article goes on to explain what has been happening in certain of the provinces, how the Government is attempting to divert foodstuffs from the provinces which have a little more food than others, and how the rationing system is beginning to break down—a system which affects the lives of 125,000,000 people. If that rationing system breaks down, 125,000,000 people may well perish. The grain which this Government has been asked to provide is for the rationing system, to feed into the pipelines of the Government system for rationing out the food so that those poor souls can at least exist on a subsistence diet.

Do Senators think we have trouble in Asia now? Just let India go down the pipeline into the Communist sewer, and we shall never have an end of trouble. We shall lose all.

Mr. President, what are we doing is not one-tenth of what is necessary, but I suppose we must go along at an easy pace. I am going to settle for that which is possible. Abraham Lincoln once said that politics is the art of the possible. Even foreign policy is the art of the possible.

I wish to drive home this point, because some day these words will be prophetic. I say that if by any failure on our part we permit this Nation to slip into the hands of the Communist dictatorship, we may well lose the battle for a free world. If General MacArthur is right when he says that the issue of communism will be settled in Asia, I would suggest that his staunch supporters had better give wholehearted support to preventing that section of the world from going Communist. I say it can be done without guns at this time. We may have to use guns. I do not know. If we do, we should be prepared. In the meantime, we can use what we have in abundance—food, food.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

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

FAMINE MIGRATION INDICATED IN INDIA—NEW DELHI'S REPORTS CAUTIOUS, BUT NEED, NOTABLY IN BIHAR, HEIGHTENS PLEA TO UNITED STATES

NEW DELHI, INDIA, April 22.—The food situation in Bihar state has deteriorated to a point where the disastrous effects of famine have begun to appear. Prices of rice and other grains have gone up so high that small landowners are forced to sell their farms and cattle to buy food.

Landless farm laborers have begun to drift aimlessly to neighboring states in search of food and work.

Officials here think that no migration of serious proportions has started, but they do not hold out hopes that it will not start soon.

Responsible leaders and newspapers have begun cautiously to warn the Government of the possibility of a repetition in Bihar of another Bengal famine.

The Central Government has mobilized all available grain surpluses as well as transport to rush food to deficit regions in north Bihar. But all these efforts will barely meet the need of millions of people.

PROSPECT CALLED UNCERTAIN

Asked what were the chances of saving Bihar from imminent famine, the Bihar States Food Minister, Anugraha Narain Sinha, was reported to have said in Patna yesterday that "the issue is entirely in the lap of the gods."

Indian purchases of food grains have begun to arrive and are being transhipped from ports directly to deficit regions. India expects to receive 350,000 tons of food grains this month and a similar quantity in succeeding months. Out of this volume, 50,000 tons each month will be sent to Bihar and the rest will be distributed to other needy states.

Immediate needs are officially estimated at 1,000,000 tons. The maximum New Delhi has found it possible to allot is 600,000 tons. At present 3,000 tons of grains are being moved into Bihar daily; the quantity is considered insufficient to meet urgent demands.

The threatening famine with all its concomitant repercussions has once again focussed attention on United States aid. It is being acknowledged at highest governmental levels that prospect of getting Russian wheat or Chinese rice in time to prevent a crisis is out of the question, as negotiations with the governments are as yet in preliminary stage. Furthermore there is no certainty that the deals will succeed.

In view of the uncertain factors, there is unanimous opinion in all responsible quarters that only the United States could help at this critical period because it has the grain at hand as well as the ships to transport it.

The position has worsened to such an extent that Indians no longer care on what basis American food comes; they are only anxious that it should come in time.

PLANNING GROUP URGES GIFT

WASHINGTON, April 22.—As sentiment in Congress mounted for a loan, the National Planning Association urged today that grain for famine-threatened India be made available as a gift. It said any effort to tie financial strings to the 2,000,000 tons of food grains needed in the present crisis "would strike at the stability desperately needed by India if it is to remain democratic."

The association's committee on international policy said it was its considered judgment "that the American people should respond promptly and in a spirit of Christian charity to the appeal from India for grain to feed her starving people."

"We do not believe," a statement by the committee said, "that the welfare of this country will be served in any way by conditioning our response to political objectives or to recent differences of opinion expressed in the United Nations. On the contrary, we feel that hundreds of millions of Asiatics, both inside and outside of India, will regard the action which we take on this matter as a sure sign of our future intentions in the Far East."

Supporting President Truman's request for the assistance to India as a gift, the association asserted India could not pay off a loan without impairment of her 6-year program for economic development. It emphasized that a downward trend of living standards in India must be halted so that the country could "withstand possible emergencies in the future."

ANALOGY TO MARSHALL PLAN

The 20-member Committee on International Policy, headed by Frank Altschul and including John Kenneth Galbraith, Carter Goodrich, and Lithgow Osborne, said that

there would be a double advantage to the United States if the aid was provided as a gift.

"It is recommended that receipts in India from the sale of grain given by this country should be set apart as counterpart funds," it said. "The United States Government can properly ask to have the equal voice in the expenditure of these funds that it now has in the use of counterpart funds of European countries participating in the Marshall plan."

"In this way, we can, in effect, use twice our appropriations for food for India: first, to feed the starving and, second, to aid India in her much needed economic development program."

The appeal was made as the House Foreign Affairs Committee prepared to meet tomorrow to vote on a new bill providing a \$190,000,000 loan, extended on easy terms, under which India could buy the grain. On Friday, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee decided to provide the aid half as a gift, half as a loan.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, lest anyone in the Senate or in Congress think that what I am talking about is not supported by the American people, I should like to call one other fact to the attention of the Senate. I hesitate to quote from a public opinion poll. I suppose such polls are often used to substantiate an argument. I submit this merely as another point in my argument.

On Wednesday, April, 25, the public opinion service conducted by Mr. Gallup found the following to be the opinion of American people. The question asked was, "Should we give India grain?"

Fifty-nine percent of the Republicans interrogated said yes.

Democrats, 60 percent.

Independents, 57 percent.

I would venture to say that any Senator would be glad to receive a vote as high as that. Get me 57 percent support for my policy or candidacy, and I will be very glad to settle for it. I would be very glad to settle for much less than that. How many say we should not support grain for India? Thirty-two percent of the Republicans, 31 percent of the Democrats, and 32 percent of the independents. That is almost a 2 to 1 vote. It is very interesting. I am sure the American people have properly expressed themselves.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I missed some of the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. I should like to ask him whether he is familiar with the experience of the combined food boards and later of the international board in the distribution of food by the Indian Government at the time of what might be described as the famine of 1946. If not, it might be interesting to relate the experience.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to have the Senator from New Mexico do so at this time. I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to do so.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say to the Members of the Senate that the one

country the Government of which we are absolutely certain had exact knowledge of what to do with meager supplies of food was India. It was possible to give the people of India a sack full of grain, and they knew how to divide it cupful by cupful, because they have been used to short rations for a long time. They understood how to do it. They understood how to make a fair division. We had trouble in many other parts of the world, as Members of the Senate know. There were areas where people who lived in cities moved out to farms, because their relatives on the farms were able to feed them better than they could be fed in the cities. We did not find that to be the situation in India. They understand the collection of grain and the distribution of grain.

Our first experience in shipping wheat into certain areas of India was unfortunate, because the people were accustomed to eating rice. They took the wheat and made a sort of gruel out of it. It was not used as we would have like to see it used as a substitute for what they had been eating. However, it was not long before they taught themselves to bake it and make other satisfactory uses of it. We were supplying food to several hundred million people, on a partial basis, at least, and the one country in which I was absolutely certain, as was every member of the Board, the supply would be received properly and distributed equitably was India. That is why I have been so very much interested in seeing the supply of grain go to India. We know it will be adequately used and equitably divided. It will not be lost. We became convinced that they saved every minute grain of wheat that was sent. They lost nothing. It was divided cupful by cupful. That could not be done in any other part of the world.

I am glad that the proposal has been supported by so many Senators, because it involves a recognition of the fact that India is a land which understands what to do with supplies that are sent to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. He has supplied some very valuable information. I am certain it will be of real interest to every Member of the Senate as he voted on the bill. The people of the country will want to know that the supply of grain will be equitably and efficiently distributed.

Arguments have been made in opposition to the proposal. Many of such arguments have been answered by Senators who have preceded me. For example, it is asked, "Why does not India pay for the wheat?" It is asked, "Why does not the Republic of India pay cash for the extra 2,000,000 tons of wheat?"

The answer, primarily, is that she does not have the dollars with which to pay. We deal in dollars.

Others have asked, "Why does she not set up some sort of system by which she could use her sterling balance?"

Mr. President, the Republic of India is dedicating most of its sterling balance, which it has on deposit in London, to the program outlined under the Colombo plan, a plan for long-range development, over a period of 5 or 6 years, to do that which is imperative.

Let me make it quite clear that the proposal to help feed the people of India is a proposal based on an emergency. It is an effort to keep the patient alive until he can regain his strength and rebuild himself. The long-range program for India is one which is very much a part of internal development, land reclamation, irrigation, drainage, development of fertilizers, new practices in agriculture, and scientific farming, as well as new, modern farming equipment.

Mr. President, the Indian Government has spent millions of dollars to improve its farms, to improve the fertility of its soil, and to expand its acreage. The Indian Government has a Grow More Food Campaign. It is trying to combat a famine which recurs about once every 7 years. Once in every 7 years India is faced with such a situation.

As has been pointed out, the famine is worse this year because of a whole series of calamities which have affected India. There have been floods, droughts, locusts, earthquakes—every conceivable calamity that could fall upon the people. All such calamities have fallen on the agricultural areas of India. I wish to say again that what we are attempting to do is not to satisfy the long-term needs of the people of India, but to satisfy the emergency need of keeping body and soul together.

Therefore, it would be unwise for the Indian Government to expend the few dollars it has, by which it can do business with us, for emergency grains. It is to our advantage that she expend her sterling balance and her dollars for the fundamental and basic development of her industry and agriculture.

Mr. President, that is where our point-4 program comes in. We did not do very much about it. We did get it started. I think we have appropriated something like \$28,000,000. We have appropriated \$28,000,000 for scientific and technological assistance all around the world. We are going to appropriate \$53,000,000,000 or \$54,000,000,000 to arm ourselves—only \$28,000,000 for technological and scientific assistance.

Mr. President, here is a program that can be of great help in the long pull and for the long term. In other words, we must extend our help on the basis of scientific and technological knowledge to many nations, not only to India. We must do what we are doing in north Africa, in Latin-American countries, in South American countries, in the Near East, and in the Asiatic area, in Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia.

Those who ask that the Government of India pay cash for the wheat are in effect actually asking that we serve the ends of communism. The first thing that could lead to Communist domination in India would be a complete collapse of its economic system. The Government of India is making heroic efforts to hold its economic system together. Someone has said that many confusing statements are coming out of New Delhi, particularly out of Parliament. I have heard many asking: "What does the Prime Minister want?" I agree that it is very difficult at times to find out what he does want. However, I interpret his

message to be: "Yes, we will be glad to accept an outright loan."

As we know, the loan as proposed in one branch of our Congress would not have any conditions or strings at all tied to it.

So the Prime Minister of India says, "We will accept the loan." He has also said that he finds the terms of the Senate bill very acceptable. The important point is that the Prime Minister of India has said that he prefers that this bill impose no qualifications or limitations or requirements upon the Indian Government.

Mr. President, do not you think that is a very natural thing for such a man to say to his own people? To be sure, the Prime Minister of India is speaking in terms that his people will understand. To be sure, he is trying to resist Russian pressure, and he has also been trying to resist some pressure on the part of some Members of our own Congress.

The question which should be in our minds is, "What do we wish to do?"—not "What does someone else want us to do?"

My honest opinion of what we should do—although I know we shall not do it—is to give the wheat to India under the terms of an ECA grant. If that were done, then when the grain went into the marketing system in India, whenever a bushel of it was sold, a counterpart fund of rupees, the Indian medium of currency, would be developed, and that counterpart fund would be under the joint management of ECA representatives and representatives of the Indian Government. That would mean that after making the gift, the Government of the United States would have something to say about its proper use—the use of the counterpart fund of Indian money, which would be developed as a result of the gift, for the development of agriculture, irrigation, and other improvements in India. That is the advantage of making a gift under such an arrangement.

On the contrary, if the wheat were sent to India as a loan which it is presumed the Government of India would pay back with interest, the United States would have absolutely nothing to say about what was done in India in terms of the internal development of India.

To be sure, Mr. President, the Prime Minister of India says that the terms of a loan sound better to him—in other words, with no control by us of the use of the funds which would be developed. However, we should remember that the counterpart funds which would be developed in the way I have suggested would be used in that country itself; so what looks like a gift would in fact be an investment.

The Senate bill provides for what is to be half a gift and half a loan. It is a compromise with the terms of the original bill.

I have submitted an amendment which I feel is worthy of consideration by the Senate. The amendment is not too different from the terms of the bill as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee. My amendment merely provides that in the first year there will be a grant of \$95,000,000, and in the second year there will be a grant or a loan of

\$95,000,000, depending upon the determination made by the Administrator for Economic Cooperation. The amendment provides that after the Administrator for Economic Cooperation determines, "after consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, that circumstances make it necessary, such sum of not to exceed \$95,000,000 may be made available for assistance to India on a grant basis upon approval by the Congress."

That language simply means that in the second year if the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration ascertains that India can repay the loan and will repay the loan, the matter will be placed on a loan basis, and the money, with interest, will be collected. If, however, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation ascertains, after consulting with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, that the economic status of India is such that she cannot repay the loan, then we simply shall give the money to her. Does that make sense, Mr. President? I think so. After all, one way to make an enemy is to loan him money which he simply can never repay. One way to make a man always cross to the other side of the street when he sees you and always be your enemy is to lend him money which he will never be able to repay.

I have reason to believe that the Government of India is already committed up to the hilt. The Indian Government has been keeping up with the loans already made to it. However, it has been straining under a program of austerity and a program of very careful planning to enable it to keep up with the payment of both principal and interest on the loans which already are outstanding. So, Mr. President, if we lend the Government of India more money at this time, we shall be lending it money which it will not be able to repay. That will not help us make friends.

On the other hand, if the suggestion I now make is adopted, the result will be that India will be able, by means of the use of the counterpart funds, to make great improvements which will be of tremendous aid to her internal development.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wonder whether I correctly understood the Senator from Minnesota to say that this grain will be sent to India and will be given to hungry and starving people there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Perhaps I did not read the bill correctly; but I should like to refer to section 6, paragraph (d) on page 4:

(d) To deposit in a special account amounts of the currency of India equivalent to the amounts of such currency accruing to the Government of India from the import and sale of commodities furnished as a grant hereunder.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Does that mean that the goods are to be sold by the Indian

Government and then given to the people of India?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Of course, the language we find in this bill is the kind of language which bewilders people generally. However, this language is written in accordance with the legalistic doctrine which we think we have to follow. Instead of saying what we wish to do, we say it in terms which require a lawyer to explain.

This provision of the bill simply means that we shall provide funds which will be used as a grant which will be used to buy wheat, and the wheat then will go into the government rationing storehouses in India, into the pools, so to speak; and it will be pumped out of those pools into the pipelines of the rationing system, and will be sold from that rationing system to those who can afford to pay for it, or will be given as relief to those who cannot pay for it; and for every bushel that is sold to people who can pay for it and for every bushel that is provided by way of relief to those who cannot pay for it, the Government of India will set up a counterpart fund. In other words, the result of our sending the wheat to India will be the development in India of a counterpart fund which will be used for the development of the internal economy of India—its agriculture or other natural resources.

Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas has certainly brought out a good point.

I have been receiving many, many letters from good folks who are urging me to vote to send grain to India. No doubt those good folks would say, after reading this bill, "How do you change all of this bill into wheat for the hungry people of India?"

Of course, that is a good question. My friend, the Senator from Maryland, or my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, do not get out a plow and use it a little if they want to get wheat, but they go to a grain elevator and buy wheat. The Commodity Credit Corporation has a sizable amount of wheat in storage. As a matter of fact, that wheat is amply adequate to meet all the needs of this loan or this grant, and then some.

So the Government of the United States would make available from ECA funds \$95,000,000, this year, under the provisions of my amendment, and that would be followed by \$95,000,000 next year, or a total of \$190,000,000. Fifty percent of it would be a grant the first year, and 50 percent would be a loan. That money would be converted into wheat, and the wheat would be sent to India, and there would be unloaded at the ports of India and would go into the Government warehouses, and then would go into the rationing system in India, and then would go into the homes and finally would go into the stomachs of the people, and they would live. The matter is just that simple. Every time the Government of India sold some of that wheat from its rationing system, it would put a certain number of rupees into a bank or fund, and that money would be earmarked. Every time the Government of India gave wheat to people who could not afford to buy it, the Government of India, would put a certain number of rupees

into the same fund. Finally that fund would be used for internal improvements in India—for fertilizer or for the irrigation of land or for the reclamation of land. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If we are going to try to prevent the Orient from falling into Soviet hands, as the Senator has well pointed out, it is important that we establish a working basis with the Indian Government. We attempted to keep China from going Communist, but waited until the Chinese Nationalist Government was in such bad condition that \$2,000,000,000 worth of military aid would not pump them out. Now, we are sending additional hundreds of millions of dollars, hoping again to try to save something of what Chiang Kai-shek's government has left. But if we want to set a pattern for working with the Indian Government to help build a strong democratic government there, is not this about the best opportunity we shall have to begin to work with those people on a basis which they can understand?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct. He has stated, in a nutshell, the whole heart of this argument. In other words, what the Senator from Louisiana is saying is, "Let us do what we ought to do, before we are compelled to do what we might not need to do." That is what he is saying. He is saying, "Let us help out a few folks now, before it is too late."

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder whether the Senator would be interested in having his attention called to another instance which cut a little pattern similar to the experiences in China. I am sure the Senator is familiar with the fact that approximately 5 years ago the Italian people were confronted with a very serious election, in which most of the political experts of Europe were confident that the Communist element in the Italian Government would succeed. The Senator is familiar with the fact that it was an extremely important election to us, because it meant the success of our efforts in Greece and Turkey, and probably in Australia, and possibly in certain other areas, specifically in France, which was very close to the Italian situation. So the very thing which is here proposed was tried.

Promises had been made by the Russian Government as to what it would do, but the Russian Government did not furnish very much actual grain for Italy. Immediately before the Italian election, approximately 150,000 tons of American grain, which was already floating on the high seas, was diverted to Italy and made available to the Italian people in a form which they understood. It was made into pasta, and became available in food which they could utilize. It came in trucks with flying American flags. That food, with the great cooperation of the Catholic Church, and other fine or-

ganizations, saved the Italian people from being engulfed in communism.

I hope the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota and the contribution by the Senator from Louisiana, tend to point out that it is possible to do something worth while if it is done soon enough, that India is an area in which something effective can be done, and that an opportunity still remains to do it. I hope the Senator will continue his plea for taking action now on any basis which is agreeable to the leaders of India, even though we may not understand the delicate political problems which a given leader may face within that country.

I may say to the Senator that I would have been better satisfied, when the grain to which I have referred was diverted on the high seas to Italy, if we had had some sort of promissory note from the Italian Ambassador, or some sort of assurance from the Italian Government. But, if that assurance had been given by the Italian Government, it would have been a clue to the Communist workers in Italy that the United States was taking a far bigger hand in that threat than they otherwise might have believed. Because it was handled on the very sort of indefinite basis upon which the workers of that country thought it had to be handled, we were able to deliver the wheat at the very time that they wanted it, and it accomplished the very purpose the Italian Government said it would accomplish. I think the best proof of it is that within succeeding years we have seen in Italy a strengthening of the effort against communism, and a development of a much stronger situation all over Europe, because of that change in Italy. I think it noteworthy to observe how much development agriculturally there has been in Italy, and that now we may begin to regard Italy as one of the strong countries.

I am sure that if wheat is supplied to India, the people there will make the best use of it. They may not make an immediate accounting of what happens, by saying, "We will pay you so many dollars on such and such a date." A great deal of it must be in the shape of a grant, as it was in the case of the grain sent to Italy, but surely no food was ever given for a better purpose, so far as Italy was concerned, than that food, which came at the very moment they needed it most. I hope that food contemplated by the pending bill will reach India in time to fill her great need.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico again. As a matter of fact, I believe he was the Secretary of Agriculture, was he not, when that program was under way?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, but I was not responsible for working it out.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand. The Senator, however, was fully informed as to what the program of our Government was, was he not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, and I may say to the Senator it was an extremely difficult situation, because most persons said, "You are going to pour this wheat down a rat hole. You will only fatten these

people so the Communists can use them. There is no chance whatever of winning the Italian election. The Communists are certain to win it." It seemed almost certain that that would happen, but there were several persons in the Government—one of whom, I am happy to say, was the very able Secretary of Defense, the late James Forrestal—who believed that it was possible still to win that election in Italy. Many persons knew of the great personal contribution made at that time by Secretary Forrestal. His judgment, combined with the judgment of the State Department and the judgment of the Italian officials, persuaded us to go ahead with the undertaking, even though many people thought it inexpedient and possibly unwise. It is barely possible that the things we propose to do here may turn out to be unwise, but the probabilities are that they will prove to be a very wise investment on the part of the American people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely want to thank the Senator. I am happy that he noted the possibility, that despite all our efforts, things may not work out as we want them to; but at least I would like to know that we made an effort. I would like to know that if we should lose the fight to keep India a part of the free world, at least we were in the fight, and were making a contribution to the winning of the fight.

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

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

Mr. LONG. At least, on other chances we have taken along the same line, we have not done too badly on these calculated risks, have we?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have done very well.

Mr. LONG. The situation in Italy was mentioned. France is still a democratic nation. Belgium and Holland are still democratic nations, and Austria is still voting democratic, wherever free elections are held. They still seem to side with the democratic free way of life, rather than with the Communists.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is correct. I think the facts today are that our humanitarian and economic-aid programs have had greater effect even than our military program, enabling us to see a gain in the friendship of government after government, so that we could build the right kind of common defense. It is important that we build that common defense.

Mr. President, I desire to read a quotation from our Ambassador to India, Mr. Loy Henderson, because, as so many people have said to me, it appears that the Government of India is a little difficult to deal with. They seem to be so edgy; sort of sensitive. Insecure people, insecure governments are always sensitive. New governments are always sensitive. It is our job, as a mature democracy, to understand the human frailties and to understand these human reactions. As a matter of fact, we are a little bit sensitive, once in a while, too. If anyone rises in the House of Commons to say an unkind word about us, we

snort around here and flex our muscles for days.

I recently read that the members of the New Zealand Parliament were flexing their muscles, saying they did not like what the Washington Post had written in an editorial. The Washington Post is read in New Zealand, whose people are making a substantial contribution to the Korean War. Of course, everyone is a little bit edgy. Let me read what Mr. Henderson had to say:

It has not been easy for India to decide to make its appeal to the United States for assistance. The Indian people cherish their new freedom. They wish to exercise it to the full. They do not wish to feel that their right to formulate and carry out internal and foreign policies of their own choosing is in any way curtailed because of a sense of obligation toward any foreign country, friendly though that country may be. The Indian people would probably prefer to starve rather than to sacrifice any of their political and economic independence. India, feeling as it does about these matters, has displayed great confidence in the disinterested friendship of the United States by appealing to it for aid in this time of need.

Mr. Henderson continues:

I hope that the United States will show by the manner in which it treats this appeal that the confidence of India was not misplaced. I have no doubt that Indian people would be shocked, hurt, and disillusioned if this American aid should not be forthcoming at a time when difficulties are crowding in on a hard-pressed government and people from all sides, both externally and internally. And we may be sure that our critics and enemies would know how to exploit such a situation to their own great advantage.

What is Mr. Henderson saying? He is simply saying that here is a new country, a country new in its freedom. Here is a country that, after the sacrifices which its people have made, after the leadership of a Gandhi and a Nehru, at long last has thrown off British domination and now stands as a free people.

Of course a free nation is jealous of its prerogatives, and it hates to ask or plead for assistance, but the situation has finally become so desperate that it had to ask for help. Such people are the kind upon which we can depend. They are not the kind who come crying to us every time they are in trouble. They waited until the situation was so desperate that they had to do something about it.

Our country has waited for months to answer this cry of human suffering. It borders upon something that is shameful. We should act with dispatch and in such terms that no one in the world can for a single minute misunderstand what we do. Let it be known to the world that so long as there is food on the American table, so long as our storehouses are filled with our abundance, so long as our land is able to produce, this Nation will not stand by and let another nation starve, but will share its abundance with those who are suffering.

Let us remember that those who give, receive. I have never known of a nation that gave away all its substance in charity. I remember that this country was once hoarding its substance, and we ended up with unemployment, depression,

and disaster. We have recently been acting like the Good Samaritan and have been criticized at times because we are too generous. I would rather be criticized for being generous than for being an Old Scrooge. Believe me, the more we give the more we shall receive. As we have cast our bread upon the waters, it has come back to us a thousandfold, not simply a hundredfold or tenfold. With every bushel of wheat we give, we give life. When we give life and the hope of life, we give something that is eternal, and people do not forget it.

That is my appeal to the Senate, Mr. President. All the facts of economics, all the hard facts of international politics, say that this is a good bill. It is good, sound policy on the part of our country.

What a tragedy, Mr. President, that we have waited so long.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder if the Senator realizes that while this debate is going on, the Russian Government is labeling our efforts today as blackmail. My attention has been called to a news dispatch which reads as follows:

The increasing famine in India is the direct result of nearly two centuries of colonial rule by the British imperialists, which has put Indian agriculture into a state of great chaos. At present, the ruling circles of the United States are trying to exploit India's difficulties in order to subjugate it to its influence.

By way of political blackmail and speculation on the national calamity of the 350,000,000 Indian people, the American imperialists are trying to force India to give support to their bloody intervention in Korea and to capture rich Indian resources of strategic raw materials.

For 5 months—

Even the Russians know how long it has been going on—

For 5 months they have been trying to attain the complete political and economic subjugation of India as payment for the delivery of American grain. However, the Indian people are not yielding to the American blackmail.

I ask the Senator from Minnesota if he thinks there is any Member of this body who believes this grain would be shipped for the sake of the economic subjugation of India by the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can honestly say that even those who have questioned the advisability of the bill have never voiced an attitude, either publicly or privately, that there is any intent of economic subjugation of India by the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder if the Senator is familiar with the fact that when the Government of the United States sent some corn to Yugoslavia, a country which does not use wheat as much as it uses other cereals, at a time of extreme difficulty there, it was said we were trying to exercise some sort of wrong influence on the Government of Yugoslavia, and the United States offered to deliver the wheat through the Red Cross or any other agency so that the people could have it. Years later we find that Yugoslavia rises up and has

more strength to resist the Russian aggressor, and perhaps has done a great service to free nations around the world.

I wonder if the Senator is familiar with the fact that in 1950, when every effort was being made by General Clay and his staff to aid Germany, the official Russian propaganda organs in the city of Berlin were day-by-day printing the statement that the grain we were shipping to Germany was surplus grain for which no sale could be found anywhere in the world, when, as a matter of fact, we were closing down American industries in order to ship the grain. They went on to say that we were selling it at such a high price that the German people would be sold into subjugation for a thousand years, when the grain was actually charged for at something like \$2.20 a bushel, and the going prices for grain supplied by other nations ranged as high as \$6 a bushel. The Russian Government is now calling it political blackmail when we try to supply grain to India. I am glad the Senator stressed the fact that when we give, we receive in return. It is only when we hoard that we have difficulty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. "If your son asks for bread, will you give him a stone? If he asks for fish, will you give him a serpent?"

In other words, Mr. President, when nations ask for bread, for sustenance, let us not give something that makes a mockery of giving. We cannot put conditions on aid when human misery is involved. The way to answer these Communist lies is by deeds so pure and so clear in their purpose and intent that even those vicious liars of the Kremlin cannot interpret them falsely. They talk about blackmail. They are blackmail artists; they are blackmailing the world. They cannot even give out a press release without using the word. We can tell the kind of person a man is by the kind of material he gives out.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator is not in favor of striking section 6 (b) from the bill, is he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not suggesting eliminating anything from the bill as it was reported from the committee. But, as I have said, let us not say that India must deliver so many tons of manganese. Let us leave that question open for honest negotiation.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think that is a very salutary provision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure it is. I think all will agree that it is a salutary provision.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is not one of our great difficulties the fact that we have gone so far in the other direction that we have not been given due credit? I am told that food has been distributed in such a fashion that no one knew where it came from. I think that is a very disastrous thing. When grain was delivered to Italy it was delivered in trucks bearing the American flag. I am glad the Sena-

tor from Maryland raised the question, because even though we do not desire to furnish grain out of a spirit of getting something for it, I think it is proper that people know the source of the contribution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

While some individuals in our country have spoken of the result of the recent Russian propaganda in connection with 50,000 tons of grain, which, of course, is only a small percentage point of what is being given, there was recognition of our efforts by the Prime Minister of India. I have here some remarks of the Prime Minister of India made on Thursday of last week. Let me quote the concluding two paragraphs of his statement:

In our view there are no political or discriminatory conditions attached to these two bills—

Referring, of course, to the House and the Senate bills—

and therefore there can be no objection on these grounds to our acceptance of either of them. While the form in which assistance is given to India is a matter for the United States of America to decide, we would prefer the terms embodied in the House bill, which are simpler.

I think the important part of that sentence is:

While the form in which assistance is given to India is a matter for the United States of America to decide—

Then he concludes, Mr. President:

I should like to express our gratitude to the Government of the United States of America for the efforts they have made to send food grains to India. I should also like to express our deep appreciation of the messages as well as offers of material help unofficially received from many citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, the Prime Minister of India has said, "Thank you." He has not only said "Thank you" to the Government of the United States, but he has said "Thank you" to the churches, to programs such as CARE, the Red Cross, to CROP, and others. The trouble is that he did mention earlier that there was some deal with the Soviet Union; that India wanted to get some 100,000 tons of wheat from them. That is what has built up feeling.

The fact of the matter is that the Prime Minister has paid his respects and uttered his expressions of gratitude to the United States of America.

Let me summarize. I say that it is in our national interest, for the common defense, that we pass the Senate bill providing for food aid to the Republic of India. I say that it is to our interest in the over-all struggle against international aggressive world communism to take such action. I say this measure represents the beginning of an effective program to combat the conditions that are conducive to the growth and the development of communism.

I detail my argument by saying that in any country where there are conditions of economic depression, where there is a condition of famine and of disease and poverty, that there is the country where the soil is fertile for the seed of Communist growth. It is axiomatic in political

history that where the economic fabric has begun to disintegrate, where the economic society shows signs of cracking up, there is exactly where communism is on the march.

Mr. President, I say it is better that we have a little preventive medicine right now. A few ounces of prevention may well save many pounds of cure. I point out that the people of the Republic of India are suffering from mass starvation. I also point out that India is the greatest free country on the Asiatic mainland. Its importance to us cannot be overestimated. Its importance geographically, its importance in terms of natural resources, cannot be overestimated. But even more fundamental, my colleagues, the cordial friendly relationships and understandings with the people and leaders of India are necessary to our well-being.

Mr. President, I point out that it is within our power to answer this great need without taxing our resources, without upsetting our economy. I point out that the supplies are available, and that the Government of India is willing and ready to cooperate with us in the transportation and shipment of this grain.

I point out that the amount of money involved in this great program is small in comparison with the amount of money we have expended for arms and for national defense and for other foreign-aid programs.

In conclusion, I call upon my colleagues in the Senate to pass the pending measure, and pass it quickly. I call upon them to give serious consideration to the amendment I have offered, which is an improving amendment. I believe I am correct in saying that my amendment is in substance the same as the report of the subcommittee before it went to the full Committee on Foreign Relations. But whatever may be the terms of the proposed legislation, whether the aid is a loan, whether it is a grant, whether it is part grant and part loan, whether it is the Humphrey-Lehman-Benton amendment—whatever may be its terms, let us act quickly, and let us act with clean hands.

Let us say to the Government of India, to the people of India, that the United States of America asks no pledges, seeks no understanding in terms of future reward; that "We, the people of the United States, who ourselves have suffered in times of adversity, extend to you the hand of human fellowship." That "What we are doing is working together in the vineyards of freedom, and regardless of what the future may have to offer, we, as Members of this body, know that we did something again that is decent."

Today the people are crying out for their leaders to be decent. They are not asking for us to be smart; they are asking us to be decent. They are asking us to be honorable human beings. That is all they want of us. The American people want honor, and integrity, in government. They have the right to expect it. They want their leaders in Congress to act like courageous, prudent but generous human beings, and not like political puppets. They want every Member of the Senate and House to respond with a warm heart of human fellowship.

The American people are sick and tired of all the shenanigans we go through, of all the delays we indulge in. What they want in the Congress of the United States today is action in simple terms, the kind of action that we take when we discover that a neighbor of ours is hungry. We do not sit around the table and bargain as to how many feet of fence we can get from him if we give him a bowl of soup. Our people want us to treat other peoples as we would treat our own kinfolk when we find them to be suffering from hunger. When our neighbors are hungry, we help feed them. Even if those neighbors should turn against us later, yet we can then say that in the critical hour of need we were on the side of God. That is the side I want to be on now and in the days to come.

Mr. President, I never felt I was more right than on this issue, and the sooner we can pass the bill, the better it will be.

Mr. President, I desire now to submit a request on behalf of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON THE FOOD-FOR-INDIA BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] on the proposed legislation which is now pending. As we all know the junior Senator from New York is one of the cosponsors and an ardent advocate of the bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON THE FOOD-FOR-INDIA BILL

The bill now before the Senate, to provide food to forestall mass starvation in India, may, in the long view of history, be considered one of the most important pieces of legislation to be taken up in this session of Congress. This proposal springs from the deep wells of humanitarianism in America. It keeps faith with a long record of American generosity in cases where other peoples have been beset by natural disasters.

In 1923, after Japan's catastrophic earthquake, we did not stop to ask what the policies of the Japanese Government were in regard to this or that political matter. Thousands of Japanese were homeless and confronted with desperate privations. America opened her great heart and sent help. There have been many similar instances.

Now, in the year 1951, India, a new Republic, a new member of the sisterhood of nations, faces a threat to her national existence in the form of a drastic grain shortage.

This grain shortage was not man-made. It resulted from floods in the Punjab and in other grain-producing areas of India. It resulted from drought in certain sections. India found herself coming into the year 1951 with a shortage of 6,000,000 tons of grain.

She has supplied part of this shortage by purchases in the world market, including the United States. She needs 2,000,000 additional tons of grain for which she cannot afford to pay.

When I said she cannot afford to pay for this grain, I meant that she could not pay for this grain—according to all the facts I

have seen—and still carry on the programs which are vital to the maintenance of stability, peace and order in India and to forestall the recurrence of such crises as the present one.

Of course, India has some pound sterling balances. But it would be poor neighborliness on our part to ask that these sterling balances which are so vitally needed to enable her to carry on her economic and political programs be used to procure grain. India could obtain grain from Russia or China by giving these Communist countries vital raw materials which she now sells to the United States for dollars. But this would be self-defeating, both from our point of view and from India's.

It is true that India, in the request that she made for grain, asked only for easy terms. India did not ask for a grant. This is a true characteristic of a proud people and a proud Government—too proud to ask for a gift or to ask for charity.

In my judgment we should have done the wholly generous thing instead of the partially generous thing. We should have made a free grant of at least the first million tons of grain and then have taken another look with regard to the second half of this amount. I regret very much that such terms are not included in the legislation now before us. If it were possible to make the terms much more generous than they are, I would support it with all my heart.

I do not think that we should insist upon any political conditions. I do not think that we should insist upon any quid pro quo in terms of raw materials of any kind. Let us not try to use this generous act as a lever for the advancement of our own immediate and narrow national interest. Our national interest will be served in a much broader and finer way by a generous attitude of enlightened self-interest.

Many of our people, as individuals, have in recent days, demonstrated the spirit which animates this country by private gifts of grain to India. I think that the Congress can do no less than to take this hint from the people.

For the past several weeks we have been discussing intently and vigorously the issues involved in our far-eastern policy. The eyes of the Nation and of the world are fastened on the Far East today more than at any time in recent history. India is an integral part of the Far East. It is one of the cultural centers of the Far East. All the peoples of the Far East, including the peoples of south-eastern Asia, look to India for cultural and political leadership. We dare not turn our backs on India. We dare not act in a negligently or ungenerous manner. We will reap the harvest that we sow. It is my belief that by prompt and wholehearted action on this India measure, we will garner more friendship and understanding in the Far East than by any other single act we could possibly perform at this time.

Let us show the world, and especially the peoples of the Far East, that the policies of America are truly based on an interest in the welfare and well-being of individuals regardless of race or absolute political conformity. If we demonstrate that this is our policy, we will have won a great and lasting victory in the Orient and in the world.

IMPORTATIONS OF BURLAP FROM INDIA—LETTER FROM AUSTIN BROOKS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter, dated April 4, 1951, from Austin Brooks, the general manager of the El Rancho Mill-

ing Co., of Clovis, N. Mex., relative to the importations of burlap from India.

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

EL RANCHO MILLING CO.,
Clovis, N. Mex., April 4, 1951.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ: I know that you are troubled about many trivial matters and that such a demand is made upon your time that I hesitate to even write you relative to the matter at hand, but the situation has been growing steadily worse for some several months, and unless an improvement is brought about, and that shortly, our industry will be prostrate.

I refer to the present very critical burlap situation. Possibly you are familiar with the fact that the burlap has been coming into this country from India in insufficient quantities for more than a year, and I know that the reserve supplies of this product are completely exhausted, and, as might be expected, prices have skyrocketed. The situation has become so critical that we are paying more for used burlap bags than we were paying 1 year ago for brand-new burlap bags.

From information which has come to me by way of representatives from the various bag-manufacturing companies and through the press it appears that India is letting their burlap go to Argentina, Russia, or some other countries, in many instances on a barter basis.

It has been of considerable concern to me that in recent weeks considerable comment has been in the newspapers and over the radio relative to a proposition to appropriate the American taxpayers' money to buy a great gob of grain and either give to India or loan to them on a very favorable basis. Now, I am not familiar with all of the reasons behind this move, and surely there must be good ones, but I am wondering if it would not be expedient to require of India that she sell us, for dollars, as many yards of burlap as we have been customarily receiving from that country, as a condition to receiving of this grant of grain. I cannot see how this would be putting strings on the deal, and unless something is done to protect the American farmer and rancher great quantities of his produce is going to deteriorate and waste simply because he does not have a package in which to put it.

You are aware, of course, that it is impossible for us to substitute cotton and paper bags for burlap, for the mere reason that both of these items are critically short also. The manufacturers of cotton and paper bags are doing well to supply the customers who have over the years been using this particular kind of package.

I cannot overemphasize the seriousness of this particular problem and as to how it adversely affects New Mexico stockmen and ranchers. True, it adversely affects this business, but if worse comes to worse we will have our product here available in bulk, and it will be up to the rancher to figure out some means to transport it to his ranch, and you know that with the building materials so critically short that the ranchers of this State could not construct the type of storage houses and barns which would accommodate range feed in bulk form.

It is my hope that you will investigate this matter thoroughly and verify the situation which I have described, and use your influence to give us some relief.

Sincerely yours,

EL RANCHO MILLING CO.,
AUSTIN BROOKS.

EMBARGO BY UNITED NATIONS ON SHIPMENTS OF WAR MATERIALS TO COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.
Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me so I may ask for consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war material to Communist China?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], without losing the floor thereby, so he may present the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Michigan that he may yield to the Senator from Florida, without losing the floor thereby, for the purpose stated? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Michigan in yielding to me so I may bring up for immediate consideration Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, which I submitted for myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] yesterday. The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to give the backing of Congress, which I hope will be unanimous, to the present effort of our delegation to the United Nations, which is seeking to have the General Assembly of the United Nations take action placing an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

I may say to the Senate, before asking for unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution, that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the ranking minority member, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], have both advised me that they have no objection to the presentation of the concurrent resolution at this time.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war materials to Communist China.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at this time I modify the concurrent resolution by striking out section 2, which is its last section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not expect, of course, to object to this resolution. I merely wish to state to the Senator from Florida that I think it is 10 months late. However, I sincerely hope that the Sen-

ate will unanimously approve the resolution today, in order to place the Senate on record as emphatically opposing the shipment of arms, munitions, and war materials to those who are fighting our boys in Korea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire from the Senator from Florida whether or not the resolution submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] probably a month or so ago is similar to this resolution? Has it ever been brought out of committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I would rather have the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY] make categorical answer to that question. However, it is my information that the resolution referred to was much more far reaching than this one. It had to do with the whole general subject of employment of sanctions against Red China. Without knowing what has transpired, I remind the distinguished Senator from Maryland that the Foreign Relations Committee has been engrossed in hearings for a period of several weeks. The hearings are still in progress. I suspect that the committee has not had the opportunity to go into the subject in detail. However, I respectfully request that the Senator address his question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to yield for that purpose.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Maryland that at the moment I cannot tell him what the status of the resolution to which he refers is. However, I believe that the questions involved were as the Senator from Florida has mentioned, and that we have not made a formal report on the resolution. It has been referred to a subcommittee. But there is no harm in that.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have no objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is that with the understanding that the pending business will not be permanently displaced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has no effect on the pending business. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has yielded to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] with the understanding that the Senator from Michigan is to retain his position on the floor.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in order to keep the record clear, the Senator from Florida makes it plain that it is his understanding that he is simply asking for temporary displacement of the pending business in order to give consideration to Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, which he believes can be disposed of in a rather short space of time. At least he hopes so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war materials to Communist China.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a quorum call?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to do so, if I may do it without losing my place on the floor.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the call.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in yielding to me so that I may bring on for immediate consideration Senate Concurrent Resolution 31. I am also grateful to the Senate for having given unanimous consent for such course to be followed.

Before beginning the rather short presentation which I shall make of the resolution, I wish to modify it by withdrawing section 2 thereof, leaving the resolution otherwise unchanged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has modified his resolution accordingly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 is a simple but important resolution. I believe the time when we are considering it is a highly important moment for taking the very action which is proposed by the resolution. The concurrent resolution has been submitted in the Senate by the Senator from Florida, on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], so as to make clear that its sponsorship is completely bipartisan, or, indeed, nonpartisan, as it is. An identical concurrent resolution has been offered in the House of Representatives by one of my colleagues, Representative ROGERS of Florida.

The reason for haste in the consideration of the concurrent resolution is that the United Nations Organization, through its important committees, is even now considering the action which

we propose and urge by the concurrent resolution. Only yesterday the special committee on additional measures to supplement the finding that Red China is an aggressor nation passed, by a vote of 11 to 0, a measure which had been proposed by the United States delegation to the United Nations. One vote was not cast, because Egypt abstained from voting. Two other votes could not be cast because two of the nations which had been appointed to the special committee, namely, Burma and Yugoslavia, declined appointment. Therefore, the committee consists of only 12 members. I repeat, that 11 of the members yesterday voted for the measure proposed by the United States delegation. The other member, Egypt, abstained from voting.

On Thursday, the day after tomorrow, the question will be heard by the Political Committee of the United Nations, which consists of 60 members. The Committee has as its members a representative from every nation which is a member of the United Nations. It would appear that a stiff fight on the proposal may be expected on Thursday before the Political Committee of the United Nations.

The concurrent resolution would voice the request and the urgent insistence of the Congress of the United States, if such resolutions be adopted by both Houses of Congress, that the General Assembly of the United Nations shall take early action leading to the placing of an embargo upon shipments to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

I may say that not only has the concurrent resolution been cleared for consideration by the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY], but also by other members of the committee, so that in deed and in truth the measure comes on now with the support and approval of most members of that committee, as the Senator from Florida understands. I hope that the distinguished Senator from Texas and the members of the committee from the other side of the aisle may take occasion to voice their approval of the resolution before debate on it shall be concluded.

The reason why the Committee on Foreign Relations could not give consideration to the concurrent resolution is that the committee is sitting on a very hard schedule, in its joint session with the Committee on Armed Services, in the hearing of various witnesses in the so-called MacArthur investigation. I believe General Bradley is the witness who is presently being heard. The situation has precluded any immediate consideration of the matter by the committee.

The Senator from Florida is grateful to the committee, its chairman, and several of its members, for having informally made a study of the resolution and for having consented that it now be considered on the floor of the Senate with their approval.

The Senator from Florida feels that the Senate should know that in the House of Representatives unanimous action was taken this morning by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which is not engaged in the hearings going on in the Senate, supporting an identical resolution offered in that body.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to say that I commend the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Michigan for having submitted the resolution. I only wish that we had acted on the matter earlier. I am very glad to identify myself with the purposes of the resolution.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I very warmly thank the Senator from New Jersey. I yield now to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. O'CONOR. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that I commend very highly his action and forthrightness in this particularly important connection. Needless to say, I am in hearty accord with the Senator from Florida, because on February 19, I had the opportunity of submitting Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 which is substantially similar to the concurrent resolution now submitted by the Senator from Florida.

Let me ask the Senator from Florida whether any reasons were assigned by the three nations which did not vote, as the Senator from Florida has indicated: Namely, Egypt, by way of abstention, and the other two, Burma and Yugoslavia, by not qualifying their members. Does the Senator know whether any reasons were assigned for the abstention of for the failure to appoint members to the committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have that information. However, I understand that there were no members from the Soviet bloc of nations on the Special Committee for Additional Measures, and I understand that it is quite apparent that a real battle may be anticipated on Thursday, when the report of the special committee will reach the Political Committee of the General Assembly, for its action—the Political Committee being composed of 60 members, namely, a member for each of the member nations of the United Nations.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pastore in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I understand that the Senator from Florida has modified his concurrent resolution by eliminating section 2. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. O'CONOR. Does the Senator from Florida feel that it is in the interest of more orderly procedure and possibly will be of greater benefit?

Mr. HOLLAND. I feel that section 2 is completely unnecessary. When the Congress takes action, I think the press,

the radio, and all other avenues of communication will make the news of that action speedily available to all concerned. Therefore, I think the addition of a section requiring the furnishing of copies is unnecessary. So, at the request of the Senator from Texas, I have been very glad to eliminate that section.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I am sure the Senator from Florida has been advised generally about this matter. Let me ask whether he knows that at this very hour a shipment of approximately 3,500 tons of rubber is on the high seas, en route from one member of the British Commonwealth of nations to Communist China, and also that in the recent past other shipments have gone to Communist China from a number of nations which are members of the United Nations, and that therefore the Senator's concurrent resolution is not only timely but is absolutely required if there is to be any united action on the part of the nations with which we are supposed to be allied in the fight against world-wide communism.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that is correct. The press has apprised the world that even though our ally, Great Britain, has imposed a strict embargo against the movement of crude rubber from British Malaya, yet prior to the time of the taking effect of that embargo, a shipload of crude rubber was prepared for shipment and left in time to be on the high seas at this time, and I understand that there is at least an open question as to the ability of Britain to stop that shipment. I hope legal means will be found to stop it.

However, in the meantime the fact that day after day shipments were getting under way, points out the need for haste. I feel that greater haste might appropriately have been taken, as suggested by my friend, the Senator from Maryland, some months ago.

I remind the Senator from Maryland that the action now proposed is not unilateral action, and our delegation to the United Nations is suggesting this action for the first time has the strong backing of our allies, Great Britain and France. It now appears that our delegation in the United Nations has gone as far as it can go. I understand that our delegation there is asking for as much as it can hope to have enacted at this time.

The action now pending in the United Nations committee does not go as far as our own Nation already has gone, largely under the prodding of the Senator from Maryland and his associates in reporting the unsatisfactory conditions which existed last fall and this spring with reference to the continued trafficking between certain of our ports and Communist China.

So the action now sought to be taken by the United States under the leadership of the United States does not go as far as many of us would like to go, but does, as I understand, go as far as we can hope to go in view of the varied points of view prevailing at the United Nations.

I am happy that the time has come when such action seems to be about to be taken in the immediate future. I hope that here today we can do our part in making it clear that the Senate and House of Representatives stand unanimously behind our delegation to the United Nations in insisting upon this action. The complete unity of approach in this case is something which differs from our condition in other fields. I feel that we can well call attention to it. We should be proud to let the world know that we stand as one man back of our delegation to the United Nations in this matter.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his very generous observation.

His concurrent resolution goes farther, does it not, than the action taken by Great Britain individually, for example, last week, when it acted through the British Parliament only in regard to rubber, and then conditioned that action by making it apply only to shipments which will be made during the remainder of the year?

In complimenting the Senator from Florida as I do, let me emphasize the fact that his concurrent resolution goes very much farther than the action which has been taken by the individual nations, because his concurrent resolution includes many other strategic items which hitherto have not been included by the individual nations.

Therefore, I commend the Senator from Florida very highly for the very fine action he has taken in this respect.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the first place, I commend the Senator from Florida for the concurrent resolution. I am thoroughly in accord with it. I expect to vote for it, and I shall support it in every way I can.

Did I correctly understand the Senator from Florida to say that the concurrent resolution was submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee and has the approval of that committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. No.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask that question because as a member of that committee, I did not know that had been done.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; my statement was that the only reason why I did not ask that my concurrent resolution be submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee was the urgency of the matter, because of the limited amount of time available, for the real fight will take place on Thursday in New York.

So, instead of following the usual channel of submitting such matters to the committee, I have done my best to contact, in the first place, the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of the committee, and also the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the ranking minority member of the committee, and all other members of the committee whom I could contact in the limited time available. I understand that the Senator from Texas has also charged the chief adviser of the

committee with the same duty, namely, to contact all members of the committee whom he possibly could contact. I am further advised that all persons connected with the committee felt that the urgency of the matter justified that action. That is what I intended to say.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe that every member of the committee will vote for the concurrent resolution as a committee matter, and I do not raise the slightest objection to it because of the fact that it was not formally submitted to the committee. I raise no objection on that score. I am supporting the concurrent resolution.

However, I am intrigued by the procedure in the present case, because so often in the past when measures of far less importance and far less international implications than those of a measure calling for the application of tremendous sanctions against certain areas in the world have been brought up, repeated statements have been made in the Senate that, "This matter must be submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee, and that committee must hold hearings and must do this, that, and the other thing regarding it." So I am intrigued by the complete lack in this case of any demand that this measure be submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee.

As I say, I raise no objection to the concurrent resolution on that account, for I favor the concurrent resolution and I am prepared to vote in favor of it now. I think it should be adopted.

However, I point out that there is a little difference between the treatment of this concurrent resolution and the treatment of some other measures in regard to which demand has been made, on the basis of principle, that the formal procedure be followed; and the Foreign Relations Committee has demanded, in that connection, that certain urgent measures be submitted to the committee before the Senate acted on them on the floor of the Senate.

I make this comment, not in criticism of the Senator from Florida—because I favor his concurrent resolution, and I do not ask that it be referred to the committee—but merely to call attention to the rather unusual situation in connection with the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his comment.

Again I call attention to the fact that the pendency of this question in the United Nations and the fact that what appears to be the toughest battle of all is likely to occur on Thursday justify, I believe, that the resolution not follow the customary course. Therefore, I approached the chairman and other members of the Foreign Relations Committee in the way I have stated.

For the further information of the Senator from Iowa, I am able to state that a similar committee in the House of Representatives unanimously has approved this measure, believing, as the Senator from Iowa and I do, that the

urgency of the situation requires quick action.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for but one question or observation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say that it is never necessary for the Senator from Florida to state to me the righteousness of his personal motives. I have the utmost confidence in his motives at all times.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is no question about this resolution. I am for it. I think the Senator did perfectly right. I am not asking for an explanation. I am merely calling attention to a rather unusual situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his graciousness.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Personally, I should like to associate myself enthusiastically with the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida and the senior Senator from Michigan. I think it is completely consistent with the attitude of the vast majority of the Members of the United States Senate. On last Wednesday we had about a 4-hour debate on the floor of the Senate, in which the shipments to Red China were involved to an extent. As I recall, 16 or 17 Senators expressed themselves at that time, and the sentiment expressed was unanimously in favor of stopping the shipment of war supplies to our enemies. I think it is perfectly consistent with the Kem amendment also, which was offered, adopted, and accepted without a yeand-nay vote. I think it is definitely a step in the right direction.

I should however like to inquire of the Senator from Florida, who has devoted much time and study to this matter, whether he feels that the embargo will be enforced by the navies of the respective countries of the United Nations, or whether it is to be left largely to each country to deny itself these shipments abroad, and is only to be enforced by each country in its own way?

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to the Senator I requested that information, and was advised that the program as now offered includes enforcement by each of the nations who will be affected by it; but also, under the supervision of a committee—either the present "additional measures" committee, or some other committee of some character, to be named—as to the degree of enforcement. I want to say for the RECORD at this time that I am informed that the suggestion of our delegation to the United Nations already approved yesterday by the committee, and which will be considered by the Political Committee on Thursday, embraces these factors, which I shall read into the RECORD:

An embargo of shipments to Communist China, of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, petroleum, atomic energy materials, and items useful in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

These are items which would be of immediate consequence on the Korean battlefield. To cite only one example, the denial of petroleum to the Chinese Communist armies would have a serious effect on their mobility. Such is the information furnished by our delegation to the United Nations. I also understand that they feel that this is the maximum which they can hope to get at this time.

The Senator from Florida wants to say that he feels it is a very fine development, when they have worked matters up to the stage where they can get what they hope will be a tremendous majority vote for a program as far-reaching as this, though it may not be so far-reaching as would be desired by others, and as the Senator from Florida himself would approve.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, it is the matter of enforcement which is the test of the real strength of this resolution. The Senator from South Dakota quite agrees with the Senator from Florida that this is a step in the right direction, and that, if the resolution were to be adopted by a vast majority of members of the United Nations and fastidious enforcement was pledged by those who vote for it, that would be a great help. But, since certain nations have abstained, since there are those who declined to serve on the committee, and since there may be those who will vote against it on final passage, the Senator from South Dakota is curious to know whether the Senator from Florida shares with him the feeling that this may also prove a step in the direction of eventually setting up an economic blockade, if that becomes necessary in order to bring about the objectives toward which this resolution moves?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida does not know whether it will grow into that, but he would be pleased to see it develop into just such a situation. That is the individual expression of the Senator from Florida. He reiterates that he understands that this is as far as we can hope to obtain general accord among the nations other than the Soviet bloc, who comprise the membership of the United Nations, and he feels that it is a very salutary thing to be done. Quoting again from an expression which he had had indirectly from our officials at the United Nations:

Beyond this, we believe that to proclaim our collective agreement on such measures—

That is, the collective agreement of the United States with other nations, including enough to make a great majority of all of the nations—

will impress upon the Chinese Communist regime and their supporters the unity of our purpose and of our determination to repeal the aggression. We should not underestimate the effect that such a demonstration of strength and solidarity would have on the forces of aggression.

I certainly join in that expression.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. As I say, I want to salute whomever it was, whether the Senator from Florida, or the Senator

from Michigan, or both, acting jointly—at any rate, some very patriotic philologist—for writing on page 2, these words:

Whereas no United Nations soldier should be the target of a bullet manufactured in the free world, or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from the free world.

That, it seems to me, sets the target toward which we are moving by the adoption of this resolution. If the United Nations desires to move in that direction, they should not only adopt the language of the resolution now before it, but also if it becomes necessary to have an economic blockade to achieve this target, I am sure the Senator from Florida and the Senator from South Dakota will say, "So let it be."

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from South Dakota has certainly correctly spoken for the Senator from Florida in that matter, and in mentioning that particular paragraph from the preamble which the Senator from South Dakota has read. I may say it seems to the Senator from Florida, too, that that paragraph is the crux of the situation. We now have our own armies fighting, and, of course, they are the great majority of the men who are there, other than the South Koreans—fighting beside 14 other nations, comprising 15 free nations who have sent armed forces into South Korea to join the South Koreans. It would be an anomaly and a monstrosity, indeed, if we found that nations which had themselves participated in the action of the United Nations in entering into this effort to repeal aggression, would send from their shores and from their factories bullets and ammunition and materials of war with which to strike down these soldiers from 15 of the freedom-loving nations who serve there together in such a high cause.

Mr. MUNDT. I entirely agree.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to commend the Senator from Florida upon this resolution. I assure him of my support. My only anxiety is that it does not go far enough to achieve the results which I think we desire and need at this time in the war against Red China. The resolution imposes an embargo only on ammunition, arms, and materials of war. It does not carry with it an enforcement provision. It is simply left up to the nations who are willing to agree to it, in the event the United Nations imposes such an embargo, to decide for themselves whether they will in good faith comply with it.

I go a little further than does this resolution. When our boys are fighting and being killed, of course, no friendly nation, no ally, should supply any arms, materials, or ammunition to be used against the Allied troops. But I am wondering about those nations that would not support it and would not join in it and who will ignore any action the United Nations may take.

What we want to do is to stop the war, to bring it to a victorious conclusion as quickly as may be possible. Assuming that the supplies which are cut off by this embargo would have their effect upon the military strength and striking power of the Red Chinese, if they make up the loss from other sources we shall have gained but very little. I think the United Nations should go further, and we should go further, and impose a complete blockade against the ports of China, not only to make certain that the embargo is enforced, but to prevent supplies from reaching the Chinese Communists from other sources which may be available to them.

If the Senator will recall, on the 16th of January of this year I submitted a resolution, Senate Resolution 37, declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately take such measures against Communist China as would be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security, including the application by members of the United Nations of measures for the complete interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, and other means of communication, the severance of diplomatic relations, and operations by air, sea, and land forces, by members of the United Nations.

On the 23d of January that resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. So far as I know, no action has been taken on it, though hearings have been held. If the resolution was too strong, if it needed some modification, if it needed to be toned down to express the sentiment contained in the resolution of the Senator from Florida, that is action which should have been taken long ago. We have been at war with Red China since last November. There has been no indication, so far as the public knows, of any willingness on China's part to cease fire, bring the war to an end, and undertake to negotiate a peaceful settlement. Everything we have heard from China has been insults upon insults, and threats of more vicious and deadly conflict.

I say to the Senator from Florida that, while I shall support his resolution, I do not believe it goes far enough. I believe our Government and our people, since they are providing the great majority of the military strength which is opposing the forces of aggression and conquest, should insist that every action be taken necessary to achieve victory, not simply partial action, not merely one step, such as the pending resolution proposes. We owe it to the young men of America who are fighting for us, and I think every other allied nation which has troops in Korea, which has faith in the United Nations, and is relying upon the United Nations as an instrumentality of peace and an opposition to aggression, owes it to its people, to join in measures designed to put all possible pressure upon the Red Chinese Government in order to weaken her, and tend to bring the conflict to an end with a minimum loss of life.

Mr. President, I shall support the resolution of the Senator from Florida, but

it is my regret, and I express it here, that we have not been more vigilant and strong in our attitude toward our colleagues in the United Nations in prosecuting the war more vigorously. Although the present struggle is an undeclared war, it is as deadly as if declaration of it had been made. I have never before heard of a situation in which major powers were at war, where troops were fighting on the field of battle in such a deadly conflict, yet diplomatic relations were carried on with the enemy country. I cannot understand it. To me it is a new and strange way to fight a war. The concessions suggested, from my viewpoint, are in the nature of appeasement. We are trying to appease, we are trying to make concessions and use them as a means of inducement to try to achieve a settlement of the war. I do not believe we shall succeed. Every time we withhold the pressure and the power we should supply we simply weaken ourselves in our effort to fight to victory.

I believe we should impose an embargo on everything, all kinds of merchandise. If the enemy cannot eat, it cannot fight. While that is a drastic means to take, what is happening to our boys is also drastic. We have not taken such measures, but we are beginning, step by step, at a belated time, considering the seriousness of the war, to take some action, and it seems to me that is a stupidly poor way to fight a war to victory against a powerful foe.

Mr. President, I believe the American people are ready for us to bring the war to a conclusion. They are ready for us to fight with all we have. I know that is the way the fathers and mothers who have sons in Korea who are paying the supreme sacrifice feel about it.

I commend the able Senator from Florida. I shall not offer my resolution as an amendment to his or as a substitute for it, but I do say that what it proposes is the next step, if we are going to proceed step by step. I regret that we are doing it in that way; but since we are, the next step is immediately to blockade the ports of China, sever diplomatic relations, and disrupt her economy in every way we can. We can weaken her sufficiently by those means so that she will not have war potentials that are so deadly as are those which she is now employing against our forces.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. O'CONOR addressed the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall yield in a moment if I may be permitted to make reply to the Senator from Arkansas.

First, I appreciate the expression of support which the Senator has given. As one Senator, I feel that the Senate and the Nation are beholden to the Senator from Arkansas for having submitted a series of three resolutions, two of which were adopted by the Senate unanimously. The Senator from Florida was glad to speak in support of those resolutions. The third resolution was referred, as the Senator from Arkansas stated, to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That resolution was more far-reaching than is the resolution which the

Senator from Florida now proposes. The Senator from Florida wants to make it very clear, however, that neither he nor anyone who stands with him, nor, in his opinion, the Senator from Arkansas when he stands with him, can be charged with any sort of appeasement, because what we are trying to do is to recognize the practicalities of the situation. There is now pending a proposal in the United Nations, where we have to deal with the representatives of 52 other nations who stand generally with us. Our delegation has to deal with the representatives of 52 other nations which stood with it in supporting the United Nations action in Korea, and just as the distinguished Senator from Michigan and I find it necessary on the floor of the Senate to give and take to reach legislation that represents the will of the great majority of the Senators, so, no doubt, our delegation has to give and take in reaching similar results in the General Assembly in the United Nations.

It is my understanding that this is as much as can be hoped for in the way of progress at this time. The Senator from Florida thinks that this proposal goes a long way. He believes it deserves the unanimous support and backing of the Senate of the United States and of the entire Congress. He thinks we would overlook an excellent chance to show the unity and solidarity of our people and their representatives in standing back of our delegation in urging that this affirmative step be taken. I will say to the Senator it is an affirmative step. Like the Senator from Arkansas, I have wanted to see affirmative steps as we approach not only the solution of the problem, but the victory we desire and will win because our cause is just. But the Senator from Florida feels this is the next affirmative step that can be taken under present conditions, and that we would overlook a good chance to help support and sustain those who represent us if we did not take this means of telling them that we are with them, that we are back of them, and that we hope that the other nations of the 52 who voted with them for the effort in Korea, will now stand solidly with them in supporting this embargo.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Florida that I shall support his concurrent resolution because I think it is a step in the right direction, as I believe the resolution pending before the United Nations is a step in the right direction. I think the Senator from Florida will agree with me that the American people, and I believe the people of the free world, are not going to be satisfied with a mere affirmative vote by the United Nations as Lake Success. The meat of the coconut is going to be how they apply the restrictions after the vote has been taken. If they merely take a vote and let the months pass without making some practical application of it, they will have simply been making an empty gesture.

I say to the Senator from Florida that while it is a late step, nevertheless it is a desirable one. It is almost 11 months

since the fighting started in Korea. It is almost 6 months since Communist China first sent her organized troops into Korea in an act of aggression against the United Nations forces. As the Senator probably knows, of the 60 members of the United Nations about five are generally classified with the Soviet and the satellite powers. That leaves 55 outside the Soviet bloc. Up to the present time, at least up until April 30, the only nations members of the United Nations that had fighting forces in Korea were the following: The United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Great Britain, Greece, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, and the Union of South Africa.

That, if I am not mistaken, is 14 U. N. members in all with fighting forces helping to stem aggression in Korea. If the United Nations is to survive as an agency of collective security it seems to me its members will have to recognize that there is a responsibility upon each and every member of that organization to send troops in the interest of preserving a system of international law and order.

Perhaps a case can be made for some of the nations not furnishing troops, but it seems to me that no case can be made for any nation to decline at least to contribute an embargo against an aggressor. The free people of the world, and I believe the people of the United States, will make their final determination as to the success of the United Nations based upon what the other nations do forthwith to bring this embargo into play.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say I thoroughly agree with the sentiment expressed by the Senator from California, that not the mere voting of this embargo, but the following with the necessary degree of enforcement of this embargo, will be the measure of the approval on the part of the American people of this step which we hope will be taken shortly by the General Assembly of the United Nations under the leadership of the United States. I thoroughly agree that if there is not, following the adoption of the embargo, strict enforcement of it, there will be very great disappointment in the hearts of the people of our Nation and, of course, in the hearts of their representatives here.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I may say to the Senator from Florida in connection with the observations which have been made by the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that I think it very wise that the Senator from Florida has limited his concurrent resolution at this time to the specific question which is before the United Nations. Otherwise, there would be opened a limitless number of questions which undoubtedly would complicate the matter. So I think the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Michigan, both of whom have been so consistently behind this general subject matter, have acted very prudently and wisely in limiting it as they have done.

May I inquire of the Senator from Florida whether it is not a fact that in the proposal before the United Nations it is required that there be a follow-up, and that the nations report periodically—I think it is every 30 days—as to the shipments which are being made, if any, so as to determine the strategic nature of the materials?

Mr. HOLLAND. The pending suggestion has included the idea that either the committee already functioning or some like committee, should be appointed to receive these reports, and to review them periodically, to check up on them, and to bring complaint, if there is not the strictest degree of enforcement. The Senator from Maryland is correct.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further so as to permit me to make one comment which I think is in order?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. In relation to the broader subject matter to which the Senator from Arkansas referred—and I agree with everything he said—the Senate committee inquiring into shipments has scheduled public hearings, which are to be resumed tomorrow, incidentally, which have to do with another phase of this matter, and which points out the good judgment of the Senators who have submitted this concurrent resolution in not bringing that subject into this particular concurrent resolution, because the investigation we have been pursuing and in connection with which we are to take testimony tomorrow and henceforth has to do with shipments—east-west trade—in and out of Germany. The investigation shows a shocking situation and, incidentally, points to laxity on the part of our own officials.

So we feel that it might very well not be in order to have the provision in the concurrent resolution which was originally proposed, because there has been presented a situation in Germany which shows that there is a virtual sieve through which critical materials have been going to points beyond the iron curtain. We are going to take testimony about that, to show the public what is transpiring at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for his comments. I am very sure the people of the Nation generally will join the Senator from Florida in expressing their very high degree of confidence that any such situation, if discovered by the committee headed by the able Senator from Maryland, will be corrected. It is in his power to do it, because he has already shown a willingness to come to grips with this question, and to bring it right out in the light where the people can see it and insist that it be corrected. He has already applied great correction to the earlier existing condition of which we were all ashamed when we found it existed.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not quite understand the Senator from Maryland with reference to what the hearings were anticipated to disclose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Arkansas in order that he may propound a question to the Senator from Maryland, and that the Senator from Maryland may answer the question.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was not quite clear whether the goods and materials of which the Senator from Maryland spoke were from West Germany, where we have control of the economy.

Mr. O'CONOR. Undoubtedly so. The inspections made by the staff member, who has returned only very recently from Western Germany, have revealed that along the interzonal borders there have been steady shipments, trainloads of them, coming from the section under the tripartite set-up of Great Britain, France, and the United States. There has been a virtual sieve through which such shipments have been going. The staff member estimates that the chance of inspection along that border is only one out of a thousand, and that the chance that such shipments will be stopped is even less than that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is a shocking revelation. I hope that the facts will be disclosed and that appropriate action will be recommended and taken.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am heartily in support of the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Florida. The resolution of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has been pending for a considerable period before the Committee on Foreign Relations, but because of the scope which it covered, which is considerably greater than that of the pending resolution, we were not able to get around to it because of the pressure of other responsibilities.

This is a matter in which I feel we are all deeply interested. The fact that an embargo proposal is now pending in the United Nations and will probably be acted on within the next day or two makes it very important that we act speedily and forward our action to the United Nations. So I bespeak for the concurrent resolution the support of all Senators. I believe that our action will be justified, and that the people of the country will respond heartily to what we are doing.

The Senator from Florida has been quite diligent and vigilant about this matter. He and I have conferred a number of times. I am very happy indeed to cooperate with him and aid him in securing the adoption of his resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan wishes to make a few observations on the resolution of which he is cosponsor. I hesitate to do so because I think it is very important that the resolution be adopted immediately, and that notice be given to the

United Nations General Assembly as soon as possible. Yet I think the RECORD ought to indicate how deeply the United States Senate feels upon this very important question, by means of individual expressions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan for the purpose indicated?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Michigan for the purpose of allowing him to make brief observations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, my remarks relate to the unusual situation of a United Nations war. Heretofore we have had alliances, but we have now, for the first time in the history of man, what is known as a war under a collective security arrangement.

We have discovered, however, that nations somehow do not recognize that when they are a part of a collective security arrangement, they, too, are at war. I think that is why we are suffering as we have suffered in fighting the Korean War. It is very difficult to understand how a nation could trade with its enemy while at war. Yet that is what has been occurring with respect to the Chinese Communists. No nation could have an enemy more violent than the enemy which the United Nations have in this war, yet we see member nations engaging in trade with that enemy.

When the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Michigan were in the Far East in December, and were discussing the whole problem of collective defense in meetings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association at Canberra, we found that there were some nations which simply could not conceive of the fact that they, too, were at war.

As a matter of fact, as late as a few days ago we discovered that one of our veterans who had returned from Korea could not get into a veterans' hospital because the United States could not realize or had not officially admitted that it was in real war with China. We have been 11 months awakening to the fact that each and every one of the 53 United Nations which supported the United Nations action in Korea is in effect at war.

We who are trained in the law know a great deal about legal fictions. We use them in the law to solve certain problems. But, as far as Korea is concerned, I think we must wipe out all the fictions, and consider that we are in fact at war.

The Senator from Michigan spoke on the floor of the Senate on the 12th of July, indicating that we had a new structure in the world, a United Nations Organization, which was at war with North Korea. I then urged that any nation which gave aid and comfort, as a member of the United Nations, to North Korea certainly was, under the regulations of the United Nations, guilty of treason. I urged that was treason because, in effect, all the members of the United Nations were members of an organized society which was engaged in fighting the war against North Korea, and the defi-

nition of treason is giving aid and comfort to an enemy in time of war.

When China itself came into the war and went to war against the United Nations, and against each and every member thereof, we discovered certain nations trading with the enemy. Russia was supplying North Korea, and is doing so today. Now we discover that China is receiving rubber and is getting aid and comfort in other ways from other member nations.

Mr. President, how late it is! The boys who have died realized how late it is. Those who have been maimed for life and are suffering today know how long it has been. But if on Thursday, at Lake Success, we can get the various nations to recognize that they, too, are at war, and that when they send anything to China or North Korea that is going to inflict injury upon any boy or man of the United Nations, they are aiding an enemy, and that, in effect, their nation is guilty of treason, we shall have accomplished something.

Mr. President, let us adopt this resolution immediately and tell the other members of the United Nations that the two bodies which have a right to speak for public opinion in America say in no uncertain terms that we request and urge the General Assembly of the United Nations to take action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials—and I underscore the words "all other materials" for the benefit of the United Nations—which might aid in the war-making potential of Communist China.

Mr. President, when the vote is taken in the United Nations, let us see whether or not the 53 nations will recognize the true situation. Today the question has been asked as to whether we are going to back an edict with shot and shell. I hope the members of the United Nations will realize that they are at war. We hear a nation, through its foreign secretary, say that it intends to furnish rubber, no matter what happens. We have heard the expression used, "We will trade with the devil if it is in our interest." I want that nation to know that it is trading with the devil when it trades with China, when that nation itself is at war with China.

I hope that these remarks and our action on the floor of the Senate today will penetrate the souls of the leaders of the various nations so that they will understand that this is war, and that every one of the nations which has subscribed to the United Nations Charter, whether they have a man on the battlefield or not, is at war with China, and at war with North Korea, and that they will prohibit any shipments of aid or the giving of any comfort to this real enemy.

Mr. President, although it is late and although we might want stronger language in the resolution, if a nation will only use its conscience, which is the conscience of the people of that nation, it will understand that the resolution prohibits absolutely any shipments. That is what we in Congress, speaking for the minds and the conscience of the American people, will be saying when we adopt this resolution today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the fervent words of the Senator from Michigan. In closing, I wish to say that in the adoption of the resolution the Senate would be approving the program presented to the United Nations by our delegation. I wish to read more specifically what the program involves, as expressed in the resolution.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very glad to yield in a moment, after I have completed my statement on this point.

The resolution before the United Nations calls for an embargo on the shipment to areas under the control of Red China and Communist North Korea of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, and items useful in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey wishes to commend the able Senator from Florida and the able Senator from Michigan for the very worth-while effort which they have put forth in connection with the pending concurrent resolution. He wishes to associate himself with the purposes of the resolution and pledges his wholehearted support. A long step forward is being made. There is much to be said also for the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the junior Senator from New Jersey would like also to associate himself with the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. We have an opportunity to take an affirmative step, which will show that the Senate and Congress stand together behind our representation in the United Nations. If we adopt the resolution it will show that there is no disunity or disagreement between us on this important question though some of us would like to go much further. We believe that our representatives are representing us loyally in the United Nations. I feel that the taking of such an affirmative step will not only hold up their hands and give the impression to the people of the world that our Nation stands together on this vital matter, but it will also have a very real effect upon the minds of our fighting men in Korea. It will say to them that, in spite of all the bickering that may be going on with reference to details of the strategy or policy which is to be adopted, on this question we are proceeding arm in arm throughout our Nation, and that we are determined to go as far as we can go to protect them while they are on the battlefield against weapons, guns, and all the other materials that may come from any free nation, and to protect them from any harm that may originate in a free nation. It would say to them that there is absolutely no difference between us and that as Americans we stand back of cutting off this nefarious traffic.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is an old saying that everybody's business is nobody's

business. It looks as though when we get into a United Nations war the United Nations war seems to be no individual country's war. That is why the matter should be called to their attention. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. HOLLAND. There is much in the observation of the Senator from Michigan.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator knows of my interest in the resolution and my support of it yesterday in a brief speech on the floor of the Senate. I again wish to commend his very fine work on the resolution. I should like further to supplement the record with the eight provisions of the resolution which is now pending before the United Nations. I ask unanimous consent to insert the eight provisions, as published in the Washington Post. I wish to call particular attention to the second provision, which reads:

Each country will determine which commodities exported from its territory fall within the embargo and will slap on controls.

Mr. President, I ask that the eight provisions, as published in the Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I voice the hope that when the resolution has been adopted by the United Nations each country will see fit to give it a very strict interpretation, because otherwise it would be merely a milk and water proposition, which would not accomplish the results intended. I further express the hope that even with the adoption of the pending concurrent resolution the Foreign Relations Committee will continue its consideration of the very serious question, which is being glaringly overlooked by the United Nations, namely, that of an economic embargo, or sanctions. If such remedy does not work we shall be driven to take such measures as we think the circumstances justify.

EXHIBIT 1

The resolution calls for—

1. An embargo on the shipment to areas under the control of Red China and Communist North Korea of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic-energy materials, petroleum, and items useful in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

2. Each country will determine which commodities exported from its territory fall within the embargo and will slap on controls.

3. Each country will try to prevent circumvention of controls, such as transshipment by a state not complying with the embargo.

4. Each country will cooperate with other states in carrying it out.

5. Each country will report to the Additional Measures Committee, which will oversee the embargo, within 30 days on the measures taken.

6. The Additional Measures Committee will continue its consideration of steps to meet the aggression in Korea.

7. The U. N. reaffirms its policy calling for a cessation of hostilities in Korea and the

achievement of U. N. objectives by peaceful means.

8. The U. N. requests the Good Offices Committee to continue its work.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for one question? It will take only 30 seconds to ask the question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in favor of the resolution. I have been in favor of such an embargo against the Chinese Reds for a long time. Is it not just as important that the recipient countries of ECA aid be prohibited from exporting to Russia and satellite countries materials which aid Russia and Red China? It seems to me the same principle is involved. We have shut off such traffic from the United States. Why should it not be shut off from Great Britain and the other countries who are doing the very thing that we are trying to prohibit by the pending concurrent resolution?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator that it is important that shipments through other channels shall be shut off, and that the resolution which was adopted yesterday by one committee of the United Nations, and which goes to the political committee on Thursday, does include such a provision.

Mr. WHERRY. As long as 2 years ago the junior Senator from Nebraska offered amendments to prohibit the shipment of strategic materials. The distinguished Senator from Florida has done very splendid work in providing that all materials which might be used in conducting a war be prohibited and that an embargo be placed against them. That is the very thing we attempted to do 2 years ago. I hope that when the conferees meet on the third supplemental appropriation bill, which was passed by the Senate 3 or 4 days ago, the House will adopt the Senate version of the Kem amendment, which requires that countries who get ECA funds be prohibited from doing the things the Senator's resolution would proscribe.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator, and I join in his hope.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution as modified.

The concurrent resolution, as modified, was agreed to, with the accompanying preamble, as follows:

Whereas the United States has initiated a proposal, under the terms of which the General Assembly of the United Nations would (1) call upon all member nations of the United Nations not to send to Communist China arms, ammunition, or any other material which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China; (2) urge that steps be taken to guard against circumvention or nullification of such embargo through loopholes which might enable the Chinese Communists to acquire the banned materials; and (3) establish a special committee to receive periodic reports from the complying member nations and to take other measures aimed at making the embargo as effective as possible; and

Whereas Communist China has long since been branded an aggressor by an overwhelming majority of the member nations of the United Nations; and

Whereas more than a dozen member nations are participating directly with the

United States in the heroic military action against the common enemy in Korea, and the troops of such nations are being shot at, and killed, by the Chinese Communists; and

Whereas no United Nations soldier should be the target of a bullet manufactured in the free world, or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby requests and urges that the General Assembly of the United Nations take action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Wednesday, May 16, 1951, beginning at the hour of 12 o'clock, noon, debate upon any amendment or motion, including appeals, that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India shall be limited to not exceeding 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], respectively, and, in the case of individual amendments or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], provided (1) that in the event the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is in favor of any such individual amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], or some other Senator designated by him; and (2) that no amendment or motion which is not germane to the subject matter of said bill shall be received; provided further that debate upon the bill itself be limited to 1 hour, to be divided equally and controlled respectively by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], or some other Senator designated by him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has been attempting this afternoon to submit a resolution in the form of an amendment to the bill. I simply wish to be sure that under the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, if it is entered, no interpretation which might be given to it would exclude the consideration of my amendment. I do not know whether the amendment will be considered relevant, because it deals with the disposition of the interest to be collected from India. I should like to have the right to have my amendment considered.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Has the Senator submitted his amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. I have it here, but I have not yet submitted it.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Will the Senator submit it now, so it can be received, printed, and lie on the table?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, if I may obtain unanimous consent for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota wait a minute until the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is read. I should like to have it read.

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

The legislative clerk read the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MUNDT, as follows:

On page 5, between lines 10 and 11, add a new section reading as follows:

"Sec. 8. Any sums paid by the Government of India on or before January 1, 1957 (or such later date as may hereafter be specified by act of Congress), as interest on the principal of any debt incurred under this act shall be placed in a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, to remain available until expended. This account shall be available to the Department of State for the following uses:

"(a) allocation, for designated educational, agricultural, experimental, scientific, medical, or philanthropic activities, to American institutions engaged in such activities in India;

"(b) studies, instruction, technical training, and other educational activities in the United States and its Territories and possessions (1) for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of India and (2) with the approval of appropriate agencies, institutions, or organizations in India, for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of the United States to participate in similar activities in India, including in both cases travel expenses, tuition, subsistence, and other allowances and expenses incident to such activities; and

"(c) the selection, purchase, and shipment of (1) American scientific, technical, and scholarly books and books of American literature for higher educational and research institutions of India, and (2) American laboratory and technical equipment for higher education and research in India, and (3) the interchange of similar materials and equipment from India for higher education and research in the United States."

Remember succeeding sections and references thereto.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the amendment considered as being germane and as coming within the germaneness provision of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection to the proposed agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the amendment has already been submitted and now lies on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course it would still be subject to a point of order, if a point of order were made.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course I understand that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. However, the Chair does not wish to pass on that matter until a point of order is made.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, so far as the unanimous-consent agreement, as proposed, is concerned, I ask that the amendment be considered as being germane and that an exception be made in the case of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota be considered as germane, regardless of any circumstances.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that under the proposed agreement all amendments must be submitted now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. MCFARLAND. No; but amendments to be submitted in the future must be germane, if the proposed agreement is entered.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; they must be germane.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, as a part of the unanimous-consent proposal, I also include a provision that debate on the bill be limited to one hour and one-half, to be divided equally.

The VICE PRESIDENT. First, is there objection to the request that the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota be regarded as germane? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request, as modified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely rise to submit an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is now considering a proposed unanimous-consent agreement in regard to limitation of debate on Senate bill 872. That matter has nothing to do with an amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it does have something to do with an amendment, Mr. President, because on a former occasion when we were debating the farm labor bill, I found myself confronted with difficulty when I attempted to submit an amendment after a unanimous-consent agreement in regard to limitation of debate on the bill and amendments to it had been entered. I wish to be sure that I do not become involved in such a situation in connection with this measure.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that no such limitation is involved in connection with the proposed agreement now before the Senate, other than that all amendments must be germane; and I assume that the Senator's amendment is germane.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well; so long as I can submit the amendment later, I shall not object to the proposed agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement does not limit the right of Senators to submit amendments which are germane.

Is there objection to the proposed agreement as modified?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I wish to point out that I reserve the right to act as I see fit and to vote as I see fit on all amendments which are submitted to the bill.

I reserve that right in connection with the provision of the proposed agreement in regard to the division of time and my designation as the one to handle the assignment of part of the time. The fact that I am charged with assigning part of the time does not mean, I point out, that I shall be either for or against a particular committee amendment or other amendment. I have agreed to such proposals, and I shall do so again, but I wish it distinctly understood that I continue to have the right to vote as I choose on all such matters.

Let me also point out that although I do not object to the request to have the amendment which has been referred to considered as germane, nevertheless I wish to suggest to the majority leader that if request is made that an amendment be considered germane and if a quorum call is not had at the time, before the request is acted on, Members of the Senate who then are absent are thus foreclosed from having an opportunity to object. I believe that situation should receive consideration when attempts are made at the last minute to have certain amendments considered as being germane, for in reality every Senator should have an opportunity to make a point of order against such amendments. Therefore, I point out that the proposal to consider certain amendments as being germane is rather far-reaching, and definitely should not be considered as establishing a precedent.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement as modified?

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely submit the amendment to which I have referred, so there will be no question about it.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement as modified; and, therefore, it is entered.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

MR. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the agreement as modified provides for the limitation on debate to begin at 12 o'clock or 12:30?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Twelve o'clock.

MR. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I meant to provide for 12:30. I ask unanimous consent to have the agreement modified accordingly.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the agreement will be modified accordingly.

The agreement as entered was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, May 16, 1951, beginning at the hour of 12:30 p. m., debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India shall be limited to not exceeding 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, in the case of committee amendments, by Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. WHERRY, respectively, and, in the case of individual amendments or motions, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. GILLETTE: *Provided,* (1) That in the

event Mr. GILLETTE is in favor of any such individual amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by Mr. WHERRY or some Senator designated by him; and (2) that no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate on the question of the final passage of the said bill shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour and 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. WHERRY or some Senator designated by him, respectively.

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

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

MR. WHERRY. Debate on the entire bill is to be limited to 1 hour and one-half, with 45 minutes to each side; is that correct?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; that modification was made.

MR. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], for himself, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself, has submitted an amendment. I send to the desk a modification of the amendment and ask that it be read by the clerk.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the modification.

The modification of the amendment, submitted by Mr. FERGUSON, for himself, Mr. McCARRAN, and Mr. BRIDGES, was read, as follows:

On page 2, line 17, strike out all of sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. The assistance authorized by this act shall be made only on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"SEC. 5. In order to carry out the purposes of this act the President is authorized to utilize not in excess of \$190,000,000 during the period ending June 30, 1952, of which sum (1) not less than \$100,000,000 shall be made available immediately from funds heretofore appropriated by Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and (2) \$90,000,000 shall be available from any balance of such funds unallotted and unobligated as of June 30, 1951, *Provided,* That if such amount unallotted and unobligated is less than \$90,000,000 an amount equal to the difference shall be obtained from the issuance of notes in such amount by the Administrator for the Economic Cooperation Administration, who is hereby authorized and directed to issue such notes from time to time during fiscal years 1951 and 1952 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to purchase such notes and, in making such purchases to use, as a public debt transaction, the proceeds of any public debt issue pursuant to the Second Liberty Loan Act as amended; *And provided further,* That \$50,000,000 reserved by the Bureau of the Budget pursuant to section 1214 of Public Law 759 of the Eighty-first Congress from funds appropriated by that act for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 as amended, shall not be available for purposes of this section.

"SEC. 6. The credit terms provided for in section 4 shall include repayment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator for Economic Co-

operation and the Government of India), or otherwise of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources."

MR. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this amendment departs from the provision of the pending bill in three respects.

First. This amendment provides that the entire amount of assistance authorized shall be made available as a loan rather than on basis of half loan, half grant. The loan basis would be in accord with the manner in which aid has been extended to many of the Marshall plan countries under the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Second. The amendment provides that funds for this loan shall be made available out of appropriations heretofore made to the Economic Cooperation Administration, which will not be required by that agency to continue the European recovery program for the balance of the present fiscal year. If those funds are not sufficient, the balance required would be made available under a public-debt transaction.

Third. It is proposed that the credit terms extended in making this loan shall include permissive repayment provisions by the transfer to the United States of certain materials which India can provide and which are required by the United States as a result of actual or potential deficiencies in the supply of such materials.

At the outset let me stipulate that the sponsors of this amendment are anxious, as Americans are always anxious, to respond to a humanitarian call within the limits of our ability to do so. Let there be no question of that.

But when we tax the American taxpayers and deduct from their earnings at the source, we must always remember that charity is a virtue, but also that charity begins at home. In taking the tax dollar from the American worker we must bear in mind also that we represent him, as a trustee of that tax money, and that when we use it, we should use it as he would have us use it, and as he would administer that charity.

I am sure that, when the American taxpayer feels that there is a famine at this time in India, even though contributed to in part by the action of man, rather than being an act of God, he is glad that we are in a position at this time to extend help, but he will want us to extend his help wisely.

We disagree with the means proposed by the pending bill for the discharge of our humanitarian desires, and we therefore propose an alternate method. We deny the validity of grant as the basis for this aid. We believe that the loan basis will satisfy India's need, and will impose no undue hardship on her.

When the Senator from Nevada offered this amendment, he offered for the Record a statement tracing the legislative background of the proposal now before us, and he presented documentary evidence of India's asset position and capacity to service a loan of the nature that would be authorized by the amendment. There is also available the report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, House Report 373 on H. R. 3791,

which even more fully offers conclusive evidence of the feasibility and the desirability of the proposal represented by this amendment.

The compelling feature of the background for this legislation is that India herself has never asked for a grant. The official appeal, presented in a note by the Indian Government dated February 8, 1951, simply requests "the United States Government to give * * * ad hoc assistance during 1951 to obtain 2,000,000 tons of food grains and would greatly appreciate if the grain be supplied on special and easy terms."

I wish to repeat the conditions of assistance contemplated in that request—on special and easy terms.

That simply does not represent a request for a grant, and there is no record of such a request. It is a part of a care-free, grandiose, global give-away philosophy that would gratuitously alter that request to provide for a gift in whole or in part.

I am sure that the American taxpayer, particularly the workingman from whose pay a deduction is made at the source, would feel that, when India requests only a loan, we, as trustees of the fund which we collect as a tax should not gratuitously offer to give his money away if we decide that some assistance is justified.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the purpose of the Senator's amendment to leave to the American and Indian officials the determination of what the price shall be for the wheat, and also for the commodities which will be exchanged for the wheat, as well as the rate at which deliveries shall be made by the Indian Government in return for the wheat?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It would then be necessary, would it not, for them to reach an agreement, which might be based on the world wheat agreement price, or on the world market price, as to the fair exchange price of one commodity for another?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, and I think that is the only way in which this matter can be handled.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not intended, is it, that India shall be required to make deliveries more rapidly than would be economically feasible for her?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The Senator from Michigan understands how India feels about this. If India could negotiate the price and the terms of payment, it would be to them a legitimate business deal.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Michigan understands, does he not, that all other arrangements made by India with other countries for grains have either been on a cash basis or on the basis of barter?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, there have been no gifts from other countries, so far as we know, have there?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. That reminds me of the fact that upon one occasion I was present at a round-

table discussion with Nelson Johnson, former Ambassador to China and Australia, and several students from the Far East. The students were selected to come to America. They came from countries in the Near East and the Far East. They were young men and women who were entering college, and they were familiar with the respective countries in which they lived. It was very difficult for them to understand how America could offer gifts to another nation. They asked, "Well, what do you really want? What do you want in return?" They said they would rather know in advance what would be expected in return, rather than be told at some later time. Until very recently their countries were ruled as colonies in the Far East and in the Near East, and it can readily be understood that these young people, and all their people, thought they had a right to look a gift horse in the mouth, because they needed to know what they would later be required to give in return.

For that reason I think I can understand the attitude of Mr. Nehru, when he stated he wanted our aid to be a loan and not a gift. He wanted to be able to say to his people that they were going to be able to stand upon their own feet. I am hoping that Mr. Nehru's government and those which follow in India will feel that this is a loan and an obligation to be rep'd at the very earliest possible date. I feel satisfied that if some outside interest does not interfere—Russia, for instance—it will be treated as a loan. But the difficulty is—and it is difficult for them to understand—Russia comes into the question.

The Senator from Michigan knows of no case in which Russia ever made a gift to another nation. Russia's materialism sometimes works rather subtly. I recall when Russia put a propaganda show on in Calcutta. The Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Michigan went to see the motion picture, which was a propaganda picture sponsored by the Russians. We paid admission in the regular theater in order to see it. Russia did not give one cent. When we were putting out moving pictures it was done free of charge. I think Russia had a better crowd in the theater by virtue of charging for the show rather than operating it free of charge. Russia understands human nature. I say we must understand it, too. We must understand that we cannot buy peace.

I think Nehru knows just what he is doing when he says to his people, "I do not want this to be a gift, in connection with which there will be counterpart funds." Counterpart funds are strings attached to our aid. They would enable us to participate in India's internal development program. Nehru apparently does not want that. I think he is being sensible. I also think he is doing this country a great service in declining an arrangement that calls for counterpart funds.

Mr. President, we are having great difficulty in solving the problem of counterpart funds. In Italy there is a game called "counterpart fund," which has been introduced to try to get the people to know the meaning of the word "coun-

terpart." I doubt that there is one citizen in America out of 10,000 who understands the counterpart fund about which we are speaking. One Senator just pointed to himself to indicate that he doubts whether he understands it.

Outside of Athens I talked to a farmer about the ECA program and found that he had never heard of it. I asked him about the Marshall plan. He had never heard of that. I talked to him through an interpreter, of course. I said, "Did you ever receive anything that came from America?"

He said, "Yes; I got a mule."

He happened to have the mule with him. I asked him if he was not grateful to America for giving him the mule.

He replied, "Oh, no; America did not give me the mule."

America gave the mule to the Greek Government, and the Greek Government sold the mule to the farmer for enough drachmas to make \$150. Was that farmer grateful to America? No. He had to pay full compensation in Greek drachmas for the mule, and it was Greek drachmas that we call by the high-sounding name of counterpart funds. He is not very grateful about that expression of our generosity, because he had to pay for it out of his pocket.

I was on a farm near Paris and met a farmer who had a tractor for which he had paid counterpart funds. The French Government not only charged him the cost of the tractor we had contributed but it placed a 50-percent tariff on it, payable by the farmer. The farmer paid the price of the tractor plus a 50-percent tariff. The price he paid the French Government was called by the high-sounding name "counterpart fund."

Do we think we can get good will out of that expression? If the foreign governments want to give things to their people, they should not use this so-called subterfuge of a counterpart fund.

The only valid question relative to the conditions of assistance requested by India is whether the loan basis we propose contains special and easy terms. When a man thinks he is receiving easy terms he thinks he is getting a bargain. People like to think they are getting bargains. I am sure that if we give India a bargain in terms, she will feel better about it.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Michigan believe that the people of India would be better satisfied to receive the fair market value for their commodities than to be required to sell them at a very low price, and then receive charity as payment for them?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I have in mind particularly the case of burlap, the price of which was forced down by our own estimable agency known as the OPS. Not long ago India controlled the price of burlap, which was selling for slightly more than 22 cents a pound. Then the controls were taken off, and the price went to the world price of 26 cents a pound. That was the world market price at the time. Then the OPS proclaimed

a general freeze as of December and early January, which reduced the price of burlap in this country below the world market price which India could get by selling elsewhere. We then stopped getting burlap from India, because our Government agency had interfered with the world market price and said, in effect, "You cannot sell your burlap in America." We use approximately from 20 to 25 percent of the burlap output of India. India was told, in effect, "You cannot sell it in the United States unless you sell it below what you can get somewhere else in the world."

The price has gone to 34 cents. Large manufacturers who are in the most-favored situation under the OPS ruling can get some burlap, but, at the same time, not all our manufacturers can get it today because of the restrictions put on them, not by India, but by our own Government. Why should not India get the world market price if she can get it?

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, the Indian people have the right to ask, "What do you expect in the future?"

Mr. AIKEN. I sometimes think there are those in our Government who regard foreign governments in the same light in which they regard the American farmer. They want to give them a hand-out and force them to sell at half price.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator seen the proposed terms of the loan? I am speaking of the loan which it is now suggested we provide for India.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I shall insert in the Record an extract from the ECA Act, which indicates the kind of loan that is contemplated. I was about to refer to the type of loan and its terms. I think we must leave it to the Administrator to negotiate the nature of the loan, as well as the price of the material. We must expect that the Administrator will be honest both to the United States taxpayer and to the Indian recipients in the negotiations.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator seen the terms of some of the loans made to other nations?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have.

Mr. WHERRY. From their provisions, would the Senator think they constitute what could be called a straight Government loan?

Mr. FERGUSON. Some of them contain exceptional terms.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator seen the one with Iceland?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have seen reference to the terms of the loan to Iceland.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the distinguished Senator from Michigan will examine the volume which gives a report on the loans, the agreements, and the conditions. I submit to the Senator that some of the agreements I have seen provide that by mutual consent of both parties they can change or alter completely the promissory note given as a basis for the loan. The reason why I ask the question is because there are amendments which provide for a loan. What kind of a loan? Is it a loan which is a straight Government loan, without any conditions, and which will be paid

when it matures, or are there loopholes which make it only a loan in name, but in reality a grant in the event the terms are altered? That is the point I am making.

Mr. FERGUSON. The loan will be under the provisions of a law which Congress has passed, section 111 (c) paragraph 2 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. In a case such as this it is very difficult in advance to prescribe definitely the terms. The loan must be negotiated in good faith. I take it for granted that the terms of such loans should be reported. The Senator from Nebraska has indicated that in the last 10 years the United States Government has loaned—what was the amount, \$100,000,000,000?

Mr. WHERRY. I am sure the Senator heard me make that statement earlier today. What I attempted to say was that that amount represented grants or loans, and I said that in my opinion most of these transactions are grants. I said the total amount was more than \$100,000,000,000 in the last 10 years. The reason why I mention that is that the so-called instruments which the Department says are loans, to me seem to be nothing more than grants. My feeling is that inasmuch as our Government has canceled many other debts, the administration can cancel or change the loan in any way the administration desires to change it under an agreement containing such terms as those which were negotiated with Iceland, if it feels that the economic situation of a country which has made a loan from us is such that it cannot meet the terms of the loan.

My point is: Is this a loan which is dependable? Are we to be paid back? Will the taxpayers be reimbursed? Or is this a loan which contains such loopholes that it can be canceled when and if the two Governments decide mutually that it should be canceled?

Mr. FERGUSON. The loan would come under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act, section 111 (c), paragraph 2. I would say that if officials of the Government made a loan which was in effect a grant, they would be violating their oaths of office. A loan is a loan. A loan must be made, and if it is not to be paid back then it is not a loan. Certainly it is intended that this loan to India shall be paid back.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to read paragraph 4, as it appears in the House Foreign Relations Committee report, and which I read earlier today:

If at any time or from time to time the parties hereto determine that it would be in their common interests because of adverse economic conditions—

Note this—

because of adverse economic conditions or for any other reasons to postpone, or provide for the postponement, of any installments of interest or principal or to provide that such installments or any part thereof shall be made and received in local currency of Iceland at a rate of exchange to be agreed upon, or to modify the aforesaid promissory note in any respect, they may by mutual agreement in writing provide for any such postpone-

ment, or payment in local currency, or any modification hereof. Any agreement for payment in local currency may specify the purposes for which such currency may be used.

I call attention to the words "or to modify the aforesaid promissory note in any respect." Would the Senator consider that to be language which would serve as the basis for what we would call a good Government loan?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels that is a stipulation in a particular loan agreement. That is not the language of the act. I made reference a moment ago to the provisions of the law under which the loan would have to be made. I now ask unanimous consent that the relevant portions of section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 be printed in the Record at this point.

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

(2) When it is determined that assistance should be extended under the provisions of this title on credit terms, the Administrator shall allocate funds for the purpose to the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 526), as amended, make and administer the credit on terms specified by the Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. * * *

* * * The notes hereinabove authorized shall be redeemable at the option of the Administrator before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such notes and shall have such maturity as may be determined by the Administrator with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Each such note shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the note. Payment under this paragraph of the purchase price of such notes and repayments thereof by the Administrator shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. In allocating funds to the Export-Import Bank of Washington for assistance on credit terms under this paragraph, the Administrator shall first utilize such funds realized from the sale of notes authorized by this paragraph as he determines to be available for this purpose, and when such funds are exhausted, or after the end of 1 year from the date of enactment of this act, whichever is earlier, he shall utilize any funds appropriated under this title. The Administrator shall make advances to, or reimburse, the Export-Import Bank of Washington for necessary administrative expenses in connection with such credits. Credits made by the Export-Import Bank of Washington with funds so allocated to it by the Administrator shall not be considered in determining whether the bank has outstanding at any one time loans and guarantees to the extent of the limitation imposed by section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 529), as amended. Amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any credits made under this paragraph shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury: *Provided*, That, to the extent required for such purpose, amounts received in repayment of principal and interest on any credits made out of funds realized from the sale of notes authorized under this paragraph shall be deposited into the Treasury for the purpose of the retirement of such notes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The language of that provision does not go so far that a loan can be converted into a grant.

Mr. WHERRY. A provision such as I just read into the Record is not one that should be the basis for a loan.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is how the Senator from Michigan feels.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly the State Department, or whatever agency is to handle the loan, will have some idea of what the provisions of the loan will be. Why does not the Congress know about it? Is it to be a loan which tomorrow or next year or 5 years from now or at a later date, may, in its terms, be changed? It will probably run for 30 or 35 years. The present administration will be out of office and another administration will be in office. Under such a stipulation as that made in connection with the loan to Iceland, even though the promissory note be negotiated in good faith by the present administration, a future administration can accept a modification of the agreement. Why cannot we know whether the provisions of an agreement for a loan to India will be based on similar language as the loan to Iceland? If it is, then what we would be doing would be to make a grant instead of a loan.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, the Senator from Michigan does not feel that is correct, because each credit transaction involves an agreement setting forth the amount of the loan and any other necessary arrangement.

Mr. WHERRY. It fixes the due date.

Mr. FERGUSON. Accompanying the agreement is a promissory note, containing the interest rate, and the terms for repayment of principal and interest.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Nebraska understands that when a promissory note is given, it is intended that it shall be a loan, and not a grant. Unless we enter into an agreement in the form of a treaty, which, after it has been negotiated is ratified by the Senate, we must proceed in the way indicated.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate does not confirm or ratify a negotiated loan.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. To do what the Senator from Nebraska wants done would necessitate the negotiation of a loan in such a form that it would have to be ratified by the Senate.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator from Michigan agree with the junior Senator from Nebraska that it is about time that some branch of the Government should have knowledge of the amount of loans which are being made to foreign countries, whether they are bona fide loans, or whether they are grants, or whether they are loans containing so many loopholes that they never will be paid? Certainly the Senator knows the experience of the United States in connection with loans made to foreign countries. It is certainly not a very healthy and satisfactory experience.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan realizes that. I think that is

why it is good for us to have this debate. It certainly should serve as a warning to those who negotiate the loans, that the Senate of the United States expects that they be genuine loans, and not grants-in-aid or gifts.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it behooves the proponents of this measure to come forward and give the Members of the Senate some assurance that what is proposed to be done now is to make a loan, because it seems to me that overnight what is proposed to be done may be changed from a loan to a grant. If loan agreements have loopholes in them which will result in the loan never being paid back, I cannot for the life of me see any difference between such loan agreements and grants.

I think we ought to be fair to the American people about this matter. If this is to be a loan, and it is expected to be repaid, the promissory note should not be altered any more than a promissory note would be altered in private life. If I sign a promissory note, I must pay the note and the interest on it. I cannot suggest 6 months or a year from now that the terms of such a promissory note be altered or that it be canceled. I would not be permitted to suggest that I pay only 10 cents on the dollar. Of course, if there were a bankruptcy proceeding, that would be a different proposition. If any conditions placed in the agreement loans are bankrupt, we ought to know about it now.

If the Senate is to approve this loan its Members should know that it is really a loan, which it is expected shall be paid back; that it is a straight loan made upon the basis of negotiations between governments, and there should not be any conditions placed in the agreement which would permit either country to step out from under any of its provisions on any pretext. The loan ought to be repaid; otherwise it would not be a loan. We should not grant a loan if the agreement contains loopholes as big as houses through which its provisions can be altered.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan agrees that it should not be a grant, and it would not be a grant if our public officials, acting as trustees, under their oaths of office acted as they should.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan said that the provisions of a loan could be handled much like the negotiating of a treaty. I agree with the Senator. In such a case should not the officials of the department handling the matter come to the Senate and ask the Senate to ratify the provisions of the agreement, or, in case there should be proposed alterations in the promissory note, to ratify the alterations, within the provisions of the law?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say that if it were not for the situation now existing in connection with the proposed aid to India, the time element involved, such a matter could be negotiated and brought back to the Senate in the nature of a

treaty, and ratified by the Senate. But under the Economic Cooperation Act we have created the authority to make certain kinds of loans, and it expedites matters to be able to avail ourselves of that authority in the present instance.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am certainly not in disagreement with the interpretation of the law which the Congress enacted; but in view of the statement made a moment ago by the distinguished Senator from Michigan to the effect that the loan could be negotiated as a treaty, and that we could write certain provisions into it, of the loan is negotiated on the basis of a straight promissory note, if the note is altered and the debtor is relieved of the debt, does not the Senator feel that at least the departments of the Government should come before the Senate and give the Senate an opportunity to alter the note, rather than having it altered by the department which made the loan?

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, the Senator from Michigan feels that public officials should act in good faith, and should report defaults. They should report to the various committees, particularly the Appropriations Committees, all defaults. The Senator from Nebraska has had some sad experiences. One of them has been that he cannot find out just how much money we have loaned. I, too, should like to know the answers to these questions. Another thing the Senator is unable to find out is whether or not any of the loans are in default.

Mr. WHERRY. Or whether any of them have been paid.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how much money has been paid on foreign loans during the past 10 years?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Nebraska has indicated that he cannot find out. The Senator from Michigan realizes that it is a pretty difficult thing to find out when the Senator from Nebraska cannot find it out. But we have discovered that, under the guise of so-called security, many things are secreted from the American people when they should not be.

One of the things which the Senator is trying to find out is how many loans we have made, how many are in default, and how many have been paid, as well as how many agreements have been changed and why they have been changed. The facts ought to come to the attention of the American public, because, after all, these are tax dollars that are being used. The situation is very much like that in which the trustee of an estate lends money from the estate, money which belongs to widows and children, without keeping track of whether the loans are being paid or not. When the public officials of America and of other nations recognize the fact that these are trust funds, and not their own funds, then we shall have honesty and morality in government. That is what we need.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not quarreling over the point of whether the Senate or both Houses of Congress should be informed. I believe that both Houses passed on the British loan.

I should like to ask the Senator another question. If India has furs or jute for sale and does not wish to dispose of them now, she can obtain a loan from the RFC, can she not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe special authority would be required.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly she can obtain a loan from the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. FERGUSON. If she has good collateral.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I mean.

Mr. FERGUSON. Not good enough for a bank loan, but good enough for this purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot understand the purpose of changing from a grant to a loan overnight, on the theory that this is a loan. The experience with ECA loans has been that we adopt the attitude, "We will lend it to them. Perhaps we shall get it back, but probably we shall not get it back." That is the theory under which an ECA loan is made.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator from Nebraska understands that the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from New Hampshire, and the Senator from Michigan do not want this transaction to go through as a grant. They want it to be a loan. They expect that it will be negotiated on reasonable and fair terms, and that the loan will be repaid. Any nation which defaults on such a loan when it has the capacity to pay, like any other debtor in a similar situation, acquires the reputation of not keeping its agreements.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has no doubt, has he, that India is about as likely to repay the loan in goods as are most of the other countries to which we are lending money. That is particularly true because India produces things which we must buy, and which do not come in competition with our own producers in the United States. It is the logical place to buy.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, India has certain commodities, of which jute is one. She has a capacity to repay and we should expect her to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The United States is a large user of jute, because we bag so many things. Jute is raised in India. I am glad to note that in February, India removed the embargo with respect to Pakistan. India is partly to blame for her own famine condition. It is to blame to a great extent. India had a trade war with Pakistan. She planted jute instead of wheat because she did not want to buy jute for the mills in Calcutta from East Bengal. There was a trade war in progress. There was no rhyme or reason for the trade war, except that the Indian Government wanted to destroy the Pakistanian Government. The Senator from Michigan feels that that is a fact. But Pakistan had a war on with the Indian Government up in Kashmir. The

United Nations has sent a representative over there to try to settle that war. Those two nations, as young nations, had better settle down and try to do business. The Senator from Michigan saw wheat in Pakistan lying on the wharf. It could not be shipped anywhere, and it was destroyed by virtue of age. India would not buy a grain of it.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that India has now made arrangements to buy 10,000 tons of wheat from Pakistan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I am glad to note that the trade war is being settled.

Mr. AIKEN. India is getting wheat from Pakistan. It is probably getting jute from Pakistan. I believe the trouble referred to is partly due to the fact that, as I understand, India had devalued her currency, but Pakistan had not got around to doing that necessary thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. That was one of the reasons.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In commercial transactions between the Indian Government and countries in South America or Russia, involving wheat, is it true that cash is paid? Or is the wheat bought on an exchange basis, so that there is a quid pro quo involved?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the way Russia does business.

Mr. DWORSHAK. How about the South American countries?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think they operate in the same way. I know of no country outside the United States which takes the tax dollar and gives it away. In her colonial empire England used a similar arrangement, but I believe that everyone who was under that colonial empire expected to pay the money back in tax dollars or otherwise, and then some. But I know of no nation in the history of the world, unless it had a colonial empire, which followed such a plan. We do not have a colonial empire, so we do not follow that program under such a guise. I know of no other country which takes its tax dollars, as we do, under the general-welfare clause, or under our national-defense program, and gives them away.

Everyone knows that one of the big reasons for fighting the revolutionary war was taxation without representation. In other words, we were being taxed in the Colonies and the money was being taken over to England and used by the English. We said that we were fighting a war because we were being taxed and did not have any representation in the British Parliament. Now we are doing exactly the same thing. In the case of Britain, she was taxing the Colonies. Now we are taxing the people of America and sending the money to England and other countries where we have no representation. That is exactly what was done in colonial days.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In view of the fact that in India there are stocks of burlap, chrome, and other strategic materials

and commodities which are needed in the United States in the interest of national preparedness, it would seem that the Indian Government would prefer to conduct this transaction on a commercial basis, rather than to establish a precedent which might be embarrassing later.

Mr. FERGUSON. She does. We placed in this particular amendment the idea of exchange of strategic materials.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Why is this loan being made through ECA?

Mr. FERGUSON. Because ECA is one of the agencies which is established for the making of loans. Either the ECA or the Export-Import Bank can make such loans, although the latter is authorized only to make production loans, I believe. ECA represents the only method we have presently available of making a loan like this.

Mr. WHERRY. It would be possible to make a loan through the Export-Import Bank without the necessity of going to ECA at all. If it is contemplated that repayment will be made in goods on a commercial basis, I maintain the Export-Import Bank is the agency through which the loan should be made.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Export-Import Bank acts as the operating agency for ECA. When the ECA passes out of existence the Export-Import Bank will handle such matters. I hope the ECA will go out of business, because it will have outlived its span of life in 1952.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not correct to say that under ECA much easier terms are provided? In other words, ECA does what it wishes to do. Under the Export-Import Bank there is a semblance of a straight loan made between countries.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. We passed the law. It is perhaps the best method that we have in existence at the present time. The terms of each loan are arrived at by the ECA Administrator in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. Loans are extended on that agreed basis. Therefore, we have the machinery available, and it is hoped that the officials will act as trustees for American taxpayer dollars and honestly carry out the functions that they are supposed to carry out. If they do so, we will have a loan, not a grant.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator consider modifying his amendment so as to provide that section 4 of the Iceland agreement shall not apply in the loan to India unless Congress first gives its full approval to it? The Senator need not give his answer at this time. He may wish to think it over. We are being told that aid to India will be granted on the basis of a loan, which will be paid back. Therefore, it would seem to me that a provision should be inserted that the Iceland agreement shall not apply. Unless ECA wants to make it under the law to which the Senator has referred, why

should it not be necessary to come back to Congress to get full approval of any such agreement?

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not true that ECA has the organizational set-up to deal with a situation which involves a measure of relief, whereas the Export-Import Bank is supposed to deal only with strictly sound business propositions? I believe there is about the same difference as there is between the Farmers Home Administration and the Production Credit Associations. The Farmers Home Administration deals with situations which, strictly speaking, are not sound banking propositions, although the percentage of repayments has been remarkably high.

The Production Credit Associations, which deal with American farmers, are just as restricted as any bank. I would say in that respect we have perhaps an analogy with the Indian situation. The Senator from Michigan proposes to have the ECA handle it, rather than the Export-Import Bank, which perhaps could not make a loan.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is, out of its own funds?

Mr. AIKEN. Out of its own funds.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There may be some provision under which it would not be a production loan, and, therefore, it would have to be handled by ECA. I am not certain about it. However, I ask the Senator once again, if it is to be a loan and, as we are told, it is to be paid back, whether there can be any objection to a modification of section 4 along the line I have suggested? I do not see anything wrong with it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan will give consideration to the suggestion.

In general, ECA loans have been for periods of 33 to 35 years, at an interest rate of 2½ percent on unpaid principal, with a period of grace for beginning interest payments of from 2 to 4 years, and a period of grace for beginning principal payments of from 6 to 8 years.

There is no desire to strait-jacket the terms of the loan contemplated by this amendment in order to provide the "special and easy terms" which India has requested, and therefore there is no attempt to write the loan conditions into the bill or to depart from the discretionary authority provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the ECA Act.

The Senator from Michigan does feel, however, that each loan should be considered by the officials making it on the basis that they are dealing with trust funds of the taxpayers of America, and that they should constantly keep in mind that it is a loan, not a gift.

As a matter of probabilities we have a statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the NCA probably would advise a loan for 35 years at 2½ percent interest with the required semiannual payments of principal deferred for 6 or 8 years, but with no grace period for the

required semiannual payments of interest.

These probable terms fully meet the only conditions of aid which were requested by the Indian Government, and in the light of that government's asset position would be entirely within its capacity to service.

It is ironical that we, who sincerely wish to demonstrate our generosity to the people of India, should have to quibble as to whether the conditions or terms of our assistance would be offensive to the beneficiaries. But that is just what has been happening.

It is a cruel irony that this quibbling should take place when the Indian Government itself has given so little credit to this Nation for its generous intentions, and in fact has served the propaganda line of the Soviet Union by stressing an announcement that Russia has just agreed to sell 50,000 tons of wheat to India. That announcement to the Indian Parliament by Prime Minister Nehru was greeted by cheers.

What was never said was that in the first 4 months of this year the United States has sold and delivered to India 411,000 tons of grain, during which same period something like 42,000 tons, or about one-tenth as much, had been dispatched on similar terms by Communist China.

I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press dispatch from New Delhi, dated May 12, be printed at this point in my remarks, as it recites this extraordinary account of India's gratefulness to this country.

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

UNITED STATES AIDES IN INDIA SEE PRESTIGE LOSS—PRO-SOVIET FEELING INSPIRED BY RUSSIAN GRAIN SHIPMENT IS LAID IN PART TO NEHRU

NEW DELHI, INDIA, May 12.—United States officials are chagrined at the pro-Soviet feeling engendered here by the shipment of Russian wheat to this nation, announced on the same day that Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru accepted the terms for much larger United States aid.

Mr. Nehru himself contributed to a major Communist propaganda gain among India's hungry millions by the dramatic announcement in Parliament Thursday that "Russian ships with wheat have started for India." He referred to a relatively minor 50,000-ton purchase.

Only an hour later did he tell Parliament that he saw no political strings attached to the famine relief bills in the United States Congress to supply India with 2,000,000 tons of wheat.

The result was that the American move to help was obscured by the start of the Russian shipment. Obscured also was the fact that more than 100,000 tons are coming to India each month from the United States through regular trade channels.

One influential newspaper, the British-controlled Statesman, headlined the Russian move and gave secondary position to India's acceptance of United States terms.

The same attitude was reflected in other parts of the Indian press, and in the conversations of Indian officials, leaders, and plain citizens.

For weeks, Indians have been viewing with growing impatience reports from Washington on the ups and downs of the proposals for a grant or loan to India. It is a \$190,000,000 project.

An important segment of Indian opinion, wavering between east and west, swung farther toward the Soviet camp when Mr. Nehru announced that Russia already was starting the 50,000 tons without waiting for the conclusion of negotiations on the terms.

The Indian Government and United States Information Services have failed to get across to the Indian people that the United States has been doing for a long time on a large scale what the Soviet Union proposes to do on a small scale.

Shipping records show that the United States has sold and delivered 411,000 tons of grain to India in the first 4 months of this year. The only delivery from Communist countries in that period was 42,000 tons from Communist China.

But Indian journalists are increasingly caustic about the slow progress of the famine relief bills in Congress.

"The United States took only 24 hours to help Korea, but it already has taken 6 months to help save India's people," said one Indian journalist.

The Hindustan Times, which often reflects Government opinion said in an editorial:

"Americans are making a poor impression psychologically on our people by the way they are discussing the request for 2,000,000 tons of food grains."

Mr. FERGUSON. However that may be, Mr. President, we do have the question whether this current assistance program will meet India's requirements in a manner acceptable to that Nation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war materials to Communist China.

CONCURRENCE BY THE HOUSE IN SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 31

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am sure it is very good news to the Chair and to the Senator from Michigan that the House so speedily adopted the concurrent resolution which the Senate adopted earlier this afternoon. It will be evidence to the United Nations, particularly to our delegation, that Congress acted very speedily in accordance with the feelings of the American people.

This speedy action by Congress will be evidence to the other nations of how deeply the American people feel about this vital matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). If the Senate will permit the present occupant of the chair to state what he feels he may properly express, the Chair would like to commend the Senator from Michigan for his statement and to join him therein as far as he can properly do so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to congratulate both the Chair, the Senator from Florida, and the Senator from Michigan on this splendid accomplishment today in the Senate, and to rejoice with both of them that the House of Representatives has acted so promptly on the concurrent resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this quick action should also give heart to the American people and should show

them that the Congress can act speedily when speedy action is required.

Frequently, statements are made about the slowness of Congress to act, and on many occasions the newspaper headlines carry the word "filibuster," with the result that the American people receive the impression that Congress cannot act speedily. However, the concurrent resolution was submitted only yesterday; it lay over for 1 day, under the rule, and now has been adopted by the Senate and, after going to the House of Representatives, has been adopted by that body. If the concurrent resolution were a measure which required the signature of the President, it could very readily be signed by the President this evening and thus could become the law of the land. However, the concurrent resolution does not require Presidential signature. It is an expression of the will of Congress as to what should happen.

I hope the American people will recognize that when Congress should act speedily, it can do so, and does so.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have already stated why I believe the current assistance program, as my amendment would provide it, should meet India's requirements in a manner acceptable to India. The Indian Prime Minister, in fact, has acknowledged as much.

Somewhat later on the day that Nehru informed the Indian Parliament of Russia's great generosity, he made entirely clear that the terms and conditions of aid contemplated in this amendment are altogether agreeable. Here is what he said, in discussing the bills which are before the United States Senate and House of Representatives at the present time:

In our view [they] have no political or discriminatory conditions attached to them and there can be no objection on these grounds to our accepting either of these two. We prefer the terms of the House bill because they are simpler.

The terms of the House bill, let me add, are essentially those of this amendment.

The present bill provides that \$95,000,000 of the funds authorized by this measure shall be provided out of the appropriation heretofore made to the Economic Cooperation Administration. The committee report indicates that according to ECA officials, that much would be available as not needed for the current year's recovery program in Europe.

There is no record to advise us whether or not ECA has indicated that anything more than \$95,000,000 would not be needed for current year operations of ECA. The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that ECA will have enough funds to provide all or most of the sum required by this measure without interfering with the current year's recovery program in Europe.

I shall not go into the details of ECA's anticipated unobligated balances as of the end of the current fiscal year. It is conceded that the absolute minimum

will be in the neighborhood of \$120,000,000 and there is every reason to expect it will exceed that amount.

What we provide is that such unobligated balances as remain, in no event less than \$10,000,000 shall be made available for this loan program. There is no desire to cut off the amount of ECA funds which may go to Formosa or as military aid under that program. Any difference between what can be made available from ECA's balances and the total of \$190,000,000 authorized for this India wheat program would be made available through a public-debt transaction.

The third provision of this amendment is that the terms for the extended credit shall include provision for repayment by the transfer of strategic or critical materials to the United States. There is nothing mandatory about the extent to which these materials shall be transferred as repayment.

As indicated by the Senator from Vermont, we must do business with India and India must do business with us on a businesslike basis. The authority is permissive, so as not to handcuff the lending authorities; but in the language of the House Foreign Affairs Committee report on a similar proposal, this would not be "an invitation to the executive branch to ignore the responsibility to acquire these strategic materials wherever possible."

Mr. President, again I say that when these agencies are handling the taxpayers' dollars, which are trust funds, they should keep in mind that the United States should on every possible occasion acquire strategic materials and should exert every possible effort to obtain them. India, which is one of the nations at the present time associated with us in the United Nations in the war, should feel the same way about that matter.

Mr. President, the fact is that India produces a number of materials regarded by the United States as critical or strategic. Among these are beryl, castor-oil seed, chromite, cyanite, manganese, mica, monazite, opium, pepper, shellac, talc, zircon, coconut oil, rutile, and natural-rubber latex, all of which are on the Munitions Board group I stockpile list. She also produces jute, leather, and sesame oil, which are in short supply in this country, although they are not being stockpiled.

These are all items which the United States needs in its battle for survival and the support of its allies in the fight against communism.

By the way, Mr. President, India must always remember, and we must remember, that India is one of the nations which is joined with us in the United Nations in the same battle against communism. If India forgets that she is in the battle against communism, communism can take over India very quickly, and then Mr. Nehru and his Government certainly will cease to function.

India needs food; but as the House committee has said:

With due regard for India's policies on strategic and critical materials . . . in the long-term view strategic materials are as vital to national survival of the United States as food grains are to India.

That is true, Mr. President, because war can kill our people as well as starvation can kill the people of India.

It seems only right and proper that our Nation and the Indian Nation should exchange these items which are so necessary to each of us. Therefore, the amendment provides that the terms of the loan shall contain provision for a continuous flow of some of these strategic items to the United States. It is indeed a small price to pay for the loan and the value that such a loan will bring to the Indian people.

I hope the sponsors of the bill will accept this amendment. I believe it is acceptable to the Senator from New Jersey, and perhaps he can speak for the other sponsors, or at least perhaps he can say a few words in regard to the amendment and in favor of it.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mention has frequently been made of the 50,000 tons of wheat which Russia is selling to India.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder whether there have been stated for the Record the amounts India has already arranged to purchase from the United States during the present year, entirely aside from the arrangements to be made under the provisions of the pending bills.

As I have the figures, which I think are up to date, of the 55,000,000 bushels of wheat which India is entitled to buy at a low price—a lower price, let us say—under the world wheat agreement, we are to furnish 28,000,000 bushels. So about 750,000 tons of wheat will go to India from the United States under the International Wheat Agreement arrangement.

We also have sold to India this year about 125,000 tons of wheat entirely aside from the wheat-agreement arrangement. I assume that wheat was sold at a higher price.

Then last month India arranged to buy 300,000 tons of sorghum grain in the United States. Thus India has already arranged for a total of approximately 1,175,000 tons of grain to come from the United States. That is over half India's normal importations of grain of all kinds.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; but that does not seem to be mentioned in the international news releases. The failure to mention it is most unfortunate.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. So we have already arranged to provide India with more than 20 times the amount of grain which Russia agreed to sell India, which agreement received such widespread publicity.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, let me point out that the wheat we have already arranged to sell to India has been sold or is to be sold at a reduced rate.

Mr. AIKEN. The 750,000 tons of wheat which we are furnishing under the international wheat agreement is being furnished at the reduced rate. I do not know exactly what it is. It cannot be over \$1.80 a bushel. How much less than that it is this year, I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The difference between the world rate and the American rate at the time, is to their advantage, is it not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true; but it cannot be over \$1.80, as I understand; so we have already, in the first 3 months of this year, arranged to provide India with almost 1,200,000 tons of wheat and sorghum.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for an observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan upon the presentation he has made of his proposed amendment to the pending bill. As the one who introduced the bill, although I cannot speak for all the cosponsors, and though, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I cannot speak for the members of that committee, I should like to say that, from my experience during the past few weeks, and especially from my contacts with the Indian Embassy in Washington, together with the recent statement made by Mr. Nehru, of India, it seems to me we would be taking the proper action, if we were to adopt the proposal contained in the amendment, to make this an outright loan, rather than half grant and half loan, as originally proposed. Many arguments could be made in favor of a grant, with counterpart funds, and the regular procedure for a grant under the ECA program; but, in the light of the circumstances, and in view of the fact that the Indian Government itself appears to prefer the loan basis, I think we should concur in that view. Therefore, so far as the Senator from New Jersey is concerned, as the proposer of the bill, I hope that my colleagues who are cosponsoring the bill with me will agree with my view. It seems wise for us to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, which he has so ably presented.

I propose to speak further on this point, tomorrow, if necessary, before the bill is finally voted on; but tonight I merely make this statement of my approval of the amendment. I have been in conference for some days with the Senator from Michigan and other Senators interested in the amendment. We have come to an agreement as to the terms and as to the way the ECA will work in handling this important program. So again I thank the Senator from Michigan for his contribution and his great assistance in helping us with this proposed legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. President, while I have the floor I wish to address myself to another section of the pending measure. Section 10 of the bill would provide for an advance of \$20,000,000 from the RFC to reactivate reserve Liberty ships, for use in transporting the wheat to India, if the President finds that private shipping facilities are unavailable or inadequate. There are no published Senate hearings on this bill, but the committee report

shows the cost of reactivating 100 Liberty ships would be \$14,000,000, of which amount \$2,000,000 would be recaptured on one voyage through freight charges.

It seems to me we should not incur such a tremendous expense as that represented by the difference in the costs and the freight revenues that might be returned, unless it is absolutely essential. I have good reason to believe it would not be necessary to reactivate the reserve ships to carry this grain, and I therefore wonder why this section is necessary.

In hearings before the Appropriations Committee last month, the Secretary of Agriculture told how well shipments of grain were going to India through regular trade channels. The Senator from Michigan asked him particularly about the ability of private shippers to transport this grain. I should hope we would simply project that shipping program under this bill, and that, as his testimony would indicate, no shipping difficulties would be encountered.

I know that evidence was submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee regarding a critical shipping condition, which might affect this program adversely. I believe further examination will show that situation has been much relieved since the Foreign Relations Committee heard the testimony. A member of my staff has contacted the Director of the Transportation and Warehousing Branch of the Department of Agriculture, who would be responsible for moving this grain to India, and he has confirmed that fact. We were informed that the aid program could be superimposed upon the current shipping program without anticipating any great difficulty, and without reactivating the reserve ships. I have requested the Secretary of Agriculture to confirm this information by letter, though as yet I have not received such confirmation from him.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a telegram which I sent to Secretary Brannan on Saturday, May 12, to which I am, of course, expecting a reply momentarily.

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

MAY 12, 1951.

HON. CHARLES BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department
of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.:

Would you please confirm by letter Monday whether contemplated India wheat program can be carried out by trade shipping facilities now available and operating without resort to reactivating reserve cargo ships. My understanding that can be done follows your answers to my questions in appropriations hearings April 12 and from telephone conversation between Mr. Hudtloff and my assistant Thursday. Also would appreciate your comment on availability of wheat for India under contemplated program considering Friday report on domestic crop prospects. Would you not agree a proviso requiring your certification of availability above necessary domestic carryovers was highly desirable to protect against any critical deterioration in domestic reserves as a result of reduced crop prospects. Personal regards.

HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. For the purpose of making certain that the expense of reactivating ships will not be incurred unnecessarily, I wonder whether the Senator from Iowa, who is in charge of the bill, will not accept an amendment to section 10, reading as follows:

On page 6, line 2, strike out the word "finds" and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "after consultation with appropriate Government officials and representatives of private shipping, finds and proclaims."

Mr. GILLETTE. Being in charge of the bill on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, I think I am justified in accepting the amendment which the Senator from Michigan has just offered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As the proposer of the bill, I am glad to accept the amendment. We had in mind, of course, that there must be a finding that private shipping was not available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that a committee amendment is pending before the Senate, so the actual acceptance of this amendment will have to wait until after the pending amendment is disposed of.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Then I shall change my statement, and instead of saying that I accept it, I may say that I shall be glad to support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, is there an amendment now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment is now pending. That amendment is itself subject to amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, Mr. President, I should like to offer the amendment which I sent to the desk as an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is advised that the amendment sent forward by the Senator from Michigan is in order only as an amendment to a portion of the pending committee amendment. It may not be offered as an amendment at this time, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it may be offered as an amendment to the pending committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment sent forward by the Senator from Michigan is recognized as an amendment proposed to the pending committee amendment.

A CITIZEN RETURNS HIS PMA CHECK

Mr. FERGUSON. I have a matter here which I am sure the Senator from Vermont will appreciate, since he and the Senator from Michigan have been interested in certain activities of the Production and Marketing Administration in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I shall ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have just sent to the Secretary of the Treasury.

With this letter I have enclosed a properly endorsed check from Hilarian Bibicoff of Chelsea, Mich., which represents a payment to him by the United States Government for attending a county PMA meeting.

Mr. Bibicoff had written me to describe the meeting which he attended and to request that I deposit his check "anywhere with the Government, except the PMA and the USDA, a wasteful and unnecessary agency," because "I do not feel justified to accept taxpayers' money for nothing."

Mr. President, I want to compliment Mr. Bibicoff for the spirit he has displayed. The amount of the check is altogether immaterial. The point is, as I have written the Secretary of the Treasury, that Mr. Bibicoff's letter is another demonstration to me of the basic good sense and integrity of the people of our country. There must be thousands of people like Mr. Bibicoff who are thoroughly disgusted with the waste and extravagance in Government policies and operations.

It is indeed refreshing to see that the people themselves have better judgment and more concern about Government expenditures than do the bureaus and agencies which needlessly spend the people's money.

Of course, it can be seen why Mr. Bibicoff did not want his check to go back to the Production and Marketing Administration, because he believed it would be used to pay someone else in the same manner. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

MAY 15, 1951.

HON. JOHN SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Herewith I enclose a check for the sum of \$7.50 properly endorsed for deposit in the Treasury of the United States.

This check was sent to me by a citizen of Michigan with instructions to see that the money it represents be returned to the Government and deposited in any account except that of the Production and Marketing Administration.

This check is a payment by the Washtenaw County PMA Committee of the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture, to a Michigan farmer, Mr. Hilarian Bibicoff, for attending a PMA meeting in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Mr. Bibicoff does not want this money, and his letter to me shows how unnecessary the expenditure was. He writes:

"DEAR SENATOR: With this letter I am enclosing a Government check I received for attending a meeting of a County PMA in Ann Arbor, Washtenaw County, Michigan.

"At the time all I had to hear was a reading of a statement of Secretary Mr. Brannan (a copy was distributed among all community representatives present) and three identical requests for more corn and soy beans from three agents of the USDA. (A letter to this effect reached me a few days later.)

"I do not feel justified to accept taxpayers' money for nothing and wish you to deposit this check anywhere with the Government, except the PMA of the USDA, a wasteful and unnecessary agency.

"Sincerely yours,

"H. BIBICOFF."

Mr. Bibicoff's letter is another demonstration to me of the basic good sense and integrity of the people of our country. There must be thousands of people like Mr. Bibicoff who are thoroughly disgusted with the

waste and extravagance in Government policies and operations.

I recall very clearly a similar occurrence on something of a wholesale scale a year ago. A large PMA meeting was held in St. Paul, on April 3 and 4, 1950. Routine farm business was the excuse for calling part of the group together, but the main attraction was a speech on the Brannan plan by the Secretary of Agriculture. For this purpose the PMA went out of its way to guarantee a large attendance. Farmers who had no occasion to be there were persuaded to come and all were promised 2 days' subsistence at \$8 per day and 5 cents per mile travel pay.

There was some dispute about the number in attendance, but it seems that over 4,000 farmers were entitled to claim subsistence and travel pay for attending the meeting. At the time of our inquiry, I recall, 2,043 claims for reimbursement had been made and the total paid out for this single meeting was \$34,000.

In these days when the need for government economy is so impelling, and when inflation threatens the very future of our country, it is refreshing indeed to see that people themselves have better judgment and more concern about government expenditures than do the bureaus and agencies which needlessly spend other people's money.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Bibicoff, but I hope you will also send him some official acknowledgement that you have received the return of this money.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, 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 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 16, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received May 15 (legislative day of May 2), 1951:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy:

James W. Bohlander	Cecil B. Johnson
Gordon R. Bryan, Jr.	Robert J. Piette
Lloyd H. Carpenter	Charles H. Propster, Jr.
Donald E. Ellis	John A. Richardson
Donald I. Garnett	Rogers P. Ryerson
James F. George	Robert W. Wilson
Kenneth L. Holmes	

William F. Blaze (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

John F. Hassenplugh
John D. Tomlinson

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed:

Clovis M. Baker	Gary C. Leighty
Gerald Barton	Franklin "J" Lesh
Daniel W. Blaylock II	Allan G. Lewis
David T. Boyd	James R. Maxwell III
John M. Daniel, Jr.	Robert G. Rogers, Jr.
Albert D. Faither, Jr.	Charles H. Samuelson
Arthur C. Foll	Herbert W. Severns
Newton R. Fuller	Jack L. Short
Gary D. Ghostley	Robert T. Silkett
Karl R. Jacobson	Glenn A. Tomlinson
Richard C. F. Kerwath	Eugene A. Ulrich
Rufus M. King	Matthew H. Van Order
Willet B. Kiplinger	Andrew J. Walsh
John A. Kohler	Bruce C. Young
Bertil R. Koller	Robert E. Young
Richard J. Larsen	

Roger H. Burnet (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy.

George L. Otis, Jr. (Naval ROTC), to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed:

Charles J. Roth, Jr.
George P. Turci

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Harry E. Atkinson	Benjamin C. Pratt
James P. Coley	John P. Recher
James P. Connolly II	John B. Reynolds
William P. Foxworth	William R. Riddell
David D. Francis	Jr.
William H. Hildemann	Walter A. Robertson
John H. House	John J. Ross III
Joseph F. Inman, Jr.	Dan W. Schausten
Branch Jordan	Paul A. Shrader
William D. Lauerman	Paul L. Siegmund
Jr.	William J. South-
Fred D. MacLean, Jr.	erland, Jr.
Richard C. Marsh	Charles C. M. Wood-
Clarence E. May, Jr.	ward
Rowland M. Murphy	Thomas V. A. Worn-
Martin I. Penner	ham

Leo M. Schneider, Jr. (Naval ROTC), to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, in lieu of ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed.

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

LIEUTENANT

Harry "D" McGee

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Francis L. Bergquist
Ralph E. Munson

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Sylvia J. Lanneau Gilda G. Whitfield
Dorothy I. Moore Gloria M. Whitfield

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Shirley M. Bailey
Kathryn M. Drozda
Frances R. Kissinger

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Robert H. Pepper
Gerald C. Thomas

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

John Halla Randolph McC. Pate
Edwin A. Pollock Clayton C. Jerome

Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general in the Marine Corps while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 15, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite and eternal God, who hast entrusted us with a high vocation, grant that in these strange and perilous days we may discharge our duties and

responsibilities faithfully and with a pure and steadfast devotion.

We are humbly conscious of our own frailty and inadequacy but we know that in Thy divine wisdom and mercy Thou art able and willing to use us even to the limit of our meager capacities and abilities.

May we daily be numbered among all who are seeking to establish Thy kingdom of peace upon this earth. May the day be hastened when Thy promises shall be gloriously fulfilled.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

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 of the House of the following titles:

On May 14, 1951:

H. R. 632. An act for the relief of Janina Wojcicka, Wojciech Andrzej Wojcicki, and Stanislaw Wojcicki;

H. R. 664. An act for the relief of Mrs. Coral E. Alldritt;

H. R. 789. An act for the relief of John Yan Chi Gee;

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sadako Kawamura Lawton;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Taro Takara;

H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Liu;

H. R. 1264. An act for the relief of Jacquelyn Shelton; and

H. R. 2357. An act for the relief of Lucia Adamos.

On May 15, 1951:

H. R. 714. An act for the relief of James A. G. Martindale;

H. R. 859. An act for admission to the United States of Mrs. Margot Kazerski;

H. R. 1121. An act for the relief of Chin Yok Kong;

H. R. 1438. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin; and

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of Sook Kat.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to make the publication, Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, a House document and to provide for additional printing of this publication; and

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution to make the publication, 100 Things You Should Know About Communism Series, etc., a House document and to provide for additional printing of this publication.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

THE LATE OSCAR DE PRIEST

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, today we note the passing of former Congressman Oscar De Priest who died at Provident Hospital in Chicago last Saturday. Those who were his colleagues in the Seventy-first, Seventy-second, and Seventy-third Congresses will remember his advent into this Hall back in 1929. He stood on the floor with other Members-elect and took the oath while former Congressman Nicholas Longworth was Speaker. He came to this body, "Horatio Alger-like," the son of former slave parents, blazing landmarks on his upward climb from a little lad in Florence, Ala., where he was born in 1871. He attended public school in Salina, Kans., where his parents migrated to the wheat fields of that area. The small town was no permanent place for him. He left Salina for Dayton and Defiance, Ohio, spent a short while in Toledo, then later found his place in business and politics in Chicago, Ill. He started business as a house painter, later became a painter-contractor. Developing traits of leadership he became associated with the late Congressman Martin B. Madden, whom he succeeded as the Representative from the First District of Illinois. His figure was noticeable on the floor—tall, white-haired, and distinguished. He seldom made formal speeches in the House but he was recognized and respected for his fearless leadership, courage, and his ever-present influence against racial segregation in any form. He had no urge for a multiplicity of bills in the hopper but was active in the work of his committee assignments, especially the Committee on Indian Affairs. His services in his State and city included a term as Cook County commissioner, and first of his race to be elected to the city council in Chicago.

Mr. De Priest was an outstanding leader of the colored race and was always in the forefront in any fight to improve conditions for his people and establish a dignified place for them in society.

In honoring his memory today I wish to include the following tribute to his life and character which was paid to Mr. De Priest by his former secretary, Mr. Morris Lewis:

Gnarled, and worn, still tall, less straight, he stood, a great oak in the forest. His were the years of service to mankind, and his God, just as he saw it. Unswerving, unbending, he had hewn to the line, let the chips fall where they may. Consistently he shouted aloud—this is my land, my native land, of whom then shall I be afraid. I am the son of my father, of earth and of heaven, a creature of God Almighty, made in His image, and I am not afraid. He feared no man, or set of men; he was resolute, immovable, like the Rock of Ages. His record is one of achievement, of works well done, a beacon light for leaders of all generations to follow. Out of the multiplicity of his travels, the paths he trod, the councils he joined, from the beginning as the little son of former slave parents in Alabama, to a seat in the Congress of the United States is a fine example for Negro posterity. Verily, in his community, in this Nation, among his people, the name of Oscar De Priest is a household word.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in this tribute to a former Member of the House. It was my privilege to serve in the Congress with Oscar De Priest. I also was associated with him in several of our national campaigns.

He was a man of great ability and devoted to the service of his adopted city of Chicago. Born a slave, he was able through study, sacrifices, and a ceaseless ambition to rise to a position of trust and esteem. He was a devoted worker for the colored race and he hoped through his efforts to improve their position in the world. He was a Republican by tradition and gave generously of his time to advance the cause of his party. As a Congressman he won distinction and respect. Through his fine service he made it possible for others to follow. My sincere sympathy is extended to the wife and family of our former colleague.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I learned with most profound sorrow of the death of a former colleague from the State of Illinois. I speak of Oscar De Priest, of Chicago, Ill., who served in the Seventy-first, Seventy-second, and Seventy-third Congresses. I had the good fortune to have served with him during the Seventy-third Congress.

To millions of people Oscar De Priest will be remembered as having been the first colored person from Illinois to serve in the Congress of the United States. I shall remember him as one of pleasing personality, of exceptional ability, as one who was helpful to me as a new Member of Congress when I first came here in 1933. He was indeed a true friend and loved and respected by everyone who knew him.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, it was my very great privilege to have known Oscar De Priest, to have known him very well.

When I campaigned for a seat in this body in 1946 he was my confidant, my counselor, and my friend.

He had a great capacity for friendship, and his friends of all creeds and races were legion.

Born of slave parents, his span of life encompassed that period of American history that witnessed tremendous forward strides by his race, an objective that was dear to his heart. He was a true representative of his race and a conscientious representative of all of the people. He was representative of the fact that under our American way of life a man from humble beginnings could reach great heights.

His life and his works have left the world a better place in which to live.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, Oscar De Priest was well known in Kansas, and stood high in the esteem of all who knew him.

His life demonstrates that this is truly the "Land of Opportunity," and no-

where else could a man with his humble beginnings rise to such heights.

In his passing, a great American has left us, leaving with us a great influence for good.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Honorable Oscar De Priest.

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

There was no objection.

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS ELECTED CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 228) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 228), as follows:

Resolved, That JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Foreign Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

GOVERNOR WARREN: ABLE EXECUTIVE WITH GREAT HUMAN APPEAL

Mr. JOHNSON. 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. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest in last night's Washington Star that many delegates at the Republican conference in Tulsa, Okla., were looking with favor upon the prospect of having Earl Warren as the Republican candidate for President in 1952.

I wish to emphatically state to Republicans in particular and to all voters who want a change in 1952 that Mr. Warren is the man who can bring that about, and how.

After Governor Warren had served 2 terms—8 years—this is how the voters of his State treated him in 1950: In his campaign for Governor he carried every county in the State; he defeated his opponent, James Roosevelt, by 1,173,808, and in the County of Los Angeles he won by over 434,000 votes. This is more than Taft's majority—431,184—in Ohio in 1950.

Governor Warren's vote was a vote of confidence, based upon 8 years of performance; on his integrity and high ethical concept of the public service; on his refusal to play cheap politics in the making of appointments. It was a vote

of confidence in his ability to understand and to develop programs for the solution of the problems of today in his State and also on the national level.

Everyone admits that we must have a change in national administration, after 20 years of rule by one party. Earl Warren is the man who can assure that result. He would revive the confidence of the American people in their National Government. He would bring courage, ethics, integrity, efficiency, and the human touch back into the National Government.

His record is his best salesman. I hope that every American voter will study and learn it.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative business and any other special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL ORDER CANCELED AND SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for this afternoon which I desire to cancel, as I do not have my material ready.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next after all other business and on Monday next for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CEREMONY IN HONOR OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Con. Res. 100) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee, composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members. It shall be the duty of the committee to prepare plans for and to hold an appropriate ceremony in honor of Constantino Brumidi, the artist who spent many years decorating the Capitol Building of the United States and died as the result of a fall while working on the rotunda frieze, his last assignment in the Capitol. Such ceremony shall be held in the Rotunda of the Capitol on July 26, 1951, the one hundred and forty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi, or on such other day as the committee herein provided for may designate. The committee shall extend invitations to attend the ceremony to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Member of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Ambassador of Italy, and such other public officials and persons in private life as the committee may select.

PROTECTING GIRL SCOUTS IN USE OF EMBLEMS AND BADGES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3442) to protect the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in the use of emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases hereafter adopted and to clarify existing law relating thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1950, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and to use, in carrying out its purposes, all emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases now or heretofore used by the old corporation in carrying out its program and hereafter used by the corporation, including the sole and exclusive right to use, or to authorize the use of, during the existence of the corporation, the badge of the Girl Scouts, Inc., which is referred to in the act of August 12, 1937 (Public, No. 259, 75th Cong.; 50 Stat. 623), and all the other aforesaid emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases in connection with the manufacturing, advertising, and selling of equipment and merchandise, it being distinctly and definitely understood, however, that nothing in this act shall interfere or conflict with established or vested rights."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "corporation", insert "and by its successor."

And on lines 2 and 3 delete the words "and hereafter used by the corporation."

Page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike out "merchandise, it being distinctly and definitely understood, however, that" and insert in lieu thereof "merchandise: *Provided, however, That.*"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To protect the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in the use of emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases heretofore adopted and to clarify existing law relating thereto."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

MORRIS TUTNAUER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3527) for the relief of Morris Tutnauer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., 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, to Morris Tutnauer, of New York City, N. Y., the sum of \$23,365.50, in full settlement of

all claims against the United States by said Morris Tutnauer on account of the injuries sustained by him when an automobile being operated by him was struck by a War Department automobile on July 22, 1943, in Queens County, New York City, N. Y., said War Department automobile being operated by a private of the United States Army: *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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$28,365.50" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD W. BRITTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 658) for the relief of Harold W. Britton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harold W. Britton, of Pawtucket, R. I., the sum of \$2,712.80. Payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Harold W. Britton against the United States on account of his unwarranted suspension on December 7, 1945, from duty as a civilian employee of the War Department at Camp Miles Standish, Mass.: *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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$2,712.80" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL MATELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1443) for the relief of Paul Matelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul Matelli, Chicago, Ill., the sum of \$900. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul Matelli against the United States for refund of part of the amount of \$1,000 which he posted as cash bail bond in the case of The United States

of America against Edward Caselli, and which was forfeited by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois on December 6, 1932. Such court, on October 29, 1935, ordered the refund of \$900 of such amount to the said Paul Matelli (\$100 being deducted as court costs) but such refund could not be made because such amount had been covered into the Treasury: *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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EVELYN CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2913) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Campbell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MRS. ALBERT W. LACK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3229) for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 765-770), the Bureau of Employees' Compensation is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of Mrs. Albert W. Lack, widow of Albert W. Lack, for compensation under such act, within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, on account of personal injuries alleged to have been sustained by Albert W. Lack on October 29, 1942, while in the performance of his duty as a member of the Coast Guard Temporary Reserve in the Ingalls Ship Yard, Pascagoula, Miss.; and the Bureau, after such consideration of such claim, shall determine and make findings of fact thereon and make an award for payment of compensation to Mrs. Albert W. Lack, as widow of Albert W. Lack, provided for in such act of September 7, 1916, as amended: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "the", insert "Department of Labor."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUNDRY FORMER STUDENTS OF AIR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. E. 3562) for the relief of sundry former students of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., 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, to C. Raymond Pohl, Jr., 505A Magnolia Avenue, Frederick, Md., \$83.95; Dan K. Rawlings, 205 Laurel Avenue, Corbin, Ky., \$13.10; Harold L. Reed, 201 West Lindell Street, West Frankfort, Ill., \$12.20; Marcus A. Sessi, 417 West Pennview Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., \$8; Robert D. Simmons, 835½ Broadway, New Orleans, La., \$23.85; Harry P. Smith, Jr., 2225 Chesapeake Avenue, Hampton, Va., \$60.66; Paul E. Smith, 2109 Eoff Street, Wheeling, W. Va., \$6.10; Raymond C. Sowko, Greenland Apartments, State College, Pa., \$444.40; Clyde C. Spears, 347 Linden Walk, Lexington, Ky., \$236.60; Donald E. Spears, 123 West Central Avenue, Belle, W. Va., \$212.70; Homer R. Steele, Route 1, Fairview, W. Va., \$142; John D. Stiles, Wadestown, W. Va., \$110.20; George F. Stock, Jr., Hollandale, Miss., \$236.95; David A. Stockton, 105 East Seventh Street, box 256, Ritzville, Wash., \$179.65; Frank A. Sullivan, 7949 Susquehanna Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., \$396.80; William K. Sutton, 981 Fincastle Road, Lexington, Ky., \$141.25; Floyd Ramsey Tarr, 3729 Marlomont Drive, Weirton, W. Va., \$170.05; Hagop H. Terzagian, 217 Myrtle Avenue, Jersey City, N. J., \$338.85; Jack Alfred Thalmer, 4518 West Grace Street, Richmond, Va., \$228.80; Eugene R. Thomas, 9 South York Street, Wheeling, W. Va., \$223.20; Forest G. Thompson, 2201 Frederica Street, Owensboro, Ky., \$157.80; Joseph C. Thompson, box 700, O. M. S., Travis AFB, Fairview, Calif., \$423.25; Thomas W. Tigertt, box 93, Wilmer, Tex., \$583.90; Richard J. Torchia, 630 Dow Avenue, Carnegie, Pa., \$229.80; Lee C. Truman, Jr., 2422 Allen Street, Owensboro, Ky., \$252.40; Charles B. Upshaw, 394 West Wesley Road NW., Atlanta, Ga., \$191; George J. Walters, Jr., 438 South Dallas Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., \$435.55; Gilbert Watz, 834 Snyder Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., \$366.45; Arthur J. Weinstein, 501 Mannheim Street (22-A), Philadelphia, Pa., \$200.10; Robert J. Weiss, 111 West Cherryhill Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., \$239.25; James Bernard Weiborn, 442 Cherry Street, Russellville, Ky., \$107.55; Earl M. Williams, box 204, Evans, Ky., \$297.50; Edwin J. Williams, Jr., 1832 Chuckatuck Avenue, Petersburg, Va., \$505.60; Charles F. Wilson, Jr., Route 1, Walkersville, W. Va., \$404.16; and Harold W. Wilson, 205½ Fourth Street, Parkersburg, W. Va., \$324.20. The payment of said sums shall be in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property as a result of a fire that occurred on June 28, 1948, in the building in which they were quartered at Langley Air Force Base, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claims, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of 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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOLPHUS M. HOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3651) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on September 28, 1942, when the car which he was driving was struck by a United States Army vehicle on the highway near Alamo-gordo, N. Mex.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claim, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from any payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELINA MARSIGLIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3653) for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Angelina Marsiglia, New York City, N. Y., the sum of \$10,000 in addition to \$1,288.50 for medical and funeral expenses. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Angelina Marsiglia against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Michael R. Marsiglia, who was fatally injured on December 2, 1944, when he was struck by a United States Army motor vehicle while said motor vehicle was proceeding on and over the public highway at the corner of West Houston and Varick Streets, Manhattan, New York City, N. Y.: *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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN K. JACKSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3706) for the relief of John K. Jackson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., 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, to John K. Jackson, of Astoria, Oreg., the sum of \$4,412.30, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages for personal injuries suffered on December 22, 1937, at Astoria, Oreg., when shot by

Garwyn S. Diehl, radioman, first class, United States Navy: *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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIRCEA GROSSU AND HIS FAMILY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 77) for the relief of Mircea Grossu and his family.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mircea Grossu, his wife Lucia, and their son, Mircea John, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officers to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

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.

JOSEPH GIRARDI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 119) for the relief of Joseph Girardi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Joseph Girardi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in 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 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.

ROBERT JOHANNA SORENSEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 165) for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Robert Johanna Sorensen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in 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 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.

LARS DANIEL SORENSEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 166) for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Lars Daniel Sorensen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in 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 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.

MRS. ROBERT M. STERNBERG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 822) for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg (Hanae Sano), Japanese wife of Robert M. Sternberg, an American citizen.

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.

GERTRUD LOMNITZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 824) for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Gertrud Lomnitz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in 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 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.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 9.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in

which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

[REDACTED] Abe Shizu.
 [REDACTED] Abramo, Filippo.
 [REDACTED] Ahmed, Ismail.
 [REDACTED] Ahmed, Yusef or Yusef Ahmed and Kasim Said.
 [REDACTED] Aitken, Marcella Vitalini.
 [REDACTED] Albanese, Frank.
 [REDACTED] Albert, Mary (nee Teuber).
 [REDACTED] Albert, Anton.
 [REDACTED] Albu, George Vasile or Josif Toth.
 [REDACTED] Alfonso, Joaquina Maria Mrs. or Joaquina Maria Alfonso, formerly Fidalgo (nee Pinto); J. Maria Alfonso; Joaquina Goncalves Barroso; Joaquina Maria Pinto; Joaquina Maria Alfonso; Maria Joaquina Pinto; Joaquina Maria Pinto Barraso dias Fidalgo; Maria Alfonso; Maria Alfonso.
 [REDACTED] Allie, Ahmed Ben (alias Ahmed Allie alias Samuel Ben Allie).
 [REDACTED] Alt, Fred Willy.
 [REDACTED] Andrew, Peter James or Pete James Andrew or Panagiotis Demetriou Andritsakos.
 [REDACTED] Andriolas, Leonidas Nick or Leonidas Andreolas.
 [REDACTED] Anastakis, Paraskevi or Paraskevi Kornelios Anastakis or Paraskeri Anastaki.
 [REDACTED] Antonelos, Alexandros Demetriou or Anthony Antonelos.
 [REDACTED] Antypas, William George.
 [REDACTED] Apergis, Konstantinos Nicolaou or Gus Pappas.
 [REDACTED] Arsenis, Peter Gabriel.
 [REDACTED] Atkinson, George.
 [REDACTED] Baddo, Benedicto Balals or Victor Baddu.
 [REDACTED] Baldini, Malania Ada (nee Tozzi).
 [REDACTED] Babaris, Pavlos, or Paul Felix.
 [REDACTED] Barberis, Vasilios or Bill Barberis or Varvaris.
 [REDACTED] Bargellini, Louis.
 [REDACTED] Bauc, Basilio.
 [REDACTED] Baxter, Bessie Margaret Rosalind or Bessie Rosalind Margaret Baxter or Bessie Margaret Rosalind Durn (nee Dow).
 [REDACTED] Belazis, Niki Thomas or Mrs. Niki Angelopoulos Belzais (nee Niki Polyrios Angelopoulos) or Niki Belazis.
 [REDACTED] Benedix, Ernst Gustav.
 [REDACTED] Benton, Madeleine Patricia formerly Parker (nee Quick).
 [REDACTED] Berck, Lionel Neil.
 [REDACTED] Bertuccelli, Amleto.
 [REDACTED] Biale, Giovanni Battista or John Battista Biale or Gio Batta Biale.
 [REDACTED] Bianco, Mary Florence Byrne alias Mabel Blanco.
 [REDACTED] Bluet, Roger Gabriel Marie Maurice or Roger Gabriel Bluet.
 [REDACTED] Bolnavita, Zaharia.
 [REDACTED] Bonechi, Dante.
 [REDACTED] Bonime, Selma or Selma Plauschugges (nee Selma Fehl).
 [REDACTED] Bonner, John Herbert.
 [REDACTED] Bosetti, Enrico Ambrogio.
 [REDACTED] Bostos, Demetrios Nicholas or James Nicholas Bastos or Demetrios Nicholas.
 [REDACTED] Braun, Elly (nee Schlesinger).
 [REDACTED] Buono, Domenico Lo or Joe Costa.
 [REDACTED] Bursich, Louis.
 [REDACTED] Butkus, Antanos.
 [REDACTED] Caetano, Joao, Jr.
 [REDACTED] Campbell, Anna Mary or Anastasia Carey.
 [REDACTED] Carbafo, Salvador Pena.
 [REDACTED] Carfagna, Frank Joseph.
 [REDACTED] Carney, Valeria Boyle (nee Boyle).
 [REDACTED] Carpino, Agostino Eugenio Angelo or Carmelo Angelo Carpino or Angelo Carpino.
 [REDACTED] Caruso, Michael Vittorio.
 [REDACTED] Chamberlain, Mary Elizabeth.

[REDACTED] Chan, Woon Lum or William Chan.
 [REDACTED] Chan, Kwan Ying Taam or Mrs. William Chan.
 [REDACTED] Chan, Shirley Shui-Ling.
 [REDACTED] Chang, Meng Ling.
 [REDACTED] Chang, Shurman You Hsi or You-Hsi Chang.
 [REDACTED] Chang, Shurman Shao Mel.
 [REDACTED] Chao, Fang Yu or David Chao.
 [REDACTED] Chao, Manual Perez.
 [REDACTED] Chayes, Chaimine or Norman Chayes.
 [REDACTED] Chejfec, Yvel or Joel Chafetz.
 [REDACTED] Chen, Julia I. H. (Chinese name—I-Hsuan) or Julia H. Chen.
 [REDACTED] Chi, En Tao or Andrew Robert Chi.
 [REDACTED] Chin, Quong Lun.
 [REDACTED] Chira, Betty (nee Dweck).
 [REDACTED] Chounard, Janice Veronica or Janice Veronica Dunn.
 [REDACTED] Christensen, Charles William.
 [REDACTED] Christiades, Athanasios Georgiou.
 [REDACTED] Cintala, Andrej or Andy Cintala.
 [REDACTED] Coelho, Joaquim.
 [REDACTED] Coggins, John William.
 [REDACTED] Coleman, Garland Michael.
 [REDACTED] Conlon, Matthew.
 [REDACTED] Contogiannis, Constantinos Demetrios.
 [REDACTED] Cornelius, Margaret (nee Nicholson), formerly Steacy.
 [REDACTED] Dan, Eng Suey or Suey Eng or Edward Eng.
 [REDACTED] Dantas, Alberto.
 [REDACTED] De Lisa, Vella.
 [REDACTED] Demouchikos, John Nicholas or John Nick Dimos or Ioannia Demouchikos or John Nick Demouchikos or Ioannia Nicolaos Demouchikos.
 [REDACTED] De Barros, Antonio Rodrigues or Antonio Rodrigues.
 [REDACTED] De Mandelbaum, Carmen Rickards or Carmen R. Mandelbaum; Carmen Rickards Mandelbaum.
 [REDACTED] De Martini, Rosa Victoria.
 [REDACTED] De Martino, Pasquale.
 [REDACTED] De Mergel, Maria Lunar (nee Lunar).
 [REDACTED] De Olmedo, Guadalupe Sevilla or Inez Garcia.
 [REDACTED] De Piro, Filippo or Lillippo De Piro.
 [REDACTED] De Winne, Vitale or Vital De Winne also known as August De Winne.
 [REDACTED] Diamantakis, Maria (nee Maria Papageorgiou).
 [REDACTED] Di Costanzo, Lucy (nee Trani) or Lucy Trany.
 [REDACTED] Dock, Lee or Dock Lee.
 [REDACTED] Donohue, Alexandra (nee Trze-trzewinski) or Alexandra Trzet.
 [REDACTED] Dorenfeld, Lo'a (nee Lola Elaimbaum).
 [REDACTED] Dos Santos, Agostinho Goncalves or Augustino Santos.
 [REDACTED] Dracius, Raphael Anatole.
 [REDACTED] Durantini, Caterina Alice.
 [REDACTED] Economou, Vasilios Alexandrou or Basil Alexander Economou.
 [REDACTED] Edquid, Uldarico M. or Uldarico Maatubang Edquid.
 [REDACTED] Edquid, Ludivino M. or Ludivino Maatubang Edquid.
 [REDACTED] Edquid, Ida Ruth M. or Ida Ruth Maatubang Edquid.
 [REDACTED] Elide, Inger Else.
 [REDACTED] Elefther, Sofia.
 [REDACTED] Eng, Bee.
 [REDACTED] Etimos, Martha (nee Koudjarl or Kotzaria).
 [REDACTED] Etimos, Mary.
 [REDACTED] Evenson, Olav Arthur or Arthur Boyd.
 [REDACTED] Fabio, Carmelo or Charles or Charlie Fabio.
 [REDACTED] Fabrizio, Anna Maria (nee Cap-pelletta).

[REDACTED] Fait, Josef Ferdinand or Josef F. Fait or Josef Fait.
 [REDACTED] Fait, Eliska or Eliska Freiberg.
 [REDACTED] Farhat, Mansour.
 [REDACTED] Fatovic, Ante.
 [REDACTED] Fernandez, John or John Fernandez Marino.
 [REDACTED] Ferenz, John.
 [REDACTED] Fernandez, Pilar (nee Rodriguez).
 [REDACTED] Ferri, Domingo Pinar.
 [REDACTED] Fikaris, Constantinos or Costas or Gust Fikaris.
 [REDACTED] Filipovic, Frank or Franjo.
 [REDACTED] Finando, Yetta (nee Feiga Yenta Kalich) or Feiga Yetta Tuch.
 [REDACTED] Fischl, Anna (nee Weissberger).
 [REDACTED] Fong, Woo Lan or Woo Lang Fong (Shue).
 [REDACTED] Fontana, Adelino or Leo Fontana.
 [REDACTED] Fook, Wong or Fook Wong.
 [REDACTED] Fragakis, Gerasimos George or Jerry Fragakis.
 [REDACTED] Fragkias, Jerry or Gerassimos Grakias.
 [REDACTED] Franczoz, Emery or Emeric or Imre Franczoz or Moishe or Mirko or Imre Franczoz.
 [REDACTED] Franczoz, Ireni (nee Menczer) or Irene Franczoz or Franczoz.
 [REDACTED] Fuller, Stanley William.
 [REDACTED] Funk, Clementina Fidela (nee Clementina Fidela Cuyugan).
 [REDACTED] Galatolo, Armando.
 [REDACTED] Galos, William Ernest or Emanuel Galos or William Emanuel Galos or William Ernest Mastrosoff or Kobelachenko.
 [REDACTED] Geller, Louis or Liepe Celler.
 [REDACTED] German, Philip Zaker.
 [REDACTED] Gevorkian, Vazgen or Gevorgian (alias Vazgen Nazer-Begian).
 [REDACTED] Glinos, John.
 [REDACTED] Goldstein, Fred or Fritz Goldstein or Fritz Goldstone.
 [REDACTED] Gomes, Anthony Lopes or Anthony Santos Gomes or Antonio Gomes or Anthony Santos and Antonio Santos.
 [REDACTED] Goo, Oy Lin Lam or Lam Oy Lin or Oy Ling Lum.
 [REDACTED] Grabner, Katherine Siha or Katherine Siha.
 [REDACTED] Graiman, Helen or Helene Slobotzki.
 [REDACTED] Gralak, Ludwig or Ludwik Gralak.
 [REDACTED] Gray, John William.
 [REDACTED] Greer, Thomas Anthony.
 [REDACTED] Grimes, Francis or Francois Scherer.
 [REDACTED] Grivich, Ivan or John Grivich.
 [REDACTED] Grumburg, Romuald Peter or Roman Peter Ellers.
 [REDACTED] Hafenbraedl, Otto or Charles Hafenbraedl.
 [REDACTED] Halberstam, Janka (nee Janka Ungar).
 [REDACTED] Hamiga, Franciszek.
 [REDACTED] Hanacik, Anna (nee Barvir).
 [REDACTED] Harlow, Constantine or Constantine Harlow.
 [REDACTED] Hart, Ida Miriam (nee Schwartz).
 [REDACTED] Haynie, Ann Feng or Anna Budich.
 [REDACTED] Heathorn, George Alfred or George Alfred Heath.
 [REDACTED] Helm, Betty Stucken.
 [REDACTED] Heropoulos, Gallopie (nee Mavromatis).
 [REDACTED] Hewitt, Barbara.
 [REDACTED] Hill, Aarne Allan or Aarne Allan Jaakkola.
 [REDACTED] Hiltunen, Anna.
 [REDACTED] Hing, Leung, Wai or Leung Shee.
 [REDACTED] Chow, Chan Fung or F. C. Chan or Chan Chow Ming.
 [REDACTED] Holmsten, Sylvia Suleima (nee Harna).

[REDACTED] Holst, Prehen Wilhelm.
 [REDACTED] Hondas, John.
 [REDACTED] Hong, Sheng Hwa or Hung or Wesley Sheng.
 [REDACTED] Hong, Florence Fung Yee Wong (nee Fung Yee Wong).
 [REDACTED] Horngacher, Hedwig Magdalena or Sister Mary Blanka Horngacher.
 [REDACTED] Howlett, John Joseph.
 [REDACTED] Huff, Bertha Isabella or Bertha Isabella Hanna.
 [REDACTED] Huneke, Nikolaus.
 [REDACTED] Hurlt, Frank Anthony or Franz Anton Hurlt, Frank Anton Hurlt or Frank Anthony Xavier Hurlt, Frank Hurlt.
 [REDACTED] Hyuck, Choy Lung or Choy Long Hyuck or Hugh L. Choy.
 [REDACTED] Iwanaga, Toshio.
 [REDACTED] Jakobowicz, Rosalia or Rozalia Jakobowitz or Rosalia Buxbaum or Rozalia Menczer.
 [REDACTED] Janner, Maria Hubertina.
 [REDACTED] Janssenes, Michael.
 [REDACTED] Jelsovsky, Karl or Carl Heinz or Carl Heinz Jelsovsky or Heinz Henninger or Carl Heinz Henninger.
 [REDACTED] Jepeway, Marie or Marie Salim De Miguel.
 [REDACTED] Jianakas, Epaminonoas Zenodiox or Peter Jianakas.
 [REDACTED] Johannsen, Emil Peter.
 [REDACTED] Johnson, Lempi Alexandra Koskinen.
 [REDACTED] Johnson, Martha Irene or Martha Irene Miskala.
 [REDACTED] Junus, Jeff.
 [REDACTED] Juul, Poul Tage.
 [REDACTED] Kadlec, Edward Laurence.
 [REDACTED] Kaliszczuk, Onofry or Fred Kalilin or Otto Fred Kalilin.
 [REDACTED] Kamp, Gisela Mertins or Gisela Kamp Mertins.
 [REDACTED] Kane, Sara or Sale Kane.
 [REDACTED] Kaps, Frank alias Frank Capps (alias Kapsch alias Capsch).
 [REDACTED] Kaptzan, Ariadna.
 [REDACTED] Karas, Dora or Dnora Karasik.
 [REDACTED] Karavolos, Stavros Nicola (alias Steve Nicolau Karavolos).
 [REDACTED] Karlens, Karl Bjorn.
 [REDACTED] Karnavouras, Michael.
 [REDACTED] Karnuts, John.
 [REDACTED] Karnuts, Elizabeth (nee Kiss).
 [REDACTED] Katikas, Christos Nicolau.
 [REDACTED] Katona, Laszlo (or Louis).
 [REDACTED] Katsimpiris, Nikolaos Michael or Nick Fadis.
 [REDACTED] Katz, Dorothy or Dwojra Katz or Kora Katz (nee Dorothy Mandelbaum).
 [REDACTED] Katzias, Concepcion (nee Linares).
 [REDACTED] Kee, Yip Hon or Hon Yip or Hon Kee Yip.
 [REDACTED] Kegyes, John or Janos Kegyes.
 [REDACTED] Kekenak, Steve.
 [REDACTED] Khodabandeh, Mostafa.
 [REDACTED] Kim, Lucia or Ryang Kim.
 [REDACTED] King, Patricia Biel (nee Patricia Biel).
 [REDACTED] Kircan, Rasit.
 [REDACTED] Klimm, Basilius.
 [REDACTED] Koltz, Harry.
 [REDACTED] Komar, Julianna.
 [REDACTED] Koplowitz, Bertha formerly Miller formerly Wachman (nee Grabovsky).
 [REDACTED] Kopassakis, Emmanuel Xenophon or Emmanuel Xenophon Copassakis or Kopassis, or Kopasakis.
 [REDACTED] Koprowski, Boleslaw Karol or Boleslaw Koprowski.
 [REDACTED] Korman, John.
 [REDACTED] Kornis, Louis or Louis E. Kornis.
 [REDACTED] Koulianos, Theofilos or Theofilos Coulianos or Teddy Koulos.
 [REDACTED] Kozas, Semon or James Alexander Gozano.
 [REDACTED] Kremke, Harry Herman.
 [REDACTED] Kremmydas, Panagiotis or Panagiotis Krommydas or Panagiotis Grommydas

or Panagiote Crommidas or Peter Dallas or Pete Dallas.
 [REDACTED] Kuchta, John.
 [REDACTED] Kuhle, Arnold John or John J. Purvishk.
 [REDACTED] Krause, Elizabeth Pauline or Elizabeth Pauline Kuhle or Elizabeth Paula Purvishk.
 [REDACTED] Kukkanen, Lydia.
 [REDACTED] Kushigemachi, Suyekichi.
 [REDACTED] Kuypers, Corstinus.
 [REDACTED] Kuypers, Jannetje Maria (nee De Groot).
 [REDACTED] Kwan, Hai Lu or Harry Lu Kwan.
 [REDACTED] Kwan, Shu Ying Hou or Susan Kwan or Susan Y. Kwan.
 [REDACTED] Kyriakides, Costas or Costas Papazoglou or Gus Pappas.
 [REDACTED] Labaro, Raffaele.
 [REDACTED] Labos, De Devenyi Raymond or Raymond Labos or Raymond Von Labos.
 [REDACTED] Labrinidis, Ioannis Michael or John Lambros or John Michael Lambros or Michael Lambros or Ioannis Michael Lampiridis or Ioannis Lampiridis.
 [REDACTED] Lacono, Federico.
 [REDACTED] Lanahas, Nickalos.
 [REDACTED] Lande, Sevine (nee Serine Skele).
 [REDACTED] Lang, Gudrun Margarete.
 [REDACTED] Langa, Michel or Michel Langas or Mike Langa.
 [REDACTED] Langemyr, Knut or Knute Langmuir.
 [REDACTED] Lannou, Jean Herve Marie or John Lannou.
 [REDACTED] Lauridsen, Halvor Norup.
 [REDACTED] Laux, Rosine Katherina (nee Seitz).
 [REDACTED] Laynas, John George.
 [REDACTED] Lee, Bessie Pi-Yun or Bessie Pi Yun Wang (maiden name).
 [REDACTED] Lee, Bor or Lee Bor Cheung.
 [REDACTED] Leon, Emanuel Constantin or Emanuel Constantinou Leontopoulos.
 [REDACTED] Lewinski, John Stanislaw.
 [REDACTED] Lewis, Guilhermina Mendonca Toledo.
 [REDACTED] Llone, Edward John or Edoardo Giovanni Llone.
 [REDACTED] Liptak, Andrew.
 [REDACTED] Lo, Shih Ting or Steven Lo.
 [REDACTED] Loftus, Larry Arthur.
 [REDACTED] Long, Danny Boyd or Danny Boyd or Danny Boyd Vaubell.
 [REDACTED] Longolius, Conrad Rudolf.
 [REDACTED] Lordt, Antoine Leon.
 [REDACTED] Losada, Manuel Fraga.
 [REDACTED] Lourbacos, Petros or Pete or Peter Lourbacos.
 [REDACTED] Lourenco, Jose Maria.
 [REDACTED] Malliaroudakis, Constantinos Pericles or Kostas Pericles Malliaroudakis or Gust Malliaroudakis.
 [REDACTED] Mallon, Sarah Jane (nee Devlin).
 [REDACTED] Manalis, Constantinos or Gus Manalis.
 [REDACTED] Maniatis, Constantinos or Gus Manos.
 [REDACTED] Mantzaris, George or Georgios Mantzaris.
 [REDACTED] Manzino, Torino Hugo.
 [REDACTED] Mariotti, Anelio.
 [REDACTED] Mark, August George or August Mark.
 [REDACTED] Markarian, Markar.
 [REDACTED] Martin, Andrew or Andras Marton.
 [REDACTED] Martinez, Antonio Gonzalez.
 [REDACTED] Marttinen, Lea Mirjam.
 [REDACTED] Marttinen, Risto Kullervo.
 [REDACTED] Marttinen, Hannu Matti.
 [REDACTED] Marttinen, Pekke.
 [REDACTED] Mascarinas, Arturo or Arturo Ando.

[REDACTED] Mascarinas, Antonio or Antonio Ando.
 [REDACTED] Matsuba, Shige.
 [REDACTED] Mattera, John or Giovanni Mattera.
 [REDACTED] Matura, Marijan.
 [REDACTED] Mazzone, Giuseppe Pala.
 [REDACTED] Mekjian, Dikranol or Dikranol Semizoglu.
 [REDACTED] Metaxas, Gerasimos Agourias or Jerry Mataxes.
 [REDACTED] Micko, Stefan.
 [REDACTED] Milcetic, Peter or Peter or Pete Miller.
 [REDACTED] Millis, John.
 [REDACTED] Miller, Aino Johanna or Aino Johanna Matsel (nee Kolemalm).
 [REDACTED] Miller, Eugenie Gabrielle Fuy-nel (nee Eugenie Gabrielle Guynel).
 [REDACTED] Miller, Charlotte Jennifer.
 [REDACTED] Milrod, Izrael.
 [REDACTED] Milrod, Lydia Ruth.
 [REDACTED] Moi, Jung Yin or Teddy Mol.
 [REDACTED] Moi, Goon Shee or Wai Ying.
 [REDACTED] Monzo, Jessie Leaetta (nee Alexandra).
 [REDACTED] Morales, Matilde or Matilde Torre.
 [REDACTED] Morrow, Maria or Maria Morariu.
 [REDACTED] Moschos, Nick John or Nicolaos John Moschos.
 [REDACTED] Moy, Shee Tong.
 [REDACTED] Muller, Eugenia.
 [REDACTED] Musial, Hans Erich Kurt or Hans Peschkow or Erick Musial.
 [REDACTED] Muslu, Mihail Johan or Mike Johns or John Michael or Mihail Joan Musi.
 [REDACTED] McCutcheon, Grace (nee Grace Steinmetz).
 [REDACTED] Napoleoni, Maria Palma.
 [REDACTED] Neider, Edward Julius or Edort Julius Neider.
 [REDACTED] Nicolescu, Traian or Dan or Daniel Nicholas or Dan Nicolescu or Floria Bergian.
 [REDACTED] Nicosia, Gaetano or David C. Marsano.
 [REDACTED] Noxon, Anne Woodbridge.
 [REDACTED] Nunes, Serafino Da Rocha.
 [REDACTED] Oaks, Eugene Vernon.
 [REDACTED] O'Connor, Earle Robin.
 [REDACTED] Odenbach, Rolf Dieter.
 [REDACTED] Olmer, Joseph or Joseph Morris Olmer.
 [REDACTED] On, Law (How) Duck or Wilbur Hall.
 [REDACTED] Haw (How), So Woon Ying or Susie Hall (nee So Woon Ying).
 [REDACTED] Ortolo, Math of Matthew or Matthew John Ortolo.
 [REDACTED] Orzea, Candit or Orzia or John Orzea.
 [REDACTED] Oseguera, Karl or Karl Vizvari.
 [REDACTED] Otamendi, Maria or Sister Marta.
 [REDACTED] Ozaki, Yoshio (nee Toshiyo Miyano).
 [REDACTED] Ozdizdar, Hamdi Hasan.
 [REDACTED] Paasuke, August Richard.
 [REDACTED] Pagano, Anello.
 [REDACTED] Page, Albert Joseph.
 [REDACTED] Pagoulatos, Jerasimos or Jerry Pagoulatos.
 [REDACTED] Penagakos, Dimitra or Dimitra Nicholas Selimou (maiden name).
 [REDACTED] Panagopoulos, Eugene.
 [REDACTED] Pangos, Eugenio.
 [REDACTED] Pantazis, John Nicholas or John Pantazis.
 [REDACTED] Papadakis, Nicolaos.
 [REDACTED] Papademas, Charalambos (alias Bob).
 [REDACTED] Papadopoulos, Stefanos.
 [REDACTED] Papoutsis, George.
 [REDACTED] Paris, May Estelle.
 [REDACTED] Pastor, Charles Emil (alias Karaly Emell Pastor).
 [REDACTED] Patterson, John.

Pejko, Joseph or Jozef or Joe Baker.
 Pelechata, Anna.
 Perdew, Blanche Sophie Ghil-siane or Blanche Sophie Ghil-siane De Vriendt.
 Perez, Andres or Andrew Perez.
 Pessl, Eric.
 Peters, Benjamin or Peter Ben-jamin and Samuel Anderson.
 Petrator, Peter or Petros Petratos.
 Petratos, Peter Panagiotis.
 Petrowsky, Emil Edouard Bern-hard or Emil Werner.
 Phasoulakes, Eustratios Michel or George Fasalakakis or George Michael Fasalakakis or Fassalakakis.
 Pihala, Kaiho Marjatta (nee Valo).
 Pihala, Kauko Einar or Kauko Einar Riittanen.
 Ping, Poon Shut (Mrs. George Fung).
 Plagmann, Max or Michael or Michale Lewis.
 Pochert, Emil Herman.
 Polsell, Federico or Frederick Polsell.
 Posantzis, Vasilios Homer.
 Poullos, Theodore.
 Prester, Julio.
 Prochaska, Nora Zweybruck or Nora Editha Ernestine Prochaska.
 Quinagon, Fely or Fely Guzman Quinagon formerly Felipa Reyes.
 Quinagon, Quinagon, Maurice or Maurice Guzman Quinagon formerly Mauricio Guzman Reyes or Mauricio Amador Reyes.
 Quinn, James Hannick.
 Racenstein, Harry or Harry Ratzenstein.
 Raftopoulos, Deoneseos Socrates or Dennis Raftis.
 Ramiene, Chana (nee Epstein) or Chana Ramm.
 Ramos, Carlos Gumsindo.
 Rasmussen, Erik Aage.
 Rasofsky, Ladislav or Larry Rush.
 Raypert, Stanislaw (nee Ko-walski).
 Reeves, Clara Brandon (nee Morrison) or Clara Lewis Erandon Reeves.
 Reid, Irma Maria or Serena Irma Maria Reid.
 Reitz, Margarete Kunst or Mar-garet Schmidt.
 Rekow, Christine Kay.
 Riley, Harry Edward (alias Harry Edward Bull).
 Rinaldi, Antonio.
 Rivera-Medrano, Augusto.
 Robles, Gregorio Laciste.
 Roig, Juan Jose Balta Seller.
 Rose, Ramiro.
 Rosovich, Emil Zebo or Eusebio Rosovich.
 Rossbacher, Ingeborg Gerda.
 Roussos, John.
 Ruckdeschel, August Franz.
 Ruppert, Peter Karl or Peter Karl Ruppert Jones.
 Ruppert, Kurt or Kurt Ruppert Jones.
 Russo, Francesco or Frank Russo.
 Rytkenon, Waino Heikki.
 Sabalja, Joseph or Josip.
 Sagner, Karin Monica Eliese.
 Sakaguchi, Namie or Namie Saruwatari.
 Sakamoto, Shonosuke or Frank Sakamoto.
 Sakamoto, Koito.
 Sandberg, Gustaf Adolf.
 Sandnes, Rolf George.
 Sang, Ho or Sang Ho or Ho Tin Sik.
 Sanles, Ricardo Santos or Dia-montino Almeida Campos.

Santini, Enrico Enio.
 Sardis, Eleftherios Nicholas.
 Schaefer, Reinhardt.
 Schaefer, William Erich or Willi Erich Schaefer or Willie E. Schaefer or Eriche Max Willy Schaefer.
 Schonfeld, Isidor.
 Schultz, Helena (nee Pawlak).
 Schwalle, Barbara.
 Schwulera, Ida (nee Kommorowski).
 Scibetta, Josephine or Giuseppe or Gluseppina Scibetta or Schibetta (nee Perrone or Perrone or Hrrone).
 Seemann, Rudolf.
 Seitzer, Catherine (nee Appinel) formerly Brett.
 Shadrina, Agreppina Terentiev-na.
 Shee, Der Lee.
 Sheung, Chan Lai or Evelyn Jiu.
 Silinonte, Giuseppe or Joseph or Giuseppe or Joseph Silinunte or Silinunte or Silimonte or Selimonte or Selimunte or Selimonte or Selinunte or De Gioriomo or Muffolette or Muolette or Moulletta or Nuffolette or Monte.
 Simhon, Enrique, or Entique Simhon Cohen.
 Skellas, Stefanos.
 Sklavounos, Aggelos or Angelo Sklavos.
 Smith, Stephen Klar.
 Souza, Mary Alice Kim or Mary Alice Souza Kim or Mary Alice Kim.
 Spathari, Antonio.
 Nitas, Antonios Speridon or Evangelos Stelatos.
 Spicjarich, John.
 Spithogiannis, Lambros Kon-stantine or Louis Spittas.
 Steinfeld, Paul.
 (Steinfeld, Ruzena (nee Herzog), alias Roise or Rosalie Herzog).
 Stephan, Irene Jerome or Irene Nicolaou Stefanitis (maiden name).
 Stenger, Michael.
 Stulman, Max, or Norbert Max Stulmann.
 Sundstrum, Karl Hjalmar.
 Svevar, Axel Lennart Waldemar or Axel Svevar.
 Switzeny, Peter Klaus.
 Switzeny, Leonora.
 Syvertsen, Bernt Johan or Bert Johan Syvertsen.
 Szczepski, Walenty or Valen-tine Szczepski.
 Sze, Manuel, or Sze Chiu Wah or Sze Chiu Hua.
 Takahashi, Iku.
 Tang, Kwok Cho or Danny Tang.
 Tang, Marguerite Zing-Tsung or Mrs. Zubin Percy Tang.
 Tang, Zubin Percy.
 Tang, Mina.
 Tanikawa, Masahi or Tadashi Tanikawa.
 Teachman, Brame Jay or Teack-man or Ben Teachman.
 Terecido, Ramon Deus or Ra-mon Deus.
 Terpich, Romano Dominic or Romano Terpich.
 Throbjornsen, Arne Thorlef.
 Toralbilla, Leopoldo Vasquez.
 Toralbilla, Gloria (nee Cortes).
 Torcello Rodolfo.
 Traque, Apriano Marques.
 Treash, Purificacion Nabong.
 Tsang, Betty Ling or Shu Hsieng Tsang (nee Ling) or Elizabeth Simp-son Ling.
 Tsang, Sten Moo or Seymour.
 Tsien, Virginia or Cho Ing or Virginia C. Tsien.
 Tsikouris, Helen or Helen Ga-tis Tsikouris or Helen Kouskoutis.

Tsikouris, Ioannis or John Tsi-kouris or Giovanni Kachias or John Nico-laou Kachias or John Chekouris.
 Tyler, Bertha Drewett or Bertha Tyler.
 Vaccaro, Alida Margaretha (nee Martens) formerly Gravesteyn.
 Vago, Isabella Natalia.
 Valentis, Jacovoa or Jacobos Va-lentis or Jacovos J. Valentis.
 Vanenburg, Jules Armand.
 Varian, Maria Franco.
 Varian, Morris Franco.
 Varian, Terestha Franco.
 Varian, Helen Franco.
 Vecere, Maria Maddalena or Placentra or Peltuso (nee Sevilla).
 Ver, Paz Silva.
 Veta, Benedetto.
 Vigorita, Gaetano or Thomas Vigorita.
 Visnjak, George Philip or George Visnjak.
 Wagner, Gisele Marie Therese or Gisele Wagner.
 Warnack, Fritz Johann.
 Wegelius, Lennart.
 Weintraub, Stanislaus.
 Weiss, John or John or Janos Weiss.
 Weller, John.
 Wellner, Christine Doris.
 Weskis, Johannes.
 Wiest, Harold Henri.
 Wilkinson, Maurice Finbar.
 Williamson, James Oliver or John James Peters.
 Wincup, Charles Christopher.
 Wing, Ching or Hing Ching or Jimmie Hing.
 Woods, Synnove or Synnove Pedersen or Synnove Pedersen Woods.
 Wujcik, Paul or Wujick.
 Wujcik, Frances or Wujick (nee Slawak).
 Yaco (Jaco) Ymrich or Em-rich or Imrich or Yatsko, Emrich.
 Yamicic, Josef or Joseph Yam-ich.
 Yau, Lam Chai or Walter Lum or Lum Chai You (alias Walter Lam or Lam San Ping).
 Yokoya, Yoshi or Sei Cho or Shiqu Ono or Yoshi Mori or Toshi Toyo-shima.
 Young, Choy Shie or Choy Sie Young or Choy Yong.
 Yeun, Wong or Wong Yun.
 Yungler, Anna Steibel or Anna Kirch (maiden name).
 Zainudin, Yousuf or Esouf Jainodin or Eusoof Jainoo.
 Zamparo, Frank or Francesco Zamparo.
 Zanicos, Kyriakos.
 Zolas, Astghik formerly Boy-adlian (nee Hatabian).
 Zolas, Edward.
 Zolas, Astghik Fimi.
 Zorilla, Jesus Aparicio or Jesus Zorilla or Zorrilla.
 Mora y Gonzales, Isidoro Felipe de.

With the following committee amend-ments:

On page 3, line 13, strike the registration number and name:
 "Benedix, Ernest Gustav."
 On page 9, line 6, strike the registration number and name:
 "Galatolo, Armando."
 On page 11, lines 8 and 9, strike the regis-tration number and name:
 "Hornbacher, Hedwig Magda-lena or Sister Mary Blanka Hornbacher."
 On page 23, line 2, strike the registration number and name:
 "Sang, Ho or Sang Ho or Ho Tin Sik."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution 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.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 10.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

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

Abalo, Celestino or George Abalo or Celestine Aballe.

Ackerman, Zeida (nee Schneider).

Agaccio, Edmondo Giuseppe or Edmondo Joseph Agaccio or Joe Agaccio or Edmondo Ogaccio.

Akiyama, Sur iyuki or Stanley Akiyama.

Allen, Arthur Albert (alias Albert, Allen).

Almaz, Paul Salin.

Alves, Jose Lino.

Anagnostidis, Constantin Emanuel or Gustav or Constantin Emannel or Constantin Emanuel Efstratadis or Lorenz Melarand or Milerand.

Angelaras, Dimetrios.

Angeles, Lopez, Augustine George (Jorge) or Augustine Angeles Comacho or Augustine George Angeles.

Angelopoulos, John or John Angel.

Arakaki, Taro or Isamu Okamura.

Baches, Loukas or Lucas Bachas.

Backhaus, Elizabeth or Elizabeth Hartman or Elizabeth Vogel or Elizabeth Klein.

Backhaus, Joseph or Joseph Klein.

Badamo, Giuseppe or Joseph.

Ballis, Constantin Stavros.

Ballis, Helen Constantine (nee Andrews or Andriou).

Ballis, Kimon or Cimon Constantin.

Barbieri, Giorgio Angelo.

Barbosa-Ramos, Rosendo (alias Roberto Rodriguez).

Barone, Antonio or Tony Barone.

Barone, Antonio or Tony Barone.

Nathalie, Velmo or Bascome (nee Joell).

Bastoni, Albertina Fosca (nee Mariotti).

Beck, Redvers Howard, or Redvers Howard Simpson.

Beck, Margaret Elizabeth (nee Gazzard), formerly Simpson.

Bekrakis, John.

Belvedere, Vittorio.

Berry, Robert Duncan.

Bertoglio, Giacomo (alias Pete Bertoglio).

Bestani, Mohamed Adib Amine.

Bladt, Michael, or Mikal Bledt.

Blais, Marie Madelaine (nee Gagne).

Bodfish, George aka Juergen Kantor.

Bonati, Richard Joseph.

Bonello, Anthony.

Boot, Anton.

Bottino, Mariano.

Boules, Antonios Michael.

Bove, Fulvia Teresa (or Theresa) (nee Capuana) or Sylvia Capulano.

Bravo, Thomas Amorin.

Bregant, Francis Charles, or Franz or Frank Bregant.

Brown, Jack.

Brussee, Wietske Van Der Goot.

Buchinnick, Harri, or Harry Kitz.

Guono, Giuseppe, or Joseph Buono or Jose Buono.

Butterfield, Jean Donald.

Cacerez, Saturnino Rodriguez.

Calcanides, Sofia (nee Christoforides).

Calcanides, Despina.

Careklas, Orestes George, or Oreste Careclas.

Carinos, Emanuel, or Emmanuel or Emanuel Karinos.

Caropreso, Virginio, or Virginio Rocco Antonio Caropreso.

Carrieri, Raffaele (alias Ralph Carrieri).

Caruana, Carlo.

Castagna, Pietro.

Cavallaro, Ilario.

Chang, Cheng Shu Wang.

Charbides, Evdochia (nee Mimopoulos).

Charron, William Joseph.

Chen, Man Chu.

Chen, Shou Heng Chue.

Chen, Fung-Cheung, or Francis

Feng-Hsiang Chen.

Chen, Raymond Fung-Chu or Fung Chu-Chen.

Chengges, Louis or Elias Dimitrius Chenggas or Cheggis or Tsengges.

Chengges, Christina or Christina Louis Chengges or Cheggis or Tsengges.

Chiang, Hual-Chang.

Chiang, Zoh-Ing (nee Shen).

Chin, James Chee or Wing Chin (Chan).

Chinchefas, Michael Constantino.

Chryssikos, Paul Nicholas or Paul Nicolas Chryssicos.

Chuan, Raymond Lu-Po.

Clarizio, Saverio or Sam.

Clasoff, Ella Dimitroff or Ilija Dimeff Klasoff or Dimovich or Lewie Dimitroff.

Cohen, Frances (alias Frances Kneeter).

Colombos, John or Ioannis Colombos.

Constantinides, Eugenia Savvas or Eugenia Savva (nee Eugenia Evangelou Pagonis).

Costas, Elpiniki or Elpiniki Petros Giannopoulos.

Crowder, Gertrude Agnes or Jerabek.

Czerniawska, Anna.

Daniel, Suzanne Olga or Suzanne Olga Mornaghini.

Daras, Gerasimos Anastassias or Gerasimos Daras or Jerry or Geris or Gerry Daras or Darros.

Darinskas, Bernardas or Ben Darin.

D'Arpino, Arcangelo.

Da Silva, Agostinho Ferreira or Manuel Maria.

Da Silva, Alfred Alves.

Daughenbaugh, Edith Cecilia Lopez or Eddit Lopez.

Davis, Aglaia Constantin Stafilas or Aglaia Constantin Stafilas.

Dawson, William Rudeman or William Rudman Dawson.

Dawson, Constance Beatrice.

Debney, Audrey Rennle.

De Carvalho, Manuel Cordelro.

De Covello, Vincent Scotto or Scotto, Vincent.

Deftereos, Nicholas John or Nicholas J. Deftereos or Nicholas Deftereos or Nicholas Thefteros or Nick Defterton.

Del Greco, Dino or Danny.

Dell'Aquila, Pasquale.

De Mammos, Maria, formerly Maria Eichvald (nee Maria Amers).

De Seaton, Celia Torres or Celia Torres Villanueva or Celia Villanueva de Seaton or Celia Villanueva de Espinoza.

De Wit, Louis Charles.

Diamandopoulos, Eustache.

Di Carlo, Francesco or Frank Di Carlo.

Di Filippi, Antonino.

Di Meo, Gennaro.

Dimoff, Pete or Pando Eftimovich.

Dittiger, John Caspar or John Dittiger.

Dobrocky, Michael.

D'Oliveira, Manuel.

Dorizas Katina Michalopoulos (nee Katina Michalopoulos).

Doukis, Ourania S. (nee Ouranis Sahinis or Ourania Doukis or Ourania Doukis).

Drivas, George J. or Georgios Drivas or George John Drivas.

Du Theodora Sumner Hsu.

Dugdale, Ernest or Thomas Dugdale.

Dunat, Kuzman or Cosman Dunat.

Duvekot, Taetske (nee Van Der Helde aka Thea Duvekot).

Edwards, Alfred James.

Elfant, Zelman.

Esposito, Crescenzo or Christie or Prunk.

Ewing, Ernest Aleck or Ernest Aleck Kleeman.

Ewing, Monika Margot or Monika Margot Kleeman.

Fafalos, Spiros or Spiros Leonida Fafalos.

Farga, Soledad Maria Comparro formerly known as Soledad Maria Comparro or Soledad Camporro Alonso.

Fernandez, Manuel Ben or Manuel Ben.

Ferrell, Alvan Sigfrid or Alvar Sigfrid Carlson.

Ferrugia, Charles.

Finkelstein, Benjamin or Benjamin Finkelsztejn.

Fisch, Esther or Esther Persiner.

Follet, Claude Jean Rene.

Follet, Guy.

Frank, Ernest or Ernst Stopsack.

Fricioni, Giuseppina (nee Balle-rini).

Frost, Joseph or "Joe" Frost or Meroski or Marawske or Muryczka.

Fucco, Pasquale.

Fuchs, Alexander.

Fuchs, Serena (nee Serena Zoldan).

Fut, Lim Yun.

Garcia, Geronimo or Geronimo Garcia Nieves.

Garcia, Jesus Dopazo or Jesus Dopazo or De Paso.

Garcia, Jose Lago or Jose Garcia Lago or Lago Jose Garcia.

Gatsios, Panagiotis.

Gatsios, Olga.

Gavitt, Ethel May (nee Leane).

Georgopoulos, Konstantin Gerasimos or Jerry Gregory.

Giancarli, Sarah E. or Serafina Emilia Giancarli (nee Mattioli).

Giardina, Serafina Cascio.

Ginters Emma Emilia (nee Stulpe).

Gioulis, Constantinos Michael.

Glass, Rachel Anna nee Neumark or Rae Glass.

Glenos, Athanasios Demetrios or Tom Glenos.

Goldberg, Sophie or Sophie Goldenberg.

Gonzalez-Garcia, Demetrio.

Gorlero, Gilbert or Gilberto Corlero or Gilbert Golero.

- Goudas, Spiros Charilaos.
 Gray, James McEwan.
 Gray, Wesley.
 Grayson, Yvonne Carole.
 Green, Eva.
 Grededler, Masha (nee Golad alias Molly Grand).
 Grededler, Solomon or Solomon Grand or Sol Grand.
 Grigoriou, Vasillos or Bill Grigouriou or Vasillos Grigauriu.
 Grimley, George.
 Grubelich, Jacob.
 Guariglia, Nicola.
 Gunther, Carl Heinrich or Carl Heinrich Guenther or Carl Henry Guenther.
 Hannah Cornelia Sophie or Cornelia Sophie Van Dilleem or Cornelia Sophie Tierle.
 Hansen, Johannes Vikkelso or John VI.
 Hanuszek, Rosa Lina (nee Heymann).
 Haripar, Kurt Claus formerly Bahner.
 Havlick, Edward.
 Heckert, France Aimee, maiden name Meister.
 Hee, Mrs. Wong Wah or Ng Yee or Ng Woon Tai or Suey Yee Wong or Woon Tai Ng or Suey Yee or Woon Tai.
 Hellevik, Konstanse Petrine or Konstance or Constance Petrine Hellevik.
 Hendry, Violet Maryon Oma.
 Hignett, Thomas Henry.
 Him, Quon Ming or Quon Seetoo.
 Hing, Lee Wai or Harry Lee.
 Ho, Guy Chang-Ching.
 Ho, Wan or Ho Wan.
 Hoi, Lo or Hoi or Lo Park Chen.
 Hummel, Wenzel.
 Hutt, Florence.
 Hyla, Wladyslaw or William Hyla.
 Iengo, Antonio.
 Imre, Strasser or Imre Strasser.
 Strasser, Irene (nee Menczer).
 Ing, Dick or Charlie Woo.
 Inkster, Norah (nee Park).
 Inouye, Shokichi or Henry Inouyn.
 Ioannou, Petros or Peter Joanou.
 Ishakawa, Kichihel or Ishikawa Kichihel or Junjiro Koshimizu.
 Isnard, Marcel Eugene Theodore.
 Iversen, Jhalmar Lindberg.
 Jeffrey, Moses or Mohamed Jaferji.
 Jensen, Ole.
 Johansen, Halfdan Jarl or Halfdan Karl Johansen.
 Johansson, Werner Leopold.
 Johnsen, Kristian Henry Vincents.
 Jongejans, Gerrit, Junior (alias George Johnson).
 Junke, Gerhard Kurt Hugo or Gerhardt Juemke.
 Kainz, Karl Joseph.
 Kainz, Helen Marie.
 Kajiwara, Kaori.
 Kapor, Vincent Dominiek or Vincent Kapor.
 Karan, Nikola P. or Nicolas Peter Karan formerly Nikola P. Karanikitch.
 Karavitis, Nicholas George.
 Karibon, Lilly (nee Schott).
 Karpenkiel, Theodore Karl or Theodore Karpenkiel.
 Karpenkiel, Gertrude (nee Labahn).
 Kastrissios, Emmanouel D. or Emmanouel Demetrios Kastrissios.
 Kataoka, Yoshizo.
 Katomeritis, Nicholas Stephanis.
 Kavoras, Eleanora (nee Skouras).
 Kawczynski, Antoni or Anthony Kawczynski.
 Kechriotis, Stamatios.
 Keller, Nicolai or Nicolae Keller.
 Keller, Maria.
 Kennedy, Noel Percy.
 Keong, Louie Wah or Lay Hua Chiang or Willis Louie.
 Khan, Peer.
 Kimm, Richard Chi Yon or Chi Yon Kimm or Richard Chiyon Kimm.
 Kiparissus, Evangelos Georgos or Angelo George Kipper.
 Klausen, Karl Johan or Carl Johan Clausen.
 Kleppe, Lars Johnson.
 Klingler, Magdalena (nee Ganz).
 Kloucek, Henrik, Peter.
 Knotick, Annie or Annie Lillian Fuser.
 Kobylinski, Aleksander (alias Arthur Collier).
 Kosparek, Mary Frances (nee Chmelar) or Mary Frances Harrison.
 Kostandinos, Risto or Hristo Vasil Naumovich Sandros (alias Thomas Christ Stoikoff).
 Kousoulinos, Timoleo Pantell (alias Timoleon Koussoulinos, alias Tom Konsolas).
 Krazik, Alexander Ignatz or Alex Krazik or Ignatz Krazik.
 Kremedias, Ioannis Mihail or John Michael Medas or John Mitchell Medas.
 Kyllitis, Antonios or Anton Kyllitis.
 Lahti, Eino Esajas or Eino Lahti.
 Lambrinides, Pholikroni or Paul Lambros.
 Lanzoni, Rino Custone.
 Lardas, Kyriakos Nick or Antonios Patrinos.
 Larson, Gudbjorg (nee Gudbjorg Stefansdottir).
 Laughton, Walter or Walter Lauktien.
 Leng, Hsi-Hung.
 Leong, Yot Chung or George Loeng or Leong Ling or Leong Ling or Mon Tong.
 Leto, Giuseppe or Joseph.
 Leung, Alicia (nee Alicia Sevilla).
 Levedas, George Leonidas.
 Levi, Pamela Shirley Louise or Pam Levi.
 Lezis, Apostolos or Paul Lazos or Jim Raftopoulos.
 Liblich, Zofia (nee Laurowicz).
 Lie, Leif.
 Lier, Martinus Van.
 Ling, Young or Alvin Young Ling.
 Liu, Yoh Han or Yok John Liu or Y John Liu.
 Lokker, Aaltje Wilhelmina or Aaltje Wilhelmina Noback.
 Lopez, Alejandrina or Alejandrina Mendez y Perez.
 Lopez, Manuel or Mannel Lopez y Barredo.
 Louda, Svatava or Svatava Louda (nee Kysela).
 Louda, Frantisek or Frank Louda.
 Lucza, Emery Khiss or Emreic Lucza or Khiss or Emery Lucza.
 Macaleese, Angele Marie Aimee or Angele Marie Aimee Bertrand (maiden name) or Angele Marie Aimee Defosse (first marriage).
 MacGillcuddy, Joan Marie Therese or Joan Maggill or Joan Winfield.
 MacGillcuddy, Mellie Veronica (nee O'Connor).
 Macia, Rodasindo Beloso.
 Macone, Pasquale.
 Maggioro, Vincenzio or Vincent Maggioro.
 Makris, Evangelia or (nee Christopoulou).
 Mamais, Anthony or Antonios Nicolaou Mamais.
 Manis, George C. or George Constantinos Zagrimanis.
 Martinez, Francisco Gonzalez.
 Martinovich, Joseph or Joso Sime Martinovic.
 Martinsons, Anna or Stankious (nee Beckman).
 Massimino, Mario.
 Mastrogeorgakes, Demetrios or James Mastrogeorge.
 Mastrojohn, John or Ioannis Mastrogianis.
 Matsui, Yoshiaki.
 Matsui, Matsuko.
 Maynard, Irene Agatha (nee Ward).
 McDowell, Thomas.
 Mecker, Bernhard Frederich Wilhelm.
 Mestousis, Demetrios Nick or James Nick Metousis.
 Metelitz, Trudy Louise or Liza Meterilza or Elka Samseber.
 Miah, Chang or Abdul Miah or Suna Miah.
 Michalek, Peter Michael.
 Milicia, Pietro.
 Millas, Themis Demetrios or Themistogles Demetrios Millas.
 Moe, Ho Fuh or Moe Ho Fuh.
 Momjian, Harry or Haroutine Satrag Momjian.
 Montella, Giuseppe or Joseph Montella or Giuseppe Montella or Montello.
 Morgan, Ernest George.
 Moschouris, Loukas.
 Mouldevanou Konstantina I.
 Moy, Ou.
 Mulholland, Patrick Joseph.
 Najera, Manuel or Manuel Najera Cano.
 Naccache, Elias Gabriel.
 Nannetti, Roberto or Robert Nannetti.
 Nicolau, Stilian Iovanis or Steve John.
 Nordbeck, True Einar or John Einar Nordbeck.
 Normal, Horatio Macfadyen.
 Ntuli, Isaac William.
 Nunes, Xavier.
 Nymann, Elsa Irene Catharina Wang (nee Elsa Irene Catharina Wang).
 Nymann, Rolf.
 Nymann, Bjorn.
 Okubo, Sugao or Kudao Okubo (alias Sam Salki).
 Oling, Emil Isak.
 Olsen, Agnes Ovida (nee Agnes Ovida Abrahamson).
 Orenbain, Saul or Salo Morit Orenbain.
 Otero-Ventin, Jose or Jose Caruso.
 Ozata, Mehmet Selim.
 Pacheco, Arnaldo or Chico Pacheco.
 Pagliara, Gennaro or Jerry Pagliara.
 Pahy, Lota or Lotta Pary.
 Palan, Vlasta.
 Paloheimo, Riitta Marjatta (Liikola).
 Paloheimo, Eric Scott.
 Papadopoulos, Kostas.
 Papalazaros, Lazaros Demetrios or Lazaros Demetrios Papalazarou.
 Pasquale, Alano, De.
 Patterson, Richard.
 Patterson, Teodora Aguillon.
 Patterson, Sylvia.
 Paupin, Lisa (nee Lisa Kiec or Lisa Kundsinn).
 Pelizon, Celestine Kowalska or Celestine Genovefe Klein or Celestine Kowalska.
 Pereira, Eduardo Vicente.
 Peros, Frane Mile.
 Pescic, Paolo Svetislav or Paul Pescic.

xxxxxxx, Pesic, Milena Bojovic de (nee Milena Bojovic or Boyovic).
 xxxxxxx, Petekas, Peter or Panagiotis Petekas.
 xxxxxxx, Petrides, Stephan or Stephan Peters.
 xxxxxxx, Pettersen, George.
 xxxxxxx, Philippides, Novolaos Theodoros.
 xxxxxxx, Phillis, Antigone or Antigone Karavia.
 xxxxxxx, Piao, Liou King or King Piao Liou.
 xxxxxxx, Piarulli, Constantino alias Vincenzo Piccolomo now known as Frank Spano.
 xxxxxxx, Piccininno, Vito Antonio.
 xxxxxxx, Pizzo, Concetta formerly Esposto (nee Borrelli).
 xxxxxxx, Piscopos, Peter or Panagiotis Piscopos.
 xxxxxxx, Plaxton, William Michael.
 xxxxxxx, Podimatos, Dionissios or Denny Pappas.
 xxxxxxx, Ponevejsky, Gita Samullovna or Ponve.
 xxxxxxx, Ponevejsky, Irene Anatolievna.
 xxxxxxx, Ponevejsky, Tamara Anatolievna.
 xxxxxxx, Poon, Sew Kai or Poon Sew Kai.
 xxxxxxx, Portcheller, Max.
 xxxxxxx, Portcheller, Eva (nee Trendler).
 xxxxxxx, Portcheller, Eva.
 xxxxxxx, Portos, Peter or Panagiotis Antonios Portocalides.
 xxxxxxx, Pozner, Goldie or Goldie Himel.
 xxxxxxx, Pulido, Susana Peralta Sumalbag or Susan Peralta Sumalbag.
 xxxxxxx, Quintas, Trinidad (nee Trinidad Sosin Rey).
 xxxxxxx, Quistgaard, Helma Kirsten Dolores or (nee Muerlin).
 xxxxxxx, Rados, Demetrios George or James Rados.
 xxxxxxx, Ramirez, Ramon or Ramon Ramirez Tello or Primo Raymond Raniero.
 xxxxxxx, Rando, Giuseppe or Joseph Rando.
 xxxxxxx, Rasmussen, Victor Emanuel.
 xxxxxxx, Ratoliska, Dalibor Vaclav or Dalibor Ratoliska.
 xxxxxxx, Reppas, Spiros.
 xxxxxxx, Ricchetti, Giacomo Mario or Giacomo Carlo Domenico Ricchetti.
 xxxxxxx, Richmond, Stanislaw Stompka Jackowski.
 xxxxxxx, Rissone, Adelina or Adelina Kissone or Rissone or Adelina Gibellino or Adele Rissone.
 xxxxxxx, Rodrigues, Joao or Rodriguez or John Rodrigues.
 xxxxxxx, Rodriguez, Fredesbinda Altigracia Russo or Altigracia Russo.
 xxxxxxx, Rodriguez, Isidro or Isidro Rodriguez y Lopez.
 xxxxxxx, Rodriguez, Edita (nee Edita Dominguez-Fernandez).
 xxxxxxx, Rogale, Josef (Joseph).
 xxxxxxx, Rondon, Sidney.
 xxxxxxx, Roumellotis, Peter John or Panagiotis Roumellotis.
 xxxxxxx, Roussos, George or George M. Roussos.
 xxxxxxx, Rudani, Enrico or Henry Rudan.
 xxxxxxx, Ruona, Marie Maria.
 xxxxxxx, Salutsky, Arvum or Mordche Semigieliski or Max Semigieliski or Abraham Salutsky.
 xxxxxxx, Samonas, Nicolaos or Nicholas Semonies.
 xxxxxxx, Sander Bernat.
 xxxxxxx, Sankilampi, Johan Jhalmar or John Lampi.
 xxxxxxx, Santamaria, Ventura.
 xxxxxxx, Sauro, Gregorina (nee Procopio).
 xxxxxxx, Scheuer, Berish or Benjamin or Ben Scheuer.
 xxxxxxx, Schmidt, Helene (nee Pollack).
 xxxxxxx, Schneider, Michael or Michel Schneider.
 xxxxxxx, Scognamillo, Giovanni or John Scognamillo.

xxxxxxx, Scuderi, Giuseppe or Joseph Scuderi.
 xxxxxxx, Shalhoub, Violette Youssef (nee Fallaha).
 xxxxxxx, Sharman, Edna Gladys May or Edna Gladys May Lane or Edna Gladys May Watton.
 xxxxxxx, Shee, Ho or Law Ho Shee.
 xxxxxxx, Shee, Lum Woo (maiden name); Woo Hing Sheong.
 xxxxxxx, Shuitkas, Spiros Georgiou or Steve Adams or Styros Shuthas.
 xxxxxxx, Silra, Sulo Onni.
 xxxxxxx, Silinsky, Alexander Basil.
 xxxxxxx, Silva, Ralph or Rafael (alias Arturo Sanchez).
 xxxxxxx, Silva, Diamante or Diamante Nassy y Altez alias Mercedes Morina Hernandez.
 xxxxxxx, Sjolín, Erik Gunnar.
 xxxxxxx, Smilovici, Otto-Michel or Michael Smiley.
 xxxxxxx, Smith, Arnold Wilhelm Robert or Arnold Wilhelm Robert Ligmann.
 xxxxxxx, Smith, Hannah (nee Callaghan).
 xxxxxxx, Soderquist, Elof Rolf Aka.
 xxxxxxx, Sokolowski, William Dominick or William Falconer.
 xxxxxxx, Spacek, James Vaclav.
 xxxxxxx, Spathis, Panagiotis or Panagiotis Spathis.
 xxxxxxx, Spiegel, Sidonia (nee Hirsch).
 xxxxxxx, Spillipoulos, Evangelos.
 xxxxxxx, Stalder, Herman Peter.
 xxxxxxx, Stamatou, Lesvia Jean or Lesvia Jean Simanderis.
 xxxxxxx, Stanton, Charles or Constantine Studitis or Constantin Studiti.
 xxxxxxx, Stave, Mary Kristiane.
 xxxxxxx, Stave, Tonnes.
 xxxxxxx, Stevens, Ross William or Ross William Langford or Ross Boyd.
 xxxxxxx, Stolice, Isidoro or Isidoro Stoleca or Isidore Stolesia.
 xxxxxxx, Syropoulos, Maria Athanaslou.
 xxxxxxx, Tai, Lee Kin or Charlie Lee.
 xxxxxxx, Takeuchi, Yuwako or Yuwako Yukawa.
 xxxxxxx, Tamzarian, Kegham or Kay Tamzatian.
 xxxxxxx, Tarcon, Maria or Mary or Maria or Mary Nyakas.
 xxxxxxx, Tasso, Giuseppe Felice or Joseph Tasso.
 xxxxxxx, Tessman, Manuel or Manuel Quijada.
 xxxxxxx, Teus, Dolores Deanna or Dolores Deana Teus.
 xxxxxxx, Thorsen, Reidar Geyer.
 xxxxxxx, Tomaszewski, Frank.
 xxxxxxx, Tripodi, James Vincenzo or Vincenzo Tripodi.
 xxxxxxx, Tsemperis, Michael Nick or Michael Tsemperis or Michael N. Tsemperis or Mike N. Tsemperis.
 xxxxxxx, Udris, John Arcid or Harry Uders.
 xxxxxxx, Udris, Emily or Emily Auder.
 xxxxxxx, Urrutia, David Victorio Gastelu or David Gastelu.
 xxxxxxx, Uy, Julita Habaluyas (nee Julita De Guzman Habaluyas).
 xxxxxxx, Uy, Yu Sin or Florencio Chuytie Uy.
 xxxxxxx, Uzzell, Henry.
 xxxxxxx, Valente, Raul.
 xxxxxxx, Van Bokhoven, Alexander Johannes Andrianus Marinus or Alexander J. Van Bokhoven.
 xxxxxxx, Vasilou, Anna nee Vrostou or Anna Vassili.
 xxxxxxx, Vasiloff, Boztn (alias Christ Vassila Gerogopoulos).
 xxxxxxx, Vassiliou, Theocharis Constantin.
 xxxxxxx, Venzen, Lily Vitalia.
 xxxxxxx, Vergou, Alkaterini or Katherine Vergou.
 xxxxxxx, Vergou, Demetrios or James Vergou.

xxxxxxx, Vineberg, Benjamin or Benjamin Wajnberger.
 xxxxxxx, Vocos, James Dimitrios or James Vocos or James John Vocos.
 xxxxxxx, Vonakis, Julia (nee Julia Charalambos Hatziharalambos).
 xxxxxxx, Wajzman, Perla or Walsman or Perla Windman or Perla Winderman.
 xxxxxxx, Weissman, Oslas Noe or Jean Blank.
 xxxxxxx, Wilson, Alice Ann.
 xxxxxxx, Wolther, Irving or Isaak Wolski.
 xxxxxxx, Wong, Tom or Wong Chou.
 xxxxxxx, Worobetz, Dmytro or Dmytro Worubec.
 xxxxxxx, Yamanaka, Satiko.
 xxxxxxx, Yang, Ling Fu or Yang Ling Fu.
 xxxxxxx, Yang, Shiang Ping.
 xxxxxxx, Yang, Anna Hsiao or Anna Hsiao.
 xxxxxxx, Yanushkevich, Gregorio or Gricori.
 xxxxxxx, Yensen, Lauritz Johannes or Lauritz Johannes Jensen or Fritz L. Yensen.
 xxxxxxx, Young, Anthony Michael Gascoyne.
 xxxxxxx, Yu, Horace I-Sen.
 xxxxxxx, Yu, Lota Lois.
 xxxxxxx, Yuki, Anthony Toschimichi.
 xxxxxxx, Zeffler, Astrid Sigrid.
 xxxxxxx, Kulukundis, Manuel Elias also known as Manual Kulukundis.
 xxxxxxx, Kulukundis, Calliope aka Calliope Manuel Kulukundis (nee Calliope Elias Hadjilias).
 xxxxxxx, Kulukundis, George Elias.
 xxxxxxx, Kulukundis, Manuel Michael.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 15, lines 13 and 14, strike the registration number and name:

"xxxxxxx, Liu, Yoh Han or Yok John Liu or Y John Liu."

On page 16, line 9, strike the registration number and name:

"xxxxxxx, Maggioro, Vincienzo, or Vincent Maggioro."

On page 18, line 19, strike the registration number and name:

"xxxxxxx, Pacheco, Arnaldo or Chico Pacheco."

On page 20, lines 19 and 20, strike the registration number and name:

"xxxxxxx, Quistgaard, Helma Kirsten Dolores or (nee Muerlin)."

On page 26, after line 18, insert the registration numbers and names:

"xxxxxxx, Foti, Joseph Arthur or Giuseppe Arturo Foti or Giuseppe Corraeale or Arthur La Pierre."

"xxxxxxx, Karpman, Dahlia."

"xxxxxxx, Haydari, Ebrahim."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution 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.

MABEL MONROE BONDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 629) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mabel Monroe Bonds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Mabel Monroe Bonds a patent in fee to the following described lands on the Blackfoot Indian Reservation, Mont.: Lot 6 and the north half of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 33, township 36 north, range 14 west, Montana

principal meridian, containing seventy-six and sixty-one one hundredths acres, more or less.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Interior, upon application in writing, is hereby authorized to sell the homestead allotment numbered 1641 of Mabel Monroe Bonds, described as lot 6 and the north half of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 33, township 36 north, range 14 west, Montana principal meridian, containing seventy-six and sixty-one one hundredths acres, and to disburse the proceeds of such sale for the benefit of Mabel Monroe Bonds: *Provided*, That when the land is offered for sale the Blackfeet Tribe or any Indian who is a member of said tribe shall have 90 days within which to execute a preferential right to purchase said tract at the price offered by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase: *Provided further*, That if the land is purchased by the Blackfeet Tribe or a member thereof title shall be conveyed by deed to the United States in trust for the purchaser, and if the land is purchased by a non-Indian a patent in fee shall be issued to the purchaser."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD JAMES BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 630) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Richard James Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Richard James Brown a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.: The west half of the northwest quarter, section 12, township 37 north, range 10 west, Montana principal meridian, containing eighty acres.

Sec. 2. Said patent in fee when issued shall contain a reservation to the Blackfeet Indian Tribe of the oil, gas, and all other mineral deposits as provided in the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALICE E. WILLIAMS SISK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Alice E. Williams Sisk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Alice E. Williams Sisk a patent in fee to the following-described land allotted to her within the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: Lots 10, 11, and 12 of section 3 and the west half and the west half of the east half of section 10, township 2 south, range 29

east, Montana principal meridian, comprising five hundred ninety-five and sixty-four one hundredths acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL PATENT TO CHARLES A. GANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 651) to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann for the following-described lands: southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter, east half northwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter, south half northeast quarter southwest quarter, section 1, township 6 north, range 16 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, containing forty-five acres more or less according to the official plat of resurvey accepted April 1, 1943.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUE A PATENT IN FEE TO PERCIVAL H. GLENN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 964) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Percival H. Glenn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Percival H. Glenn a patent in fee to the following-described lands, known as allotment numbered 2368 on the Crow Indian Reservation, Montana: The west half of the southwest quarter of section 3, lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 and the southeast quarter of section 4 and the west half of the northwest quarter of section 10, township 4 south, and the east half of section 33 and the west half of the west half of section 34, township 3 south, range 27 east, Montana principal meridian, containing nine hundred ninety-six and twenty-four one hundredths acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS BY CENTRAL PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1129) to validate a conveyance of certain lands by the Central Pacific Railway Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to the Union Ice Co. and Edward Barbera.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the conveyances hereinafter particularly described and heretofore executed by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain lands or interests therein, in the city of Lodi, all in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and forming a part of the right-of-way of said Central Pacific Railway Co., granted by the Government of the United States of America by an act of Congress ap-

proved July 1, 1862, entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes" (vol. 12, U. S. Stat. L. 469), and by said act as amended by act of Congress approved July 2, 1864, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes,' approved July 1, 1862" (vol. 13, U. S. Stat. L. 356), are hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed with the same force and effect as if the land involved therein had been held at the time of such conveyances by the corporations making the same under absolute fee simple title.

The conveyances, recorded in office of county recorder of San Joaquin County, Calif., in book of official records, which are hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed, are as follows:

1. September 16, 1937: the Union Ice Co., a corporation; volume 594, page 31.

2. October 8, 1946: Edward Barbera; volume 1022, page 83: *Provided*, That such legalization, validation, and confirmation shall not in any instance diminish said right-of-way to a width less than 50 feet on either side of the center of the main track or tracks of said Central Pacific Railway Co. as now established and maintained: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed to legalize, validate, or confirm any rights, titles, or interests based upon or arising out of adverse possession, prescription, or abandonment, and not confirmed by conveyance heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co. and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co.: *And provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, or other minerals in the land, and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING TO KAISER STEEL CORP. OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1853) to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant to Kaiser Steel Corp., a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Nevada, permanent rights-of-way, not exceeding two hundred feet in width, on, over, under, through, and across public lands of the United States in the county of Riverside, State of California, in the townships, ranges, and sections described in section 2 of this act, for the purposes of constructing, operating, and maintaining any and all works, structures, facilities, roads, railroads, power lines, and pipelines necessary, convenient, incidental, or appurtenant to the operation of the mines, camp sites, and mill sites of Kaiser Steel Corp. in the vicinity of Eagle Mountain, Riverside County, in the State of California: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall, in his discretion, attach and impose such conditions on said right-of-

way, and promulgate such rules and regulations as he shall deem appropriate, consistent with the use of said rights-of-way for the purposes prescribed in this act.

Sec. 2. Said rights-of-way shall extend through all lands owned by the United States or any department or agency thereof in any of the following townships, ranges, and sections of Riverside County, in the State of California:

(a) Township 8 south, range 11 east, sections 20, 29, 28, 27, 21, 22, 23, 14, 13, and 12; township 8 south, range 12 east, sections 7, 8, 9, 10, and 3; township 7 south, range 12 east, sections 34, 35, and 36; township 7 south, range 13 east, sections 31, 32, 29, 28, 21, 22, 23, 14, 13, and 12; township 7 south, range 14 east, sections 7, 8, 5, and 4; township 6 south, range 14 east, sections 33, 28, 21, 16, 9, 8, 7, and 6; township 5 south, range 14 east, sections 31, 32, 29, 28, 27, 26, 23, 24, 13, and 12; township 5 south, range 15 east, sections 7 and 6; township 4 south, range 15 east, sections 31, 30, 19, 20, 17, 18, 7, and 6; and continuing through townships 4 south and 3 south, range 14 east, to a terminal point at the site of the mill and camp of Kaiser Steel Corp. in the vicinity of Eagle Mountain in the State of California.

(b) Township 4 south, range 15 east, sections 30, 19, 20, 17, 18, and 7, and continuing through townships 4 south and 3 south, range 14 east, to a terminal point at the site of the mill and camp of Kaiser Steel Corp. in the vicinity of Eagle Mountain in the State of California.

(c) Township 3 south, range 15 east, section 31, and continuing through townships 4 south and 3 south, range 14 east, to a terminal point at the site of the mill and camp of Kaiser Steel Corp. in the vicinity of Eagle Mountain, in the State of California.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby further authorized to grant a patent in fee to Kaiser Steel Corp., a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Nevada, that property located in townships 4 south and 3 south, range 14 east, Riverside County, Calif., which said Kaiser Steel Corp. now maintains as a camp site and mill site in connection with its mining operations, and which is composed of four hundred sixty-five and eighty-five one-hundredths acres, more or less.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior shall fix, and Kaiser Steel Corp. shall pay, a reasonable sum or sums to the United States, including compensation for the cost of surveys necessary to carry out the grants and patent authorized hereby, as consideration for such grants and patent. Said grants and patent shall include suitable detailed descriptions of the property covered thereby.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 17, after the word "to" insert "grant a."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUE PATENTS IN FEE TO CERTAIN ALLOTTEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2349) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to the following-named persons pat-

ents in fee to their allotted lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, Montana:

Estella Wolfe, the south half of the southeastern quarter of section 20, the northeast quarter, and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 29; the south half of the southwest quarter of section 21; the northwest quarter, the north half of the southwest quarter, the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, and the northeast quarter of section 28; the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 27, township 5 south, range 38 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 840 acres.

Mark Wolfe, the south half of the northeast quarter, and the southeast quarter of section 24; the north half of the northeast quarter of section 25, township 5 south, range 37 east; the south half of the southwest quarter of section 20; the northwest quarter of section 29, township 5 south, range 38 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 560 acres.

Furman E. Wolfe, south half of the southeast quarter of section 25, township 5 south, range 37 east; the southwest quarter of section 29; the northwest quarter, the south half, and the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 32, township 5 south, range 38 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 760 acres.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, strike out the following language: "and the northeast quarter of section."

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out the following language: "28; the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 27."

Page 2, line 3, strike out the word "eight" and insert in lieu thereof "six."

Page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike out the following language: "south half of the southeastern quarter of section 25, township 5 south, range 37 east."

Page 2, line 12, following the word "the", insert "south half of the."

Page 2, line 16, strike out the word "seven" and insert in lieu thereof "six." Strike out the words "and sixty."

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRIS as an amendment to the committee amendment: Page 2, line 18, after the word "hundred", strike out "and sixty."

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SALE OF CERTAIN ALLOTTED INDIAN LAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3215) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Eloise White Bear.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Eloise White Bear a patent in fee to the following described lands allotted to her on the Crow Indian Reservation, Montana: The southeast quarter of section 14 the northeast quarter, the west half of the southeast quarter, and the west half of the east half of the southeast quarter of section 23, and the northwest quarter and the west

half of the northeast quarter of section 24, township 8 south, range 37 east, containing 680 acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Interior, upon application in writing, is hereby authorized to sell the remaining lands contained in trust allotment numbered 3613 of Eloise White Bear, described as the southeast quarter of section 14; the northeast quarter, and the west half of the southeast quarter, and the west half of the east half of the southeast quarter of section 23; the west half of the northeast quarter, and the northwest quarter of section 24, all in township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 680 acres, conveyance to be made by deed or the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser and to disburse the proceeds of such sale to Eloise White Bear for her benefit."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Crow Reservation, Montana."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOMAS J. ZAFIRIADIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 616) for the relief of Tomas J. Zafiriadis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Tomas J. Zafiriadis shall be deemed to be a native of Uruguay.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANZ FURTNER AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 617) for the relief of Franz Furtner, his wife, Valentina Furtner, and her daughters, Nina Tuerck and Victoria Tuerck.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Franz Furtner, his wife, Valentina Furtner, and her daughters, Nina Tuerck and Victoria Tuerck, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

Sec. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the necessary quota numbers that are required.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "the necessary quota numbers that are required" and insert "four numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. GIUSEPPE MAZZONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 895) for the relief of Dr. Giuseppe Mazzone. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Giuseppe Mazzone shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in 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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VASILIA PARSELLES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1233) for the relief of Mrs. Vasilias Parselles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Vasilias Parselles, of San Francisco, Calif., who entered the United States in September 1947 for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of such entry. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Turkey for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Vasilias Parselles shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SELMA CECELIA GAHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1234) for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl as of February 8, 1948, the date on which she was admitted to the United States.

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 quota for Australia for the first year that said quota is available.

With the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTRANIK AYANIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Antranik Ayanian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Antranik Ayanian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in 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 bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOE LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2114) for the relief of Joe Lee (also known as Lee Jow).

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JINDRICH (HENRI) NOSEK AND MRS. ZDENKA NOSEK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2310) for the relief of Jindrich (Henri) Nosek and Mrs. Zdenka Nosek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jindrich (Henri) Nosek and his wife, Mrs. Zdenka Nosek, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended

(62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "fee and head tax" and insert "fees and head taxes."

Line 9, strike out "alien" and insert "aliens."

Line 11, strike out "one number" and insert "two numbers."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHAEL POST-POSNIAKOFF AND ZINAIDA POST-POSNIAKOFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2372) for the relief of Michael Post-Posniakoff and Zinaida Post-Posniakoff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Michael Post-Posniakoff and Zinaida Post-Posniakoff shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be admitted for permanent residence pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1952).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "fee and head tax" and insert "fees and head taxes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUON MEE GEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2852) for the relief of Quon Mee Gee, also known as Loui Siu Lin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and not withstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Quon Mee Gee, also known as Loui Siu Lin, a minor Chinese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born daughter of Tai Hung Leong, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after "amended", strike out "and not withstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIZUE SAKURADA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2853) for the relief of Shizue Sakurada.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Shizue Sakurada, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Shizue Sakurada shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOROTHY FUMIE MAEDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2854) for the relief of Dorothy Fumie Maeda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Dorothy Fumie Maeda, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Dorothy Fumie Maeda shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIZU TERAUCHI PARKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2916) for the relief of Shizu Terauchi Parks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Shizu Terauchi Parks, the Japanese fiancée of Henry Francis Parks, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Shizu Terauchi Parks shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Shizu Terauchi Parks is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Henry Francis Parks, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Shizu Terauchi Parks, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C. title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Shizu Terauchi Parks, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the

said Shizu Terauchi Parks as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSINA MOURADIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3063) for the relief of Rosina Mouradian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Rosina Mouradian may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIN YUEN LING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3133) for the relief of Chin Yuen Ling, minor unmarried Chinese child of a United States citizen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien Chin Yuen Ling, the minor unmarried child of Chin Yick Goon, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VIVIAN M. GRAHAM AND HERBERT H. GRAHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 643) for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Vivian M. Graham, San Pedro, Calif., the sum of \$3,000, and to Herbert H. Graham, San Pedro, Calif., the sum of \$6,788.25. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Mrs. Vivian M. Graham on account of personal injuries sustained by her, and of all claims against the United States of the said Herbert H. Graham on account of personal injuries, property damage, and loss of earnings sustained by him, on August 12, 1945, when an automobile operated by George T. Copp, of Bellflower, Calif., in which the said Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham were riding was in collision with a United States Marine Corps truck on United States Highway No. 66, approximately 2½ miles east of Barstow, Calif. The operator of such Marine Corps truck was not operating within the scope of his employment: *Provided,* That no part of either of the sums 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 the claim settled by the payment of such sum, 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.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$3,000", and insert "\$400."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$6,788.25", and insert "\$2,400."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMIL SBARBORI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2363) for the relief of Emil Sbarbori.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., 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, to Emil Sbarbori, of Jersey City, N. J., the sum of \$815. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical expenses, and loss of earning power sustained as a result of a collision on September 6, 1943, on Route No. 25, Elizabeth, N. J., between an automobile in which he was a passenger and a United States Navy station wagon No. 17791, driven by an enlisted man of the Navy, operating from the United States Navy, Department of Supervisor of Shipbuilding, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.: *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.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated," strike out the bill down to the colon in line 4, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "to Mr. and Mrs. Emil Sbarbori, of Jersey City, N. J., the sum of \$375; to Edna Perfetti, of Union City, N. J., the sum of \$125; to Anthony Perfetti, of Union City, N. J., the sum of \$20, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical expenses sustained as a result of a collision of September 6, 1943, on Route numbered 25, Elizabeth, N. J., between an automobile in which they were passengers and a United States Navy station wagon, numbered 17791, driven by a Navy employee, operating from the United States Navy, Department of Supervisor of Shipbuilding, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Emil Sbarbori, Edna Perfetti, and Anthony Perfetti."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN R. HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2453) for the relief of John R. Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John R. Harris, Scranton, Pa., the sum of \$326.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John R. Harris against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel performed by his wife Mary P. Harris from Scranton, Pa., to Paris, France, in March 1948, while he was serving in Paris as an officer with the Quartermaster Corps, Headquarters, American Graves Registration Command, European area: *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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$326.50", and insert "\$201."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LULA M. WHITEBEAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3216) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lula M. Whitebear.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Lula M. Whitebear a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to her on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The east half of section 11, the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter, the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter and the south half of the southwest quarter, section 12, and the northeast quarter of section 14, township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing six hundred and forty acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Lula" and insert "Lulu."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lulu M. Whitebear."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICOLETTA AND GUILIA PONTRELLI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 756) for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli, with an amendment of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, after "Pontrelli", insert ": *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Nicoletta Pontrelli becoming a public charge."

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.

LOUISE LEITZINGER AND DAUGHTER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1722) for the relief of Louis Leitzinger and her daughter, with an amendment of the Senate 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 14 and 15 and insert "date of the payment by them 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.

JOSE ENCARNACION ORTIZ

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1823) for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz, with an amendment of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, strike out "Upon the enactment of this act" and insert "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act."

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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 55]

Anfuso	Frazier	Magee
Angell	Gary	Miller, Calif.
Beall	Gillette	Miller, N. Y.
Belcher	Gordon	Morgan
Boykin	Gregory	Morrison
Buckley	Gwinn	Murphy
Byrne, N. Y.	Harden	Murray, Wis.
Celler	Harrison, Va.	Pickett
Chipperfield	Herlong	Powell
Colmer	Herter	Rogers, Tex.
Coudert	Irving	Short
Cox	Jackson, Wash.	Taylor
Dawson	Jonas	Whitaker
Dempsey	Jones	Woodruff
Dingell	Hamilton C.	
Eberharter	Kersten, Wis.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 387 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 158, Rept. No. 447), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, effective, from January 3, 1951, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (o) of the Rules of the House of Representatives. For such purpose such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Dominion of Canada, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. WHITTEN. 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. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, 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. 3973, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday, May 10, the Clerk had read through and including line 25 on page 26 of the bill. If there are no amendments to be offered at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL

For expenses necessary, in accordance with the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law 738), as amended and supplemented to make preliminary examinations and surveys, and to perform works of improvement, and to plan the agricultural phases of the development of the Columbia Basin area, the Arkansas-White-Red River area, and the New England-New York area, in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, including not to exceed \$100,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), to remain available until expended, \$8,000,000, with which shall be merged the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to the Department for flood-control purposes: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for the purchase of lands in the Yazoo and Little Tallahatchie watersheds without specific approval of the county board of supervisors of the county in which such lands are situated, nor shall any part of such funds be used for the purchase of lands in the counties of Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah, in the State of Oklahoma, without the specific approval of the board of county commissioners of the county in which such lands are situated: *Provided further*, That of the funds available herein, not in excess of \$6,000,000 (with which shall be merged the unexpended balance of funds heretofore made available for these purposes) may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, for necessary gully control, floodwater detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 27, line 14, strike out "\$8,000,000," and insert "\$6,112,800."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will give to this particular division the same amount of new money which was given to them for the 1951 fiscal year. I am proposing to reduce the \$8,000,000 now in the bill to \$6,112,800. Let me call to your attention how a division or a bureau keeps on growing and growing. In 1947 we gave to this particular small division only the sum of \$2,101,000. That was upped 50 percent in 1948, giving it about \$3,000,000 of new money. In 1949 the appropriation was doubled and the Congress gave them \$6,000,000. In 1950 we gave this bureau \$9,500,000. In 1951 we gave them \$10,312,000.

What happened to the \$10,312,000 that the Congress last year said was necessary? If you will recall the Congress in-

structed the President under the one-package bill last year, and mistakenly so, to make a \$550,000,000 reduction at his discretion in the one-package bill. The Congress was too worn out by the length of time that bill required to clear the House to do its work properly.

I hold it is the responsibility of the Congress under the Constitution to control the purse. The President, in order to achieve that \$550,000,000 cut last year, took from this particular item the sum of \$4,200,000. To my mind by that action, the administration stated that they had little confidence themselves in this particular program as it was being operated. It is disturbing, Mr. Chairman, to note this fact and I wish you would turn to page 772 of the hearings and see where the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], stated:

I notice last year that you had reductions under section 1214 of the appropriation bill. You took a cut of \$4,200,000. How were you able to do that? Where did you absorb that amount of money?

Mr. Phillips, Mr. Wills' assistant, replied:

About \$200,000, Mr. Chairman, from preliminary examinations and surveys and about \$4,000,000 from works of improvement.

Mr. WHITTEN. You just held up the works of improvement to that extent?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is right.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the amount cut by the President under section 1214 was applied in the main to the actual work involved in flood control. Only \$200,000 was taken from the large item, preliminary surveys.

Think of them spending \$1,700,000 for surveys at a time when we already have 171 preliminary surveys of watersheds and full survey reports on 19 projects. Here we are in the position of actually working on only 11 watersheds, half of that work being done in two States, Mississippi and Texas, and yet when this group were told by the President that it would be necessary to take off \$4,200,000 of the 1951 appropriation, did they take the bulk of that from the preliminary survey work? Oh, no. According to Mr. Phillips' statement, just quoted, \$4,000,000 of the \$4,200,000 reduction was saved at the expense of the actual work of construction, while \$1,700,000 was expended for the further preliminary survey work and a continued program of that kind which surely could have been dispensed with rather than to reduce by half the actual flood-control work last year.

Mr. Chairman, the cut which I propose through this amendment should be applied largely at the expense of preliminary examinations and surveys. Please keep in mind, as I mentioned previously, that here is one division of Government which has grown by leaps and bounds since 1947. These people asked only \$2,100,000 for this work in 1947. They very modestly increased their request to \$3,500,000 for 1948. Then they jumped the request almost threefold to \$9,004,000 for 1949, hiked it to \$10,000,000 in 1951, and in 1951 they apparently decided there was no limit to our Treasury and unblushingly came before us and asked for \$11,700,000 for the very same

division which received less than one-fifth of that amount only 4 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am trying to follow the gentleman's statement. I am having some difficulty in reconciling the gentleman's statement with the report. On page 13 of the report the committee states that this item has been reduced from last year's appropriation by \$1,201,575. Is that correct?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The report is not clear, I think. I am referring to the new money that we are putting into this particular activity. Last year this particular activity had a little over \$6,100,000 of new money given to it. My amendment would give to it the very same amount for this coming fiscal year. It seems that the report takes into consideration moneys which are available from previous years.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I still do not understand how you could have a reduction. The report shows less money is to be spent than last year. I just cannot reconcile the statement the gentleman makes with the report.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman will turn to page 752 of the hearings, he will see that there is appropriated for 1952, \$6,112,800. That is the figure I am operating upon. That is the base figure.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Would the gentleman tell us how it is we have a flood-control appropriation in an Agricultural Department appropriation bill?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Well, that is a puzzle to me. Of course, the responsibility of the Army engineers only goes to a certain point on these rivers. Above that you have the Department of Agriculture, on the small tributaries leading down in; and the Department of Agriculture, in turn, divides its work between the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service, and they, in turn, call in the Extension Service, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Production and Marketing Administration, and two or three others. I think we should put all of this work which the Army engineers do not take care of under one group, the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. GRANGER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We should stop, look, and listen. Let us take a little money out of this appropriation, and then let us request, through the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the kind of investigation we should have, and find out exactly what we are doing

and why it is necessary to pile up a great number of preliminary surveys at a tremendous cost, when we all want the actual construction work performed as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. D'EWARD. On page 13 of the report it is stated that the Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service have a primary responsibility for this work and that the work is to prepare surveys for the installation of watershed improvements, control of water runoff and water flow, protection from soil erosion and so forth. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that this \$6,000,000 that will be left could be used for range improvement in place of the \$500,000 that was stricken from the bill under the Forest Service item the other day?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not think this particular item has to do with that matter specifically but the language is broad enough to perhaps permit such use, if I understand the gentleman correctly.

Mr. D'EWARD. No; reseeding of the ranges, holding water in the national forests.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I certainly agree with the gentleman that this money could be spent to better advantage.

All I want to do, I may state to the gentleman from Montana, is to stop, look, listen, and see where we are going.

Mr. D'EWARD. It would appear to me, since part of this money is to be used by the Forest Service and since it is to retard stream flow, that it could well be used for the purposes I have mentioned and in cooperative range management.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would not want to commit myself on that.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Is there any provision made on the part of sponsoring agencies for this improvement?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes; to a certain degree. It is cooperative; it varies. Some places they even cooperate to the extent of 50 or 60 percent.

Mr. GRANGER. That sometimes just to the extent of furnishing rights-of-way?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Sometimes to the extent of very little, if any.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we all have a very high regard for our friend from Minnesota and his desire to save public money. As you may have noticed, his knowledge of this program does not come from having any of it in his district; I mean this cut would not reach Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I correct the gentleman? There is an item that reaches Minnesota, 1 of the 11.

Mr. WHITTEN. What is the name of the project?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Little Sioux in Iowa in Minnesota, the third largest. The two other projects, if the gentleman will yield, are in Mississippi and Texas. The States of Mississippi and Texas get more than half of this money.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, he groups Mississippi and Texas; I do not know what is spent in Texas, but I know the amount in Mississippi is very small as compared to the total amount in this bill, and much, much smaller when compared with the costs of the dams built there.

The question has been asked: Why put flood control in the Department of Agriculture? Mr. Chairman, let us get this matter of funds straight. Last year there was a carry-over of \$3,000,000 which with the amount appropriated gave a total of \$13,401,000 of funds available for work this year. With the President's reduction of \$4,200,000 we have available for the present year \$9,200,000. I want you to know that your committee has brought in reductions, because the amount available this year, \$9,200,000, was reduced by the budget to \$8,900,000. Your committee then reduced that amount by \$900,000 leaving \$8,000,000, as against available funds for this year of \$9,200,000.

I have never made any special pleas since I have been a Member of this Congress for my district, but I do think I have the right to ask for fair play. This is a construction program, this is a case of building projects, it is a program where the States and local people put up approximately 50 percent of the cost. Let us see whether what we are asking here is fair treatment. I want to use this by way of illustration because, as I say, while some of this is in my district, we have cut it in the same way that we have cut every other item in this bill by more than 10 percent.

We have cut it as against funds available this year by 15 percent. This Congress provided funds of about \$56,000,000 and went down into my area—they authorized it before I came here—and the \$75,000,000 of Federal funds will be used to close up the outlets of four rivers, two are now closed and two more will be closed. The Congress appropriated the money. You have already spent \$56,000,000 of it. You did not require any contribution from the folks below these dams as their contribution. When you stopped up those four rivers the effect of their being stopped up was felt in every

ditch clear on up to the headwaters. Not only did you flood the land of the man in that area but the man that was back of it, where you did not take his land and where you did not pay him a dime damage by stopping up the outlet of that stream, and you made his little ditches close up, too, but when you passed this legislation for those four dams you said: "We are going to provide as a part of this for flood control work above the dam, we are going to pay 50 percent of the cost."

You did not do that for the fellow below the dam. But after two of these dams have been built, after the effects are being felt, notwithstanding the fact that the farmers in the area put up 50 percent of the cost, you say: "No, the dams are there, but we are going to take our own good time before we live up to the other obligation and try to relieve the ill effects that we have visited on you."

Those people did not want the dams, they opposed the dams, and I say that the Congress of the United States has an obligation to carry out the commitment that you made when you put these dams on those folks down there and spent \$75,000,000 without any contribution locally at all. Under this program the local people have to put up 50 percent.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it not a fact that the Appropriations Committee over the protest of the people in the area appropriated money for the construction of those dams that visited these hardships upon the people of our district?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct, and under this amendment you would welch on your agreement to go ahead with these construction projects. These are construction projects and if you want to save money and you are committed to building something, is it helping any to drag out the period of time in which they are being built? Everything is going up, up, up. Do you save any money by needlessly dragging it out? I cannot see that.

Again I want to say to you that this is a cooperative program. The Government has committed itself in times past and your committee has reduced it by more than 10 percent. You have already put these dams there and flooded the land of these people, it has had this effect on the local streams. I say you owe it to them not to drag out this situation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We want to do what is right about this particular matter. On page 765 of the hearings the gentleman asked this question of Mr. Phillips, assistant to Mr. Will:

I notice last year you had a reduction under section 1214 of the appropriation bill, you took a cut of \$4,200,000. How were you able to do that? Where did you absorb that money?

Mr. Phillips replied:

About \$200,000. Mr. Chairman, was taken from preliminary examinations and surveys and about \$4,000,000 from construction.

Now, that is what they did about the construction item the gentleman is talking about. They only took \$200,000 from \$1,500,000 that we gave them for preliminary surveys yet, according to the statement in the Record they took \$4,000,000 off the actual construction money.

What is wrong? There is something wrong in the administration of the whole matter.

Mr. WHITTEN. The administration of it, as the gentleman knows, is not in this item, but the administration of it is in the Secretary's Office and in the Soil Conservation and in the Forest Service. Of course, they had to hold it up. They had their reasons for this. They had their appropriation, and the President cut off \$4,000,000. What else could they do? They did not have the money; they could not spend it. We have made the same reduction here that we have made elsewhere. I plead with you to be fair. There is hardly a Member of this House who has not on occasion been before the committee. We have tried to be fair with you; we have tried to be fair with these projects. We have given the same cut here that we have given elsewhere in this bill, and I urge you, in view of the situation we have, and in view of the fact that the Congress brought it about, that you have an obligation, and you are not spending any money here needlessly. You are carrying out your commitments where the farmers put up 50 percent of the cost.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not these projects are under construction at the present time?

Mr. WHITTEN. They are in each of these cases.

Mr. GRANGER. They are all projects that are being constructed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Absolutely. The Congress has committed itself to the completion of these projects and, as I say, in my own area the project was made necessary because you appropriated \$75,000,000 to stop up four rivers on the poor folks that live up above them. We said, "We will help you out of it, but you have to put up 50 percent of the cost" but now under this amendment you would be welching on that. I believe the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, and I do it for this reason: I have had some experience with surveys in my congressional district, and I know that there is very little interest taken after they get the money to get a survey. In 1944 an amendment of mine passed the House providing for a survey of the Susquehanna River on the North Branch up around my particular section. In 1948 we had a major flood there and there had been no rendition of a report of any kind by any of the authorities until that time, and nobody had any

idea what the recommendations were for flood control in spite of the fact that they had citizen meeting after citizen meeting in protest against the deplorable flood conditions.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman know that survey reports and flood-control work comes entirely within the purview of the Army engineers?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We talked that point over, and the gentleman from Minnesota, in presenting his amendment, says that there is too much slight-of-hand work under the table anyhow; we will pass too much money around among these different groups, so for that reason, I think we ought to cut them; the whole bunch of them, because they certainly did wrong by my district, and they did not give them any satisfaction whatsoever. Not only that, but they slapped the House of Representatives in the face, because here was a legislative direction for those engineers to go ahead and make an elaborate report on the Susquehanna River in my district there. And what did they do? They lumped it into a big report of the north branch and nobody had any opportunity to know what was going on until just this last year, 6 years after the amendment that I had presented to the House, which was passed by the House and the Senate and approved by the President, and the executive authorities had not gone ahead and done the bidding of the Congress in the matter, so I ask the question, What is the use of having any of these surveys or directing any of these people to go ahead with orders from Congress when they deliberately ignore them?

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. I have no money in this whatsoever; nothing in this appropriation goes to Tennessee, but in all fairness to the gentleman from Mississippi and to the people from Mississippi who did not want these rivers dammed up, if Congress put it on those people against their objections, do you not think it nothing but right for Congress to carry out their commitments and the promises to these people?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Is the gentleman referring to my district?

Mr. SUTTON. I am referring to the time when the gentleman was in Congress and I was, and when the gentleman from Mississippi was here, and when this was passed.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am speaking of an amendment which was adopted by the House directing a survey of flood conditions in my district. They apparently ignored it. They flouted the will of the Congress, and they apparently took the money along with it.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman says he wants to go along with cutting this appropriation.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am all for it.

Mr. SUTTON. I know the gentleman wants to economize wherever he can. I am sure the gentleman from New York is one of the top economizers, one of the most economical men in the Congress.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I appreciate that.

Mr. SUTTON. However, we made a promise to these people, we made this pledge to them. In all fairness, does not the gentleman believe we should carry out this pledge?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the gentleman's contention.

Mr. SUTTON. At the same time, the gentleman does want to carry out the promise we made to them?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am simply pointing out that the will of the Congress was flouted in the matter, and the people of my district, at least, never got any satisfaction out of legislation which was designed to improve the flood conditions in the district.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not know whether the survey to which the gentleman refers comes under the Army engineers or the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is the principle of the thing.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. However, if the gentleman will permit, I should like to quote from page 765 of the hearings:

Mr. WHITTEN. This committee, in an effort to understand better how the Department of Agriculture operates, and to check on some of the reports that have come to us, had an investigation made of the activities of the various units within the Department, one of which was the flood-control program. I quote here from a report:

"No detailed examination of the United States Department of Agriculture flood-control program was made. However, from the limited examination made, it appears that the same multiplicity of United States Department of Agriculture bureaus, with the resultant duplication and overlap, exists in this program as in the soil-conservation programs. As one Government official stated, 'the United States Department of Agriculture is trying to load the flood-control budget with many other United States Department of Agriculture bureaus. This is uneconomical and is stifling the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service which have been delegated primary responsibility for flood control by the Secretary of Agriculture.'"

Those are the words of an investigator our committee put to work on the job. The gentleman cannot tell me that there is not considerable we should look into in this particular case.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The reason I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is that this is the very thing that happened in my district. I hate to see the people get a run-around. I hate to see the legislative authority of the Congress challenged. They simply make fools of all of us when they do not carry out the mandates Congress passes.

In my district, according to the headlines of the Gannett newspapers, lurid

headlines on the front page, beef is going up 28 percent, after the order to roll back the cattlemen's prices. I wonder what is going to happen when the packers take their cut. Are the people of my district going to have to pay about 25 percent more for their meat than they are now? It is something we all ought to consider, and see that this Price Administrator gets a talking to from the people of the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY as a substitute to the amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

On page 27, line 14, strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,500,000."

On page 28, line 4, strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,800,000."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut the appropriation from \$8,000,000 to \$2,500,000, of which not more than \$1,800,000 may be expended in watersheds heretofore authorized for necessary gully control, flood-water detention, and floodway structures in areas other than those over which the Department of the Army has jurisdiction and responsibility.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Would the gentleman object to an amendment providing that the Federal Government knock out all these dams, and let the water down on those people who live in the areas affected?

Mr. KENNEDY. I would.

In addition to the \$2,500,000 which would be available, I think we can anticipate there will be a carry-over of up to \$2,000,000 from last year's appropriation. In 1949 there was a carry-over from the previous year. From 1949 to 1950 there was a carry-over of over \$1,250,000. From 1950 through 1951 there was a carry-over of over \$3,000,000. Of last year's appropriation, which was \$9,000,000-odd, the total funds obligated as of April 30, are about \$6,000,000, which means there is an unobligated balance of over \$3,000,000. So that we can anticipate at that rate of expenditure that there will be a carry-over this year, as there has been in past years, of up to \$2,000,000, which will mean the total appropriation, if my substitute is accepted, will be nearly \$4,500,000. I do not think there is any doubt that this program can stand this cut.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that during the war this entire program was practically cut out?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes; I believe it was.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That in itself would show that it is one of those so-called nonessentials that we can certainly go slow with at this time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I believe this program is most worth while, but I do believe it can be postponed. Many of these programs are not of an emergency nature, and can be delayed until another year, when the situation may not be as critical. I note that the report

of the committee said that these projects did not use critical and strategic material. I certainly think a dollar this year is a critical and strategic material, and I do not think we ought to go ahead with projects which are not of a defense nature.

While this whole program is intended to increase the agricultural productivity of this country over a long-range period of time, I think many of these projects which are of a general benefit to the country can be postponed to another year when we are not in as critical a period.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Minnesota said that this program was curtailed during the war. That is true. But, may I point out, that we did not have any flood control or any soil conservation program for 100 years in this country. Is that any reason why we should not have it now?

Mr. KENNEDY. No. I think he was making reference to a previous critical period when the dollar was in short supply. The point has been raised by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] as to whether work on these watersheds has already begun. It is true that the 11 big watersheds have work already commenced on them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. But these watersheds are divided into sub-watersheds. Many of these have not had work commenced on them, and I think many of these can be postponed to another year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Construction is actually underway on 11 authorized projects, and my contention is that it is wasting money to continue this everlasting job of piling up preliminary reports on top of one another which we may never use for the next 20 or 30 years.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, I was trying to point out to the gentleman that these 11 watersheds are divided into sub-watersheds and many of these sub-watersheds have not had work commenced on them, and they can be postponed until another year. I think there is no clear-cut connection between this work this year and defense this year. This program is for the purpose of increasing the productivity of agriculture in many areas of the country over a long-range period. I am for that. But I think this year, having a heavy financial deficit, many of these projects can be postponed until another time when we are not in such critical condition. I think we ought to spend money this year only when it has defense implication. I do not think anyone can argue that this is a case of spending money for defense. There will be over \$4,000,000 at the end of this year for expenditures for this purpose. Emergency conditions can be dealt with and the others can be postponed over a longer period of time.

I believe this substitute should be accepted by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have no purpose today in rising to talk on this proposition except to be fair. I tried to find out something about this particular provision of the bill. If you will recall, I asked some questions during general debate about this part of the bill. We have some excellent programs that are nationwide. We have the Forest Service program, which I have always strongly supported. The Soil Conservation Service has done an outstanding job. The PMA has done an outstanding job on soil conservation. I shall speak on that subject later on.

Here we have joint responsibility. We have the responsibility of the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service. Apparently, sometime, due to an act of Congress, an over-all program was set up above that, which, as near as I have been able to find out, is a duplication of the effort of the Forest Service and the soil Conservation Service. In looking at the hearings on this particular bill, I want to emphasize that this program was practically discontinued during the war years 1942 to 1947, but lest we get confused, on page 750 of the hearings, in talking about the number of positions we have "Estimated Positions, 1,033 Federal employees." Those employees are working on this particular program which, as near as I have been able to determine, appears to be a duplication.

In addition to that, we have over half of the money going for salaries. So when we talk in terms of what we are going to do as far as contracts and the fixing up of these things is concerned, over half of this money goes for personal services; duplication.

There is a group set up here that will hold a conference with people who are charged with the responsibility of doing the work. We have the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service. In addition to that we have to have a group over and above that to get those two agencies to come together in a conference and decide what they are going to do.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am very glad the gentleman is emphasizing that part, because he and I both want to see emphasis placed upon actual construction work in this particular division. I want to reiterate that when \$4,200,000 was cut off last fall the flood-control group themselves took \$4,000,000 of that off of construction, and only decreased their survey work by \$200,000.

Mr. MARSHALL. My good friend from Minnesota is a farmer and he knows, as I do, that conservation is not conservation until it is an accomplished fact on the land. That is where it has to be. We can talk all we want to about planning, we can talk all we want about schemes of how we are going to control things, but until those things are actually carried out it does not amount to a

saying to anybody. It is a matter of piling up salaries, it is a matter of piling up expenses, it is a matter of piling up detailed data which, after all, becomes obsolete. Most of the things that we ask for in the matter of surveys have to be resurveyed again because of costs. The things in this particular bill for construction will have to all be gone over as a matter of cost, to determine what will be done.

I say this is one of the places where we can save some money and it is not going to harm anybody. A little later on we will get into some phases of the agricultural program that we are all interested in, that will save our soil—conservation practices, and all that sort of thing. This is something that can be just as well set aside. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and the proof is that it was set aside during the war years 1942 to 1947.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] is in position to know whereof he speaks because for quite a few years he held a very responsible position in the Department of Agriculture working in our State of Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to try to procure the assistance of the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the committee, in getting the record straight.

Both of our distinguished friends from Minnesota have said that there is no justification for piling up a large number of surveys, and I agree with that. Yet, a consistent program of planning and survey work should be carried on. Certain new projects should be started. But I should like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi how much of the money in this bill as it comes before the committee is for surveys of new projects?

Mr. WHITTEN. The committee made no special set-aside at all for surveys. Out of the funds available they have made some surveys, and it is estimated that such examinations and surveys under the budget estimate was \$1,784,000. I understand this work is being carried on in 11 watersheds. I know, being on this committee, how many able Members of Congress and others have been on delegations urging this type of work which is badly needed in many areas. The only way you can start a project is to have something you can check against.

I do not know whether the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is just a straight cut, or to have the cut applied to the elimination of surveys and reallocated for construction work. Just what he has in mind I do not know.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly the purpose of the gentleman from Minnesota is to decrease to \$250,000 the sum requested by the Department for pre-

liminary surveys. I might say to the gentleman, if he will permit, the figure on the completed preliminary surveys is 171 watersheds, according to page 755 of the hearings, but we are actually working on only eleven.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I should like to find out from the gentleman whether his amendment would slow down construction on projects in basins which are already under construction.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I doubt whether it would on big projects, I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, because they have a large carry-over. At the most it would affect them to the extent of about one-fifth in work that they would do for this coming year if the Department of Agriculture would do what we are aiming at; that is, to take the bulk of this cut from preliminary surveys and also save on other items that they have requested which have very little to do with actual construction.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to have that statement in the record. I would hate to see work on projects under construction slowed down.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I feel that if we were assured that the money would be spent mainly where we want it to be spent, on actual construction, that following the passing of this present emergency the Congress would be well justified in putting up \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 a year until these particular projects are completed. This work is important. We must stop the water upstream as much as possible and prevent it from flooding the lower areas. We have a vast field to work in. I hope all of this will eventually be turned over to one agency, preferably the Soil Conservation Service, and help that agency do the sort of a job on the upper watersheds as the Army engineers is now doing with the navigable rivers.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with the gentleman because we are spending on some of the large dams on these watersheds as much as \$250,000,000. For a relatively small amount we can construct small dams and do soil conservation work that will prevent silting, that will preserve these great reservoirs on which the taxpayers have spent many millions of dollars. In my own State the work on the Washita Basin should be speeded and not slowed down, not only to conserve thousands of acres of good land but to protect Lake Texoma. This is a program for the conservation of soil. Contrary to the statement of my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] this is not a program which duplicates any other program. The regular program of the Soil Conservation Service dovetails into this program, but under that program, construction projects such as these are not possible. On the other hand, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have no authority to go down and build these small dams on creeks and small tributaries of the larger streams.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] was not referring to duplication as far as the Army engineers are concerned. He was referring to duplication within the Department. We have about seven different agencies getting their fingers into this pie and all I am asking by my amendment is to stop, look, listen and straighten the thing out before we go ahead with further expenditure of many millions of dollars.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Will the gentleman from Minnesota amend his amendment to cut out all surveys and let the construction go ahead?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I could not agree to that.

Mr. SUTTON. I thought that was the purpose of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Well, I want to knock out the bulk of the preliminary surveys but I would not want in case of an emergency, for example, to prevent doing absolutely necessary preliminary or final surveys and mapping.

Mr. SUTTON. Then the gentleman wants to cut out some construction?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Very little. After all we are at war and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] so well said, we have a strategic material here, the dollar, that we are thinking about today. We must be willing to curtail even the things we favor most.

Mr. SUTTON. What is more strategic than the soil of this country?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in listening to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] one would gather that at some time in the not too distant past some of these agencies had pulled a few dirty tricks on the folks down in his district. The other day I recall listening to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, who told us in several different ways that all those who had been listening to the Communists and dealing with them were getting a dirty deal. That is too bad. It is regrettable the State Department and the administration did not realize that fact long ago.

But I am wondering whether some time we are going to get back—and I

mean the Congress—and do a little homework for our own folks.

HOMEWORK NEEDS ATTENTION

While hundreds of thousands of men are fighting for "a free world"; while administration spokesmen and Members of Congress are debating how best the American people can make further sacrifices, do more for so-called "free peoples" and "free nations," some of us have been wondering when this administration and Congress will take effective action to make our people a "free people."

Because of the propaganda put out by those who worry overmuch over the fact that other people in some parts of the world have less of this world's goods, less freedom of action than do we; our own people, those who elect a President, Vice President, and Members of Congress and who pay them, are, because of ever-increasing taxation and regimentation imposed by those who should be their servants, finding it more and more difficult to meet their tax bills, to purchase in the open market at a reasonable price, the things to which they have become accustomed.

But far worse and more harmful in the end is the ever-increasing curtailment of the freedom of the individual to exercise what so many call his "civil rights"—rights guaranteed by the Constitution heretofore exercised by all of us—rights which professional organizations intent upon protecting some civil rights, ignore.

What I am trying to put across is a realization that here in America, "the land of the free," in Georgia, for example, for weeks men and women who desired to work for a livelihood were, by a minority using deadly weapons, forcibly prevented from working.

We all know that if a man and his family would eat, he must—unless he is the object of charity or of someone's generosity—go about his daily task. But here in free America, in Georgia, individuals are not free.

While seeking, through our Armed Forces to bring freedom to a people thousands of miles away—who may resent our efforts, should we not worry a little about our own citizens?

Nor is Georgia the only place in America where men are not free.

The press tells us that in Chicago people—heads of families—cannot purchase milk for family use, for the baby or babies of the family. Why? Because those who distribute milk—which otherwise is available—refuse to permit its delivery.

While we are spending billions of dollars, sacrificing thousands of American lives, to bring about a greater degree of freedom in Asia, would it not be well if we used the laws already on the books to help the farmer sell the milk he produces, give the housewife who has the money, the opportunity to buy the milk she needs?

In Detroit, without notice, individuals who operate the city-owned transportation system have, for weeks—carried on a strike, tied up the city's transportation system.

Result? Thousands of people are forced to seek other methods of transportation. This, despite the fact that

Michigan has a law which provides that when a municipal employee goes on strike he loses the job, is no longer an employee. Another law makes it a criminal offense for any individual to interfere with another who seeks to go about his daily task. A union official says, in effect, that the streetcars will not run unless the union's demands are met.

The mayor of Detroit has refused to yield to the demands of the strikers. Presumably, he realizes that if he yields to one demand, shortly others will follow.

Hundreds of thousands of people in Detroit are inconvenienced, some grievously injured because a minority refuses to recognize the law, insists upon having its will imposed upon an overwhelming majority.

And Frank X. Martel, president of the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor, says:

The DSR (Department of Street Railways) vehicles will appear only on the streets of Detroit when they are operated by members of division 26 (the striking local) under union conditions.

Does this indicate we are a free people?

Will Governor Williams meet the Martel challenge or will he yield to political pressure?

Again, permit me to ask, why should American youth be conscripted for free nations abroad while here at home—in Georgia, in Illinois, and in Michigan—our law-enforcing officers permit, because of expediency, let us say, millions of people to be deprived of their freedom?

Will some who seem to have the cares of the world on their shoulders turn their eyes homeward—do a little home work here before they continue to sacrifice the lives of more and more of our men abroad?

Instead of devoting all our thought and efforts toward the betterment of "free peoples" who do not exist, why not free Americans whose rights are denied them?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] just said, that is, that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] apparently felt that someone down in the department had played a trick on him. I think I should make some explanation of what did happen. The trick was played, to use the words of the gentleman from Michigan, on the districts which the gentleman from Mississippi and I have the honor to represent, not by anyone down in any department, but by the Congress of the United States. I do not agree with my colleague that it was exactly a trick. I am simply using his words.

Now here is what happened. In 1936, after the Army engineers had made their reports on the proposed construction of the dams and reservoirs, the Congress authorized their construction. The Congress did this even though the engineers reported the projects to be economically unsound.

The dams were put under construction prior to the war and were subsequently suspended. After the war construction

was resumed and the projects are now nearing completion.

So by an act of this Congress the waters of several rivers have been backed over the farms in the north central Mississippi. I think I should add that this was done over the protest of Mr. WHITTEN and myself. We appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and begged committee members not to appropriate money for these projects. We made our case of protest on the basis of the engineers' report and submitted evidence that the projects would utterly destroy many of our farmers. The committee and the Congress, in their wisdom, disagreed; and so the projects were proceeded with. Now that is water over the mill but the effect of the projects on our districts is not. To partially compensate our people and make their burdens as light as possible, this same Congress promised that the backwaters and runoff waters would be controlled as much as possible. That is one of the purposes of this particular item in the bill. We were also assured that there would be a good project of erosion control, which would not only benefit such land as we had left, but would control the flow of waters into the reservoirs. Those were firm commitments made to us by this Congress. Now, if you want to cut that out, that is your business; but it seems to me that when and if you do, then it would be nothing but right and fair that you restore the status quo in our districts. Of course, the latter is impossible because the dams and reservoirs are about finished and certainly should be finished with the least possible delay.

All we ask is that you carry out your commitment and give us the water and erosion control projects that were so faithfully promised in consideration of the sacrifice made by our people.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] said a great portion of this money is going to administrative costs. Sure it is. Do you know why? Because the landowners are paying primarily for the actual work. The Government is primarily furnishing technical services through administrative experts and is preparing and presenting plans, all of which naturally throws a large portion of this item to administrative costs. It is more or less an administrative item because the farmers themselves are doing the work. This Congress is building the dams and reservoirs for the benefit of people below the levee free of charge, but as for us above the dams, we are getting technical services only and paying for the work. That is the agreement. Now certainly you are not going back on it.

The gentlemen of the committee have already cut this a reasonable sum, in fact, to a greater percentage than the percentage cut made in other bills that have come to the House. I think the committee has been very reasonable and I feel that we should support the item as is. If you see fit to support either of the pending amendments, that is your privilege. But such action would be most unfair and constitute a breach of agreement with our people. I have faith in your wisdom and fairness and am con-

fident you will vote down the amendments, particularly the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to propound a question to the chairman of the subcommittee. May I ask just how the pending amendments would affect the Little Sioux River project in northwest Iowa?

Mr. WHITTEN. The Little Sioux project is in the bill for approximately \$908,000. The amount of the cut, of course, is much greater than that amount of money. How it would be applied I do not know, but the amount of the cut far exceeds the amount that was set up for the Little Sioux project, in Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. As I understand, the sum now in the bill is \$908,000, whereas during the last fiscal year we appropriated \$1,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes. The committee has made reductions in our very serious efforts to hold down every project we could. We have even cut those projects which we considered to be vital to some areas.

Mr. HOEVEN. The pending amendments are in the false-economy class. I think my record for economy in Government is equal to that of anyone present. The Little Sioux River project is the pattern for soil-conservation practices throughout the United States. It was set up some years ago, and has been unduly retarded. The proposed amendments would further slow up the soil-conservation work that is being done under the project.

The situation has been particularly aggravated this year due to serious floods in the Little Sioux area. I should tell you that the Little Sioux project is almost entirely within my congressional district. The flooding of the Little Sioux it almost a yearly occurrence. Only a few weeks ago people were forced from their homes in Cherokee, Correctionville, and Spencer, in my district. The town of Anthon, due to its peculiar location, is constantly in danger from the floodwaters. That situation demands particular attention.

It seems to me that instead of retarding the development of this flood-control project we should at least stop, look, and listen. The Little Sioux project is a thing in being. The work of redeeming the land and stopping the flood waters has been going on for several years. Our farmers are cooperating, devoting a lot of time and effort and even furnishing their own money to help complete the project. They are using soil conservation practices, are planting shrubbery and trees and are doing everything humanly possible to retain the raindrops where they fall. I therefore feel it is imperative to continue work on the project without interruption, and it should be completed as soon as possible. We

are not only dealing with the destruction of rich agricultural land, but are also dealing with human beings whose lives are placed in jeopardy every time the Little Sioux goes on a rampage.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. I want to call to the attention of the gentleman that the project which he refers to is also in my congressional district, and I think a good portion of it is in the congressional district of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. May I add, if the gentleman will bear with me, that the main part of this cut which I want to put into effect, namely, \$1,500,000 of it will come out of the preliminary surveys which will not have a thing in the world to do with the Little Sioux-Minnesota River project. That project is already authorized and in construction. I will admit that about 20 percent will be the rate of reduction in our particular project which we are both interested in. I do not see that that can do much damage.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman does admit his amendment will slow down the program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It will slow it down to the extent of 20 percent on the construction end. But may I say to the gentleman, if the Department sees fit it can take most of the survey money and utilize it on the construction, where this money should be used. The Secretary has the right to do that. I do not think, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa, if this amendment is adopted, it will be necessary basically to slow up any of these 11 projects very little, if any.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House I think it is well that I give you more information about the Little Sioux problem than has already been given by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. The Little Sioux Valley begins in Minnesota about 20 miles above the Iowa-Minnesota line, and extends approximately 100 miles from that point down into the district I have the honor to represent. There is approximately 4,000 square miles in the Little Sioux River Valley. We have had terrific rains and floods there this spring to the extent that in my district right at this minute thousands upon thousands of acres of the finest land that lays outdoors is under water. The part of the Little Sioux River Valley in my district is the lower part of the valley and hence it is the people in my area that suffer most from the floodwaters which inundated the land and will keep that land from being cultivated this year when food is so badly needed. I had a phone call last Friday from a very reputable gentleman of that area who said there were 60,000 acres of land in the Little Sioux Valley in Monona County and Harrison County in my district under water at that time, and that it would be impossible to get that

water off of thousands upon thousands of acres of that land in time to put in crops this year. I certainly would be the last one to ask the House to spend money that should not be spent. But I am not at all embarrassed in asking that the full amount in this bill be appropriated for this very necessary purpose. The Congress, with my help, has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to apply irrigated water on some of the poorest land that lays outdoors in the Western States and to make that land productive, but, when it comes to the point of keeping water off of the finest land that lays outdoors, it is a different story.

It does not make one from an area such as I represent feel very good after he has been kind to the Western States in appropriating money to place desert land under irrigation, to be refused a small amount, comparatively speaking, to keep the floodwaters off of the finest land that lies outdoors. Of course, the will of the House will prevail, but I do want my colleagues to know the true situation.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. This program keeps the floodwaters off of the good bottom farms of this country, does it not?

Mr. JENSEN. It does.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. How does spending \$1,500,000 for unnecessary preliminary surveys and planning, which cannot be used for years to come in actual construction, help keep the water off of your land? You want this money spent in construction, I am sure, in the upper reaches of the streams so that the flow of too much water at one time can be retarded or prevented?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Well, that is what I want. They are, however, using too much money for work other than construction.

Mr. JENSEN. Very well, but survey funds are also necessary for other watersheds.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not know of a man in this House who has fought more for economy than has the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], but I think the gentleman is making the wrong decision here. I know that he has the welfare of the people of his district at heart.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. I have a very good understanding of the matter under discussion. Do I understand that \$1,500,000 of this cut is to be taken out of surveys and investigations?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As far as I am concerned, yes. That is my intention. The record will certainly inform the Department as to where we think this reduction in the main should be applied.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman from Minnesota probably has the very best of intentions along that line, but if he had had that in mind I wonder why his amendment did not read, "No part of which shall be used for preliminary surveys." Then it would have had the effect of actually reducing the expenditure for this purpose, but he just cut the money. I am sure that he meant to have them reduce the funds for surveys, but had he wanted to do that, he should have tied it down in an amendment saying, "No part of which shall be used for such and such."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will accept an amendment to that effect, if the gentleman will prepare it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. ANDERSEN, all of us know of your great fight for soil conservation. But there is something else involved here. There are many small tributary valley-wide soil-conservation and flood-control watersheds in this United States that are now receiving attention by the Soil Conservation Service and Army engineers, that being the cheapest way for all the taxpayers to help conserve our soil and to keep our land productive and hence to hold food prices down to a fair level in those watersheds where the farmers have already contoured and terraced and filled gullies, grassed their waterways and done everything they could with their own money to conserve the soil. Now, this survey money which you say is in this bill is to be used to make surveys of that no-man's land between where the Soil Conservation Service can legally operate and where the Army engineers have authority to operate today. That is along the small streams or tributaries to the main stream. A number of resolutions have been submitted to the Committee on Public Works of this House for watersheds and flood-control surveys. The Honorable CLIFF DAVIS is the chairman of the subcommittee handling that proposed legislation. The facts are that that is the cheapest way to conserve the soil and to stop floods before the floods reach the lowlands and to keep the rain where it falls. That, my colleagues, is not only proper soil conservation but also flood prevention. I would hesitate to put language into this amendment which would deny the Soil Conservation Service, the Army engineers, and the Forest Service permission to make such surveys and investigations as they will make if money is allocated for that purpose. That also is very important. I believe the Members of this House who know something about watershed problems will agree with me that sooner or later we are going to have to treat these small watersheds as individual problems in order finally to get the complete job of soil conservation, flood prevention, and flood control done ef-

fectively. Remember that before the Army engineers or the Soil Conservation Service will operate on the streams, the farmers must have contoured and terraced, to a considerable extent, to keep the water out of the streams.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all time for debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, close in 14 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of registering my opposition not only to the Andersen amendment but to the Kennedy amendment to the Andersen amendment. We in West Virginia are interested in multiple-purpose dams, not in power projects. On two of the projects in my district the Agriculture Department is using money out of these appropriated funds that you are proposing to cut today. They have joined in the State along with the Forestry Department. What we need over in West Virginia, Mr. Chairman, is some trees back on the hillsides that will stop these flash floods which over the last 10 years have drowned from 60 to 70 residents of the State of West Virginia. Only last July 34 people were drowned because our forefathers did not have presence of mind enough to leave some timber on the hillsides. It is true that there will be no actual construction work on projects in West Virginia this year, but there is a whole lot of work that should be done both by the Forestry Department, Department of Agriculture, and the Army engineers in working up these projects. I sincerely hope we will not let our ideas of economy injure so important an appropriation as this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has been as responsible as any man has through the past few years, in seeing to it that soil conservation districts as such secure ample appropriations for the new districts created every year. This amendment however has nothing to do with that at all.

I am trying to cure a situation that the investigator from our committee said exists. He reported that this program, referring to the way the flood-control program is being operated, is uneconomical and is stifling the Soil Conservation Service. It is stifling it because other agencies of the department can come in and charge against this program for people it places upon its money that should rightfully be used in the Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service for the actual construction program under flood control.

Is there any good reason in the name of common sense why we should continue making more surveys, to the extent of \$1,500,000, than are absolutely necessary? If you will turn to page 760

you will see where the Department asks for \$250,000 for general basin investigations. That money, together with the larger portion of the near \$1,750,000 asked for to continue preliminary surveys and planning, could much better be devoted to the actual work upstream on projects already authorized by Congress. I am just as much for helping out my particular district as any man in the House, and one of these projects is partially in my district. I personally however do not object to seeing that project slowed down to the extent of 20 percent in construction if necessary so as to give to the Congress the opportunity to fully study this entire set-up.

We are at war and we can afford to slow down on even desirable public works so as to use our men and money in lines more closely akin to the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the gentleman from Minnesota has offered, according to my figures, would cut the works project here about \$1,000,000, even though it were applied to surveys. The gentleman from Massachusetts, motivated, I am sure, by the best of intentions, offers to cut the \$8,000,000 down to \$2,500,000. You know, that is typical of all in these times; we all recognize the absolute need for saving money, and we all can see where we can afford to cut out anything that is across the hill. With all due deference to my good friend from Massachusetts—and I listen to him on matters coming before his Committee on Foreign Affairs—I have a very strong suspicion in my mind that he is not a great expert on the conditions that exist in Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, West Virginia, California, Oklahoma, and a number of other States. Now, he is sincere in believing that you can cut those things out in those States and it will not hurt anything, and he is honest about it, but he does not know. That is what we here on this committee do every day. The gentleman from Minnesota read from the report of the investigation. That investigation was made because I asked that it be made. Do you know who put it in the RECORD? I put it in the RECORD. Do you know why I put it in the RECORD? To tell them to correct things that the report showed were bad. First, I had the obligation to try to find out; I had the investigation made and we found out and I had the obligation of putting it in the RECORD to correct it. I had the obligation of recommending to the committee to cut out enough funds to force them to correct it, and we cut this 15 percent. I think I have discharged my responsibility, but I am going to follow it up next year and see that they do. It is not a question of somebody else finding out. We get along fine in our committee. The gentleman from Minnesota and I and the other members of the committee council together. This issue was never raised in the committee; there was not one word said about it. I think that he knows, in all sincerity, that all of us want to do what we can. The gentleman from Iowa was disturbed about the

Little Sioux. Under the amendment on the desk you just cut out so much money. There is no way to tell how much of the cut might be applied to the Little Sioux.

There is no duplication here. The people in the Secretary's office that try to coordinate that are under a different appropriation. The Soil Conservation Service does have some of its people assigned to this work. The PMA has some. This is what I think is the best approach to soil conservation. First you go out and make a plan. Then your work projects are required to fit into that plan. That is what I think effective soil conservation should be; that is what it is here. But beyond all that, this is an obligation of the Congress. I pointed out to you that the problems that exist in my area were created by the Congress when you appropriated money to build these dams. In connection with it you gave assurance that attention would be given to this kind of problem. You said the people up above the dams would have to put up 50 percent of the money, but now, under this amendment and the substitute, you say, "Well, we have got the dams in and we flooded you out, but now we are going to welch on carrying out the Government's obligation to put up 50 percent of the cost of relieving the situation which the Government brought about; you would not assist them to open small streams and do the best they can, because the Federal Government stopped up the river down below."

I believe I have a good record for economy in this Congress. I believe I have a good record on this committee. I have investigated every chance I had where I thought there was any chance of doing good. I did it here. We made proper reductions, and we are going to follow up and see that this money goes where it should go.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendments will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time on the amendments has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 100, noes 96.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. KENNEDY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 110, noes 124.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 123, noes 95.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask

unanimous consent to proceed partially out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WHITTEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we had an agreement to start with, that we would have to object to any Member speaking out of order. I regret very much to object but this is the third day on this bill, and with the leadership trying to move forward, we must insist on the agreement.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is my recollection that that agreement was with reference to general debate only. I do not recall that there was any agreement with reference to speaking under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not want to hold the gentleman to any agreement he did not make, and therefore I will not object.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. REED of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not propose to deal with the highway question.

Mr. KEATING. I do, and I shall be glad to proceed in order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order and is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriation bill, and my remarks have to do with the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. Chairman, Hopewell is a quiet, law-abiding community in western New York. When a high-powered car charged through the town at 70 to 75 miles per hour, it was overtaken and stopped by police officers. The driver is reported to have said that he was acting for the President of the United States, that he had the President's sister in the car with him, and that "the President will be distressed if his sister is detained." The police officer, thinking that this was simply another excuse for speeding, although admittedly a novel and ingenious one, insisted on taking the driver into custody.

He gave his name as Grady A. Stowe and his occupation as a special agent assigned to guard a member of the President's family. He was not able to produce a driver's license. He was sentenced to be fined \$20 or imprisoned for 20 days. He paid the fine and departed.

Investigation then developed, to the surprise of the inhabitants of Hopewell and the surrounding countryside, that, sure enough, it was the President's sister traveling around in western New York in a Government-owned limousine together with two Secret Service agents assigned to drive and guard her. It further developed that the accused was from Grand View, Mo., the home town of the President's sister, and apparently a friend of the Truman family who had been placed on the Federal payroll for this usual assignment.

Justice of the Peace Warren Smithem, of Hopewell, wryly commented at the close of the proceedings in his court

that he would probably now receive a letter from the President.

If this violation of law had not taken place, it is questionable whether this newly devised method of squandering the taxpayers' money would have been brought to light. One can understand why it is necessary for the President's immediate family to have protection in the form of a bodyguard. But if this same privilege is to be extended to all the President's collateral relatives, a fair inquiry would be how many there are now receiving this kind of treatment, normally accorded only to visiting dignitaries.

It is reported also that this car was traveling in an easterly direction. If they were on their way from Washington back to Grand View, Mo., they would never have had occasion to travel in anything except a northerly or westerly direction. Also it would seem that, if a guard was necessary, one man ought to be able to do the job.

It is not the dollars and cents involved in this particular incident which constitutes the inherent scandal in the situation. It is the evidence of callous disregard for the legitimate interests of the taxpayers and wage earners who must foot the bill for Government cars, chauffeurs, and bodyguards which is the really serious element in this disclosure.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman from New York proceeding further on the ground that his remarks have nothing whatever to do with appropriations for the coming fiscal year for the Department of Agriculture but concern some picayune matter which seems to be of interest only to the people of Hopewell, N. Y.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. KEATING. The disclosures to which I have referred are symptomatic of the squandering of the taxpayers' money which we are seeking by the cuts in this bill to eliminate and put a stop to, at least in part. They indicate too that the need to improve the ethical and moral standards with relation to the waste of public funds in the Executive Office of the White House reaches to the highest echelon in that office. Let me hasten, however, to exculpate the President's sister. I understand she is a thoroughly estimable lady of high character. There was no reason for her to question the propriety of a sightseeing trip in a Government car with a driver and companion, all compensated out of the pay envelopes of American workers. Indeed, there was every reason for her to accept that as the norm of conduct for one with deep roots in the White House. The President has been taking everybody else in the country for a ride for 6 years. Why not his own sister?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on a point of order against the gentleman's proceeding. He is out of order and is taking the Committee for a ride by violating the rules of the House.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman would acquaint himself with the rules

of the House, he would know I do not have to ask his permission to address the Chair on a point of order. I further insist on the point of order that the gentleman from New York is not proceeding in order.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York must proceed in order.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman asked to proceed out of order. There was temporary objection to it, then the objection was withheld, and the agreement is that he can proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is in error. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] objected.

Mr. McCORMACK. A Republican.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a-590f), title III of the act of July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010-1012), and the act of August 11, 1945 (7 U. S. C. 1011 note), including research and investigations into the character, cause, extent, history, and effects of erosion, soil and moisture depletion, and methods of soil and water conservation (including the construction and hydrologic phases of farm irrigation and land drainage, and the construction, operation, and maintenance of experimental watersheds, stations, laboratories, plots, and installations and water regulation to conserve the soil and reduce fire hazards in the Everglades region of Florida, except that expenditures for all work in the Everglades region shall be limited to a sum not in excess of funds made available for such work by the State of Florida, or political subdivisions thereof); making conservation surveys and plans and establishing measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the silting of reservoirs); establishment and operation of conservation nurseries; development and management of land utilization project lands and facilities; dissemination of information; purchase and erection or alteration of permanent buildings; operation and maintenance of aircraft; and furnishing of subsistence to employees; \$54,278,000: *Provided*, That the cost of any permanent building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same to any such building and with the exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed \$2,500, except for eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed \$15,000 per building and except that alterations or improvements to other existing permanent buildings costing \$2,500 or more may be made in any fiscal year in an amount not to exceed \$500 per building: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the construction of any such

building on land not owned by the Government: *Provided further*, That in the State of Missouri, where the State has established a central State agency authorized to enter into agreements with the United States or any of its agencies on policies and general programs for the saving of its soil by the extension of Federal aid to any soil conservation district in such State, the agreements made by or on behalf of the United States with any such soil conservation district shall have the prior approval of such central State agency before they shall become effective as to such district: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the act of April 27, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 590a-590f), in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$265,000 of funds authorized for fiscal year 1951 for development of land utilization projects may remain available until expended.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 30, line 22, after the period insert a new proviso, as follows: "*Provided further*, That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the service."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in an attempt to make it possible for the work of the soil-conservation districts to proceed with more speed.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Personally I have no objection to the amendment. I cannot speak for the committee, however.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I know there are quite a number of Members who are interested in the point I am bringing up now. I want to impress upon the Committee the fact that we have shown here a great interest in all types of soil conservation from the watershed, the very crests of our great mountains, down to the deltas of our rivers. We are interested in that and we are urging that more soil-conservation districts be formed. We are appropriating more and more money each year for this purpose. Today the total number of soil-conservation districts in the United States is somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,300 or more. That is a round figure and approximately right.

Keep in mind that if the intent of this body continues, and I hope it does, it will result in a final figure in 1970 or 1975, when we have reached the acme of this program that we want, of 15,000 people working in the Soil Conservation Service. I do not quarrel with that because we are asking for it, but I certainly would do everything in my power to provide for per diem or non-civil-service people who can qualify for this great work, a lot of which lies ahead of us. That is the intent of this amendment which I understand has been accepted by the chairman.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has offered a very good amendment and I hope it will be adopted. I wonder if at the present time they have that authority?

Mr. HORAN. No.

Mr. GATHINGS. The authority to hire these civil engineers?

Mr. HORAN. No. We had a lot of trouble with that very item. This amendment will put them right on the spot as to whether or not they will do it. They have not been doing it and we have had protests from qualified civil engineers in some districts in which they have had difficulty getting technical service. The intent of the amendment is to bring out in the open that very point.

Mr. GATHINGS. I have prepared an amendment that would utilize the services, when practicable, of private civil engineers in connection with the conservation and use of agricultural land resources program. I trust that your amendment will attain that objective, if so it will not be necessary for me to present mine.

Mr. HORAN. They have that power now; the transfer of 5 percent of the conservation and use funds for the Soil Conservation Service work.

Mr. GATHINGS. Since the consolidation of the Soil Conservation Service offices with the Production and Marketing Administration local offices I have received complaints that private accredited civil engineers in counties that are not in soil conservation districts have been deprived of laying off the farms and doing this technical engineering work that they had formerly done. I hope that the gentleman's amendment will keep these engineers in business. They should not have to apply to the Government for a job.

Mr. HORAN. They have that power already, although it is on a voluntary basis.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I can see where the effect of this amendment will be for economy. This will be temporary help?

Mr. HORAN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Instead of the Department hiring people on a yearly basis, then having the possibility that many of them will lay around in the off-peak period, they will simply be permitted under the gentleman's amendment to hire technical assistants when needed?

Mr. HORAN. That is exactly right.

Mr. JENSEN. Then they will be removed from the rolls when not needed?

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION
CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND
RESOURCES

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Al-

lotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g-590q), including not to exceed \$6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; \$256,500,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1951, carried out during the period July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1951, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$25,250,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than \$4,968,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That payments to claimants hereunder may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive order No. 9069, of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1952 program of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to \$225,000,000, including administration, and formulated on the basis of a distribution of the funds available for payments and grants among the several States in accordance with their conservation needs as determined by the Secretary, except that the proportion allocated to any State shall not be reduced more than 15 percent from the distribution for the next preceding program year, and no participant shall receive more than \$2,500); but the payments or grants under such programs shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)), for the respective States: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted with the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing serv-

ices, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 33, line 4, strike out "\$225,000,000," and insert "\$150,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment on page 33, line 4, to reduce the \$225,000,000 figure to \$150,000,000. This proposal is designed to reduce the amount of allotments to be made under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended. It has the endorsement of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and all of you have received a telegram from Mr. Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which I will read. It is dated the 10th:

Reduction Federal expenditures absolutely essential part sound inflation-control program. Unless we control inflation, we jeopardize the freedom of all citizens, farmers included. Therefore, farmers willing to do their share toward accomplishing this objective. Specifically urge your support the amendment agricultural appropriation bill to reduce agricultural conservation program funds for 1952 crop year to \$150,000,000.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President,
American Farm Bureau Federation.

This matter is in somewhat the following situation: These funds have been spent or supposed to be spent for different items that have been handed to the farmers to use on their farms: Inorganic fertilizer to the tune of 50 percent; protective green manure crops, 15 percent; erosion-control practices, 15 percent; range and pasture improvement, 15 percent; and other items, 5 percent. The figure last year was \$235,000,000 and the budget submitted that figure to go in the bill for this year and the committee cut it to \$225,000,000.

The Farm Bureau at its meeting discussed this situation and they said this:

With respect to our recommendation of \$150,000,000 for the 1952 program, we reiterate our previous position that these funds be apportioned on the basis of need.

The encouragement of better farming practices which this program has fostered has been a sound public investment. Many of these practices have become interwoven into farming operations to the extent that many farmers will follow them because they are good business. In other words, the educational and demonstrational aspects of the program have served their purpose. The

existence of a firm demand for the greatest production of grain, fiber, and livestock products which can be turned out is an added reason for reducing these funds.

Then they quote their resolution.

That is a part of the situation. I have been up against that situation in my own territory many times. I have had many farmers come to see me about it. This is what has happened. Several hundred pounds of fertilizer would be dumped in the corner of a lot, and the farmer on whose land it was dumped would not even know it was there. At other times they have brought in fertilizer that was not suitable for the land in question, and left it with the farmers. Many times they have brought in lime where the soil was underlaid with limestone, and it would be absolutely useless to try to put lime on it with any desirable effect.

Mr. Chairman, we are right in this situation, a pretty serious situation. The Committee on Ways and Means is holding continuous sessions trying to find ways to raise money to pay the 1952 expenditure bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Every day you read of some group on whom they have increased taxes. Is it not about time that we take things in hand and undertake to reduce expenditures as far as it is possible, so that our budget can be balanced and we will not have to pay our debts with further inflated dollars? It seems to me it is about time we wake up to our responsibilities and meet them face to face. I know there will be farmers who will want to have this money handed to them, but this is not a soil conservation program. That is the item that was covered from page 28 to the middle of page 31. This is a program where we turn over money to the farmer to use on his own soil if he uses it.

I believe any friend of the farmer can come to realize that unless we do away with these things that are costing money and are for the benefit of individual farmers and for the benefit of farmers as a class, outside of such advisory programs as the Soil Conservation Service and such things as agricultural research, we are really doing them a disservice. The longer we carry on with those things and the more money we spend that way, the more we make the farmer subject to being a target of other folks.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman will be interested to know that a few weeks ago the leading farm paper in Nebraska made a check with the farmers in our State and asked them whether payments for certain soil conservation practices that benefit the farmer should be omitted from the President's budget.

The farmers voted 72 percent in favor of omitting those benefits.

Mr. TABER. That is the situation with the best of the farmers. The lights in the Chamber went out temporarily just a moment ago. The lights will go out for good if we do not begin to save money. Let us start now with an intelligent approach to this problem.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARSHALL as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 33, line 4, strike out "\$225,000,000" and insert "\$285,000,000."

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is this the item where the cranberry bog owners were paid to sand in their bogs?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is a part of this particular program.

Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest problems we have and which will ever face this country is the production of food, fiber, and oil which is needed. That is a huge problem. One of the greatest problems that our forefathers had when they came to this country was the conservation of our natural resources. The pages of history are filled with examples of how Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and Patrick Henry carried on soil-conservation programs. Patrick Henry said something to the effect that no man is a greater patriot than he who conserves his soil. They began that kind of work to conserve their soil. But in our greed to get the wealth out of the soil we have depleted our natural resources. We have depleted our timber supplies and depleted our soil. It is very questionable if any nation in the world has ever depleted its soil as rapidly as the United States has. Unless we do something to sustain the soil and to build up the resources that we have in this country we can very soon sink to the status of a third-rate power. All my amendment intends to do is to carry on a soil-conservation program for which the Congress originally authorized \$500,000,000, on the same basis that it has heretofore been carried on. The psychological effect at this time would be very bad if we were to say that we do not need food and fiber and oil in this critical period. We made that mistake in World War I. We did not pay proper attention to the conservation of our soil, and because we did not we went into a stage in our history, which is a sad chapter to look back on. The Dust Bowl grew out of the lack of proper conservation of our soil.

We have people in a number of Federal agencies who are interested in soil conservation. The Soil Conservation Service, which we just considered, has been doing a remarkable job. The Forest Service has been doing a remarkable

job. But over and above that the Production and Marketing Administration, with its agricultural conservation program, has done an outstanding job. One of the reasons it has been doing an outstanding job is that it can reach every farm family in the United States. Five and three-quarter million farms have an opportunity to carry on soil-conservation practices under this program. With an excellent job of planning this year and with the greatest of optimism, the Soil Conservation Service program will reach about 900,000 farms since its inception. This program year in and year out will reach and hence give opportunity to every farmer to comply with it. It is true enough that a leading farm organization, the National Farm Bureau Federation, of which I am a member and of which I am proud to be a member, has come out recommending that we spend \$150,000,000 for soil conservation for the next fiscal year. That spirit and that intent of the National Farm Bureau does not indicate what the Farm Bureau units in my district think.

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Last year the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation came out against the cotton bill. He made a mistake there, because we are in dire need of more cotton right now. Yet, he said the cotton bill 2 years ago was too liberal. I wonder what he will say on his fighting the cotton bill at this time.

Mr. MARSHALL. That indicates that it is possible for a human being to be in error. I think he is very much in error in this instance. I read his report before the Committee on Appropriations. His statement asking for a cut in this worth-while appropriation is not justified by his statement.

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman referred to the Farm Bureau Federation. I wonder whether the gentleman is aware of the division in the Farm Bureau Federation Board itself.

Mr. MARSHALL. I understand it was very close.

Mr. HARDY. My information is the vote was 9 to 11.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman. I am interested in his statement because I understand that the great Senator from the gentleman's State, Senator BYRD, has advocated that we have at least \$300,000,000 appropriation in order to carry on the proper conservation work.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I wonder whether the gentleman has any information to indicate whether or not this action on the part of the American Farm Bureau Federation may have a background of this internal fight in agriculture between Extension and the AAA, and whether this might be based on prejudice rather than on national interest.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is certainly not based on a knowledge of farm conditions. In every community of our country we see farms abandoned because proper soil-conservation programs are not carried out on those particular farms.

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it not true that Mr. Klein and a portion of the Farm Bureau Federation has for the last several years been attempting to get all of the soil-conservation functions under the Extension Service, and do you not think that this is really an underhanded way of trying to accomplish what they have been unable to accomplish otherwise?

Mr. MARSHALL. I know the Secretary of Agriculture has been doing an outstanding job in attempting to get organizations interested in soil conservation to work together. This Congress is interested in avoiding duplication of the various agencies engaged in soil conservation. The Secretary of Agriculture has made great strides in that direction. I hope that we will all give him an opportunity to make his program work. I would not know what is in the mind of Mr. Klein. I am talking today in terms of things which affect my farm neighbors. Every time we have a farm which goes to pieces because of improper maintenance of fertility, that farm becomes a burden upon the community, upon the county, and the State. Every one of us can go out into our districts now and see farms which have been abandoned on account of failure to maintain fertility. This program that we are talking about now of providing for \$285,000,000 to carry on the soil conservation program to the extent it has been carried on will not provide sufficient funds to completely do the job. It will provide funds to carry on the program to the extent it has been carried on during the last year. That is highly important at this time, because we are asking our farmers to produce, as they have never had to produce before, the food and fiber that is needed. We are calling attention to the fact that we must safeguard our soil resources. We must carry out a crop rotation program. We must carry on the seeding of legume crops to protect the soil. We must provide for green manure crops, for the application of phosphate. We must provide for lime that is so badly needed to protect our soil and our land and our grasses.

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. What effect would the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] have should it be adopted?

Mr. MARSHALL. It appears to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would completely sabotage the program and would cut down the payments to such an extent that after allowances for administrative work which it would be absolutely necessary to maintain there would not be adequate money left to

carry on these practices so necessary for proper conservation of the soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. The thing that we want to emphasize is that this is no handout to the farmers. The farmers contribute more than 50 percent of their funds besides their labor to carry on these practices. We are doing it in a democratic way, not in an autocratic way; it is not regimentation. The older countries say to the farmers or to their peasants, if you will, "You must do so and so." We do not do that in this country; we say to them that if they will carry out these worth-while practices that are intended to maintain soil fertility we will cooperate with them and give them part of the funds with which to do it. Just think what a wonderful thing that is in a country like this—to carry out principles of soil conservation in that matter. Just think what wonderful things have been done by this program and will continue to be done by this program, the building up of our water resources, the building up of soil fertility, the preservation of our greatest resource, the land; all those things which affect the future wealth and welfare of our country.

It will be entirely false economy to cut this appropriation at this time, because every dollar spent on this program renders a return of nine or ten times. We are going to need to sustain and maintain our economy in the very best manner we know how. It would be a very poor bargain to do away with soil conservation and let our soil be depleted. That is very poor economy, because we need every acre of it that we have; every particle of that soil to provide fine food and fiber to maintain the economy of our people now and for future generations.

WHY AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM APPROPRIATIONS SHOULD NOT BE CUT

The United States cannot measure the strength of its agriculture on its capacity to satisfy only home needs for grain, cotton, and other farm products. For this purpose, our lands and farmers are more than adequate. Since 1939, United States agriculture has been shouldering increasing responsibilities reaching far beyond our shores and we need to consider carefully whether farming is strong enough when measured against these world responsibilities. The United States farm program is now a world program and our allies and many other nations await with great anxiety the determination of our food policies.

During the past decade, the role of United States agriculture as a member of the Nation's defense team has been greatly expanded. During and following World War II, United States farms provided the chief guaranty of food security for ourselves and our allies. The urgency of the present world situation on the food front demands that our

agriculture be made strong enough to meet any emergencies that may arise. These demands require greater not less effort to increase and strengthen the production capacity of our farms—a production capacity which must be measured against the requirements of emergencies which may dwarf all past emergencies in intensity of demand on our agricultural resources.

The agricultural conservation program has and continues to bring about, a steady increase in the productive capacity of American farms. A high demand for food without equally vigorous programs to protect and improve our fertility reserves and expand the future productive capacity of agriculture involves risks our Nation can scarcely afford.

Periods of high production are periods of heavy drain on our soil, water, ranges and woodland resources. In such periods unless adequate programs are kept in force deterioration of our resources sets in unless labor, equipment, essential materials and supplies needed for sustained high production are provided and made readily available. Erosion and loss of fertility are a constant threat to food security. When conservation is slowed down the forces that tear down our agricultural resources speed up.

The cost of the agricultural conservation program is not great, in fact, it is small compared to the benefits. An appropriation of \$285,000,000 amounts to \$1.82 per person in the United States and its insular possessions. The proposed authorization of \$225,000,000 would be \$1.44 per person or a difference of 38 cents per person.

A food insurance policy at a cost of \$1.82 is cheap indeed. A saving of 38 cents would be expensive economy right now and a gamble on food production we as a Nation cannot afford to take.

The \$60,000,000 difference means much more than \$60,000,000 less soil-conservation and soil-building practices applied to the land. Farmers more than match the Government contribution and throw in their labor for good measure.

One of the most remarkable things about the agricultural conservation program is that it gets soil-building measures carried out far in excess of that expected from the payments made. The effectiveness of the Government assistance in getting measures applied to

the land in increasing volume and thereby strengthening the productive capacity of our farms has been clearly demonstrated.

Great strides have been made. In 1936 the use of limestone under the program was 3,600,000 tons. In 1949, 24,400,000 tons were used; however, it is estimated that 78,900,000 tons should be used annually. The story is similar for phosphate. The acreage of cover and green manure crops has increased from 5,900,000 acres in 1936 to over 17,000,000 acres in 1949. Before the program started, dust storms were becoming increasingly severe. Stripcropping, an effective wind-erosion control measure, was practiced on 6,800,000 acres in 1949. The acreage of land terraced under the program totals 16,900,000.

Little had been done about the western range prior to 1936. It was in bad shape. Stockwater and other facilities to obtain proper stock distribution and better range management are being provided for under the program but are still inadequate. Fifty-eight thousand stockwater reservoirs were built in 1949; however, over one million remain to be built. In the principal livestock-producing areas, pasture and range seedings of grasses and legumes are important to conserve soil and feed livestock. In 1949 over 5,000,000 acres were seeded under the program. This is more than double the acreage seeded in 1936. The increasing productive capacity of all our farm and ranch lands are our insurance of abundant food now and in the future.

The effect of incentive payments under the program is amply demonstrated in the following table which shows just a few practices. In 1948 the ACP authorization was cut to \$150,000,000 from \$300,000,000 in the previous year, 1947. The extent of practices carried out fell off sharply. In 1949, when funds authorized totaled \$262,000,000 for the agricultural conservation program, substantial recovery was made in the extent of practices applied, but it will be noted that the recovery was slower for permanent-type practices. This is to be expected as contractors become scattered or get on to other work, equipment is dispersed, and farmers hesitate to go ahead in memory of the previous years' programs.

Practice	Unit	1947	1948	1949
Dams to conserve water for irrigation or livestock or to control erosion.	Number.....	118,096	65,028	99,368
Drainage.....	Acres.....	5,595,076	3,290,880	3,718,559
Pasture and range seeding.....	do.....	5,238,232	3,538,076	5,035,975
Liming materials.....	Tons.....	29,285,677	22,284,542	24,433,957
Green manure and cover crops.....	Acres.....	18,617,621	13,914,487	17,379,703
Terracing.....	do.....	1,592,634	1,253,337	1,596,098
Farms participating.....	2,729,794	2,296,056	2,586,791
Individual practices carried out.....	5,881,647	4,396,756	5,494,622

The picture is similar for other practices, irrigation and water conservation, erosion control, drainage and the rest. Farmers just cannot carry out conservation measures if they don't have the money. The costs of carrying out conservation measures are up; supplies, materials and labor also cost more. When a farmer has to choose between spending

his money for daily necessities or conservation, the conservation loses out even though he knows that the conservation practices will repay their costs in future years. Many practices repay their costs only over a long period. Some even reduce income as compared with exploitation of the soil. Some practices do not increase production at

all. They do prevent its reduction by protecting the soil. Many practices are of more value to other land downstream than to the land on which performed. In general, the permanent and semi-permanent practices are of a type that repay their costs only over a long time.

Great strides have been made but much remains to be done. It is estimated that five times the \$285,000,000 I am asking for is needed annually to do the job.

Our agricultural responsibilities may be briefly reviewed.

Food and our growing population: We have a much larger population here at home to be fed than ever before and it is growing larger at the rate of about 2,000,000 each year. Our present population is over 150,000,000 and may number 170,000,000 by 1960. We must prepare ourselves to feed them diets that will keep the Nation strong.

Food and the ever-normal granary: The ever-normal granary was established in the thirties to cope with weather contingencies. We needed reserves to tide us over another emergency drought period.

Not drought, but war, emptied the granary and it was emptied despite phenomenally good weather. During the past decade, we have twice seen what seemed to be over abundant supplies of wheat, corn, cotton and other farm products rapidly disappear. Our own population growth and our international responsibilities leaves no doubt that we will need a much larger granary in the future.

Our farms must fill and maintain this more commodious granary. At the same time, they must fully meet the current requirements for food, feed and fiber.

Food and fertility reserves: Storage reserves, no matter how big we make them, are good for emergencies only. They cannot possibly be big enough for the long pull. We must place our dependence for food security on greatly expanding the productivity of our farms by increasing fertility reserves in our soils.

We have in the present situation, a far greater urgency for the creation of fertility reserves than ever existed before. Objectives must now go far beyond making up for our exploitative errors of the past and set out to create fertility reserves that will insure fruits, vegetables, grains, fibers, meat, milk, and eggs in such abundance as to fully meet the needs of our people and supply a lot for others.

Food and reconstruction: Immediate postwar years are usually those when food demands are at their peak and production the lowest. Reconstruction periods, therefore, begin with many people in war-torn countries desperately seeking food. These are years also when vanquished peoples are reconstructing their governments and seeking guidance and political principles to follow.

Food and friendship are potent answers to Communist oratory and discipline. Food helped mightily to stop communism in Western Europe; however, the margin was too close for comfort but the fact remains that we won

because we could deliver food as well as oratory.

The next reconstruction period will enable United States food, if the country is prepared to supply it, to be an enormous boon to suffering humanity and a most potent political weapon. Perhaps nothing could argue so well as the fundamental strength and decency of our democracy as could the fact of its having made provision to feed a hungry world when food was most needed. In fact, at no other point, is the argument for creation of great fertility reserves in our soils quite so eloquent as this relating to reconstruction period food supplies.

Food and the financial health and vigor of agriculture: The financial health and vigor of agriculture is a necessary condition for the continued upward progress in the further development and expansion of our agricultural resources. The parity concept of price support combined with orderly marketing and production through the operations of the commodity loan and allotment programs have contributed greatly in making it possible for agriculture to gain and maintain a healthy financial condition.

The agricultural conservation program gives the needed incentive and directive force and constant vigilance necessary to assure steady improvement and protection of our food supplies for the future.

These programs were well conceived and helped create a favorable economic environment for United States agriculture. Indeed, the improved financial condition of agriculture since the inception of these programs, has been the greatest single factor in accounting for the rapid progress made in conservation farming and the phenomenal production records our farmers have made during the past decade.

I do not propose to weaken these proven programs when there is such an urgent necessity to build up the fertility reserves in our soils at a much faster rate than has heretofore been necessary. The urgency of the present international situation and our tremendous responsibilities of our Nation adds force to the view that greater, not less, effort needs to be directed toward strengthening the productive capacity of our farms.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to arguments here for several days and I am convinced we have before us three fallacies.

Just before we rose last Thursday the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] had spoken persuasively on the subject of the value of the dollar. He made the statement that there had been a change in the dollar. The gentleman was absolutely right. The fallacy is that we think we are dealing with the same kind of dollar.

The 1900 dollar is worth 31 cents today; the 1939 dollar is worth 46 cents today. If you want a very visual demonstration, it would take this \$2 bill to buy what this \$1 bill bought 12 years ago.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have but a moment and I have three points I wish to make.

The second fallacy, is one for which I will use as an illustration the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. I will vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and I will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Somehow we have been sold the idea that these expenditures can only be made if the Federal Government makes them, that these things will not be done unless the Federal Government does them, that nobody can spend money unless the Federal Government spends it, and that money cannot be secured anywhere nor work done except by the Federal Government. That fallacy has arrived in the 18 years in the increased centralization of the Federal Government.

The gentleman from Minnesota, when he thinks about it, will agree with me that many of these things will continue to be done by all good farmers. When he talks about phosphates or fertilizers he knows we are putting fertilizer on our land because it increases production, therefore we are going to get more in the way of crops. When he talks about cover crops, he knows a good farmer puts cover crops on his land, as I have done, and many of you have done, because it increases the productiveness of the land. These things will be done.

Many of the things we are talking about in the appropriation bills will be done cheaper, better, more efficiently, by the States or by the local agencies or by the farmers in this case, by the people themselves.

The third fallacy I touch upon only briefly in the time remaining. This is the fallacy that we are in a normal time. We are not in a normal time. We are in a third world war. The Congress just 2 days ago by its action on the Veterans' Hospitalization Act declared that we were in a third world war and created the veterans of the third world war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we are in an emergency, we should declare by our votes upon this floor that we are going to distribute these responsibilities. We are going to ask the States to carry some, we are going to ask the citizens to carry some; we are not going to continue the centralization of expenditures and the centralization of power as we have in the past and this, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, would be an excellent place to start. I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I want to inform the distinguished gentleman that every practice that these funds help is done by the farmers themselves, as I am sure the gentleman realizes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, and more often at their own expense.

Mr. MARSHALL. Unless these practices are encouraged by the Federal Government they will drop off. And also I would like to inform the gentleman that during this time, and I am sure the gentleman agrees with me, the farmers are going to be asked to carry a tremendous portion of our production load and that they will do the best they can.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am sure they will and many of the farmers are strongly supporting this amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], in sort of a dramatic way, took some bills out of his pocket. He first showed us a one dollar bill and then a bill of a higher denomination and referred to one as a New Deal bill. Yes; I remember 1930, 1931, and 1932 when we had the raw deal bill. Those were the "raw bill" deal days; those were the days when the American people were sold down the river through lack of unthinking leadership under the Republican Party and under former President Hoover. Those were the days when cotton was selling for 6 cents a pound, when wheat was selling for 25 cents a bushel, when corn was selling for about the same, and when oil was selling for 25 cents a barrel; yes, when 12 to 15 million people were unemployed, and behind them were millions of others dependent upon them, their wives and their children. So, when in his Republican-minded way my friend from California talked about the New Deal dollar, he honors the Democratic Party, because it was the leadership of the Democratic Party that took the country out of the economic nose dive it had taken and brought it back so that today instead of a \$39,000,000,000 national income in 1932, last year we had a national income of \$270,000,000,000, and the national income this year will be higher.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us refer briefly to the amendment offered by my friend from New York [Mr. TABER], who made a sincere argument in support of his amendment, for whom I have profound respect. I come from a district that has not got one farm in it, but I know the value of agriculture to our national life. I know, studying history, that many great nations of the past that were great agricultural nations, became deserts when they forgot the topsoil. That four to six inches or more that is the topsoil of a nation, and which is the productive part in connection with agriculture, is vital in the life of a nation. I wonder how many realize the value of the fertile topsoil to a nation. Four to six inches deep, yes, but take that away, thin it away, then the nation commences to go down and down. The strength of our Nation lies in our industry, but without agriculture we would be dependent. I am glad that we are not only a powerful industrial Nation, but I am very glad that we are a powerful

agriculture nation. God has been good to us, and we have to keep that topsoil fertile; we have to keep it productive. I am speaking of one who realizes, from my study of history, what has happened to great agricultural nations of the past. Take many deserts that exist in the world of today. Yes, at one time they, too, were productive areas. Other areas of the world, great nations of the past, have come and gone, and invariably you find, as you study history, that one of the main causes has been their failure to conserve the topsoil of their land, the failure to assist agriculture in preserving its strength, in preserving its dignity, and in preserving its soil productive capacity. So, we in America, in appropriating money through the Congress of the United States for purposes of this kind, are not only making a sound investment in connection with our country as a whole, but in connection with our national defense. We are making a very important investment, because a country in these modern times, particularly with a powerful and active agriculture, is all the stronger from the angle of national defense because of it. And I am surprised to see my Republican friends offering an amendment to reduce the amount included in this bill by the committee from \$225,000,000 to \$150,000,000. We Democrats recognize the value of the topsoil. I hope the majority of the Republicans will join with us in defeating the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on what I conceive to be the thought of the subcommittee that has had this matter under consideration. You may not agree with us, but I think it only fair for me to come down here in the well and review the work of this subcommittee through the years, because our able chairman and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and I have served for some 6 years or more on this subcommittee which annually considers this item.

Let us once and for all give up the idea that these soil-conservation payments are anything in the nature of an addition to the income of the farmer, at a time when, to keep his place in this inflationary national income of ours, he must have in the neighborhood of \$40,000,000,000 a year. Certainly, in that light, this appropriation does not amount to much, so let us forget that.

Let us get on to the bill, and perhaps I might reflect the two attitudes that have obtained in our committee and the reason for what you find in the bill now. You find in this bill an appropriation of two hundred and fifty-six million-odd dollars for commitments which we made in last year's bill. Then on page 33, and that is what the amendments are addressed to, you find various amendments offered against the commitment for our

next crop year, that your committee thought was fair in the light of the information that had come to us and the various ways that we as a subcommittee reacted to the various pressures and arguments both pro and con on this item.

We arrived, I think, quite generally on the figures that are in the bill by give and take. We are here today defending our action. It is not anything that we did arbitrarily, because we have lived with this item. We can cut it or we can raise it, but I feel that our judgment was such that it should remain where it is.

Our chairman has been most eloquent in the past in pointing out that this is not really an appropriation that goes to individual farmers but is a protection against erosion and the loss of valuable topsoil, and a security and assurance that we are going to have crops each succeeding year. Our ranking Republican on this committee has been most eloquent also in pointing out the good work, in addition to this type of thing, that our local committees do.

Bear in mind that none of the amendments nor the commitment does anything in the direction of lowering or adjusting or modifying the twenty-five and a quarter million dollars that is in this bill and is involved in the commitment for next year that will go for local administration, the paying of your county committees.

I make this explanation because I feel it only fair that you have the advantage of our committee work.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before commenting on the pending amendment I want to express the appreciation of those of us who come from agricultural sections of the United States to our distinguished majority leader, who historically has stood in the well of this House and defended agricultural legislation and agricultural appropriation bills. He comes from a city; nevertheless, he has been a loyal friend of agriculture. I can say that he has that same broad attitude about other segments of our economy. It is a thing that makes him one of the great majority leaders of all times, in my opinion.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York is designed to do one thing. It is the beginning of a step to kill this conservation program. I am just as confident as I can be that if it were in the power of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] today to take his pen and write off this program for good, the gentleman would not waste much time in doing it. This program originated under a Democratic administration. It has been one of the things that has made the Democratic Party strong in the agricultural sections of our country. The Democratic Party has historically sponsored legislation favorable to the farmers of the Nation. I know there are Members on the Republican side today who are not going to support this amendment and who realize the importance of this program to their sections. In the brief time I have I would like to point out to the committee that we are all concerned with our production and in how much we can increase our potential for production in this great hour of crisis.

We are allowing industry to charge off expansion costs within a period of 5 years and to depreciate capital investments in that short length of time. We are actually lending money to steel companies and machine-tool companies at practically no cost or with a very low rate of interest in order to bring about greater production. The agricultural-production effort is just as important to our war effort as our industrial effort is. So it seems to me to be penny-wise and pound-foolish to strike at one of the most important parts of our total mobilization program. Do you mean to tell me this is not an important program? I have seen it work in my section of the United States. It has brought about a total change in the type of farming that we used to engage in. This very soil-conservation program has revised and revamped our entire agricultural system in my section of the country. Today—not because of inflation, but because of this soil-conservation work, land is worth twice as much in my section of the country as it would be worth if it had not been for this very program. It has worked. It is a good investment. It is not a give-away program. It is not a subsidy. We do not back off on subsidies for shipping and for aviation and other industries. This is not an actual subsidy. It is a capital investment in America.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. And the land produces twice as much as it did 15 years ago, does it not?

Mr. PRESTON. That is correct. That is the purpose of the program. The land produces more when you follow these soil-conservation practices. So I say to my friends on the right, from the city districts, I beseech you to follow the good example set by our majority leader. Let us not have a coalition in reverse on this amendment. Stand with your farmer friends and let us defeat this amendment and preserve this important plank in the program of the Democratic Party.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Taber amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that at this time I cannot agree to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. If we were not at war, I would vote for his substitute. As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has well pointed out, we on the subcommittee first took into consideration the point of how much money was spent under this program in the last crop year. We found that that sum was two hundred and fifty-six-odd million dollars. Last year, if you will recall, the Congress set the figure at \$285,000,000 for the program. The President saw fit—and when I say “the President,” I mean the administration—to impound last fall, as part of his \$550,000,000 savings, approximately \$28,000,000 which was in this particular fund and which normally would have been used to carry over into this crop year as a sort of revolving fund for the purchase of soil-conservation materials.

I think the position of the subcommittee should be upheld, because, after all, this is what we have done: First \$285,000,000 was last year ordered by the Congress for this year's program. Only \$256,000,000 was spent. We have taken this \$256,000,000 figure which was the cost of the program for both this year and last year and we have simply cut it about 11 percent, about the same amount that was cut generally throughout the Department of Agriculture bill. We felt that this program, regardless of how much we think of it, should also take its proportionate cut. So we have placed in the bill for next year the sum of \$225,000,000, and I do think that amount will give us a very good and effective program, allowing for the fact that we must save money for the war effort.

I am glad to see that this House has not tried to amend or question the actual \$256,000,000 appropriation in this particular bill for this program. By putting that in there we showed faith with the farmers. We promised them last year a certain program. We are simply giving to them that particular amount of money, although, as I stated before, the budget did impound the normal carry-over on this particular program amounting to \$28,000,000. We have also provided ample money for the proper operation of our PMA and committees right down to the township level. These committee organizations are the very heart of all of our price-support programs. I have fought for ample money for them ever since coming to Congress.

I might say again about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], that if things were not as tough financially as they are I would today vote for his amendment. In normal times we must have about a \$300,000,000 program if we are to hope to leave our soil to our children in more fertile condition than we found it.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman was talking about what the farmers had been promised. What were they promised for this program this year?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Exactly what we have in the bill. All commitments under the announced \$285,000,000 program are being taken care of.

Mr. TACKETT. I understood they were promised \$285,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The \$285,000,000 was the base for this year's program. It has not all been expended, as far as I know.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, I want to add to what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has said, that we announced last year a \$285,000,000 program. What we do in the spring is to state the amount the Government will contribute if the works are done. How much you actually owe at the end of the year depends on how much of the work has been carried out by the farmers. It was believed that the amount in

the bill would be sufficient to pay our obligation to the extent it had been carried out by the farmers.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. We did provide that under the basic law, if it did not cover the amount of work done, the Government would carry out its full amount to the extent of the \$285,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We have provision, as the gentleman has said, that, if it does require more funds than we have put in the bill, this fund will be made available. Any commitments made by our Government should be honored.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman knows as well as I do, because I have heard him repeatedly make remarks on the floor of this House, the cost of production which the farmer has to contend with. Therefore, during this time we need to think in terms not only of right now but of future generations, as a time when an additional incentive is needed to carry on soil conservation practices. In a short-sighted way, because of lack of information, we are in danger of failing to carry out the things that we all know we should carry out in connection with good soil conservation practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] that what we have done in the bill in proposing a \$225,000,000 program for 1952 is about halfway between the viewpoint of the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Farmers Union. Personally, I am a member of the Farm Bureau, and here is my card for 1951. I have been a member, probably, for more years than Mr. Kline. I do not agree with his contention that we should cut this program down to \$150,000,000, any more than I can agree to the contention of my friend, Mr. Christensen, head of the Farmers Union of Minnesota, who wired me today to support the Marshall amendment for \$282,500,000. I think if we go between those figures, about \$225,000,000, as we have placed in the bill, we will have as good a program as we can in good conscience ask the Congress to approve, considering the straits we are in today.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman has made the statement that we should give the President credit for impounding the \$28,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. You understand that I also gave to the Democratic administration credit for helping this soil conservation program through these years. I also want the President to

take the credit or blame, as you may look at it, for impounding that \$28,000,000 last fall. In effect he cut the \$285,000,000 program down to the \$258,000,000 program we here give funds for.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is why I want to straighten the gentleman out. The gentleman, as I know, voted for the Taber-Thomas amendment a year ago, when the over-all bill was up before us. The reason for the impounding of that money was the action of the Congress itself and by the vote of the gentleman from Minnesota and practically everybody on that side; you voted for the Taber-Thomas amendment, and when it came back from the Senate we abdicated our authority and gave our authority down to that place on Pennsylvania Avenue about which the gentleman has been hollering for the last 15 years.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly I voted for the Thomas-Taber amendment last year, and I would do so again. But never will I vote, and never have I voted, to give to the President the power to cut our appropriations. It is our job, I may say to the gentleman from Rhode Island, here on the floor of the House to do as we wish, and should do with these appropriations; it is not up to us to give our authority to the administration.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is exactly what the gentleman did a year ago, and he knows it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Not with my approval.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise largely to ask one question: Does any member of this committee know of any nation in the world, any nation anywhere, any civilized nation, that is wasting its soil like the United States is?

I think that is a question for us to ponder. I do not have at my fingertips the exact details in regard to some statistics that I wish to use, but I do have the picture indelibly impressed in my mind, and I can give it to you in substance. There are two counties in Oklahoma, one of which is in my congressional district, that have lost more topsoil in the last 40 years than all of Ireland has lost in 2,000 years. As a matter of fact, we have been the most wasteful people on the face of the earth with our natural resources, and especially our soil. It has become, I am sorry to say, almost, if not, a national disgrace, and it does seem to me that if there is any place in the world where we ought to be very liberal in carrying out a program, it is right here in the field of soil conservation.

You know, we are not the largest nation in the world as far as land is concerned; it takes the sun 8 hours to cross Russia, and Russia is more than twice as large as we are from a square-miles-of-land standpoint. China is just a little bit smaller, as I remember the square miles, China proper; but China, with some of its outlying territories, is a little larger. Brazil, as I recall it, is just a little larger than we. So if we are to maintain the leadership of the world, we must be liberal in this matter contained in this appropriation bill right here.

Then there is one other thing. I do not claim to be a doctor, but I am interested in the health of my family and

in my own health, in the health of my friends and in the health of America. I love America. We all do. We love this country. I am interested in the health of my fellow man of the people here in America, of you both on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle. If I read current literature correctly, and I think I do, the greatest health-giving elements in our soil are right under our very feet. The minerals that are vital and necessary to our physical well-being, we tread on every day. The most precious part of our soil is right on top and we are permitting so much of it to wash and blow away. If I read the health articles correctly that appear in our daily press and in our magazines and books, and if I am correctly informed, it is very probable that much of the heart trouble that is plaguing us, yes; and even cancer and other serious, deadly, and malignant diseases are, if not caused by, at least aggravated by, lack of proper minerals and other essential elements that ought to be in the food that we eat. It is not alone just the type of vegetables, fruit, and food generally that we eat that does us so much good, but the quality of it as well. We are permitting our very lives to be washed and blown away.

Yes, if we are to maintain this leadership of the world, and all of us want to do that, we better not start cutting here. We better support the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and raise it. That is what we ought to do; and of course we should defeat the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest regret that I find myself in an opposing position to some of my very good friends with whom I generally see eye to eye.

This bill teaches us that we people from the cities have got to take more of an interest in what goes on on the farm, because we are paying the bill. We are paying it in the form of the cost of food, and in this matter of appropriation involved, we are paying it, in addition, in taxes.

I think the point that has not been brought out as yet is what we are talking about. We are talking only about what individual farmers are to be paid for taking care of their own land. We have already passed an appropriation of over \$50,000,000 for advising farmers on good soil conservation practices and this is proper, indeed. We are not dealing with that now. There are also appropriations which have to do with building dams and carrying out drainage and other works—in this or other bills—in order to preserve the land. We are dealing now only with what we pay the individual farmer for using fertilizers, spreading lime, plowing under certain crops, and similar practices.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. We are talking about soil conservation on a national basis, area wide. I think if you were to compile the amounts in this bill for that purpose, including all of these funds, it would be in excess of \$325,000,000.

Mr. JAVITS. May I point out that according to the testimony before the committee it is made very clear what these payments are for. I should like to quote from page 539.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I gather from what the gentleman says that there might be a little element of payback here.

Mr. JAVITS. No.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that if that is involved here, God save the country.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree with the gentleman. Nobody has moved to eliminate this or to cut it 95 percent. The biggest cut before us is only a cut of 40 percent. So there is no paybacks in what I say nor is any whatsoever intended by me and I should like to stick solely to the facts.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am glad that the gentleman has prepared himself on this because, really, if there is anyone more dependent upon the farmer than the consumers in the city, I do not know who it is. The farmer is going to grow enough under any circumstances to feed himself. But those of us, like you and me, who are dependent upon that surplus which he has over and above his needs, which goes into the cities, are much more dependent on this bill right today than the farmer.

Mr. JAVITS. Might I tell the gentleman that there is no such thing as much more dependent? We in the cities are fully dependent upon the products of the farm and the farmer is fully dependent upon the city worker and employee for clothes and automobiles and machinery and often for the very fertilizer which he spreads on the ground. We are completely interdependent—city and country—and we should treat each other that way, and I propose for my part to proceed in that fashion.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, if he will get me more time.

Mr. SUTTON. As one who voted for public housing, coming from a rural section, I would like to say this: This appropriation for the soil-conservation program will enable your people in New York to buy food cheaper, because the farmer will produce more food at a cheaper price.

Mr. JAVITS. May I continue with my analysis of the situation?

The testimony before the committee shows the following—page 539:

The rates of assistance vary by practices and by states and area so as to make the most effective use of available funds. The average rate of assistance for all practices is less than one-half the cost of performing the practice, the farmer bearing the balance of the cost.

So what we are dealing with here is how much of the cost the farmer shall get from the Government, whether he

shall get 50 percent, 40 percent, 30 percent or what percentage he shall get, and on that I think the evidence from the farm areas is very good.

I quote now from the Des Moines Register, a newspaper published in the farm area, of January 4, 1951, this very year, and under an editorial headed "Here's a place to cut the Budget" speaking about these very soil conservation payments to individual farmers they say the following:

In other words, most of this Government money is used to pay farmers for performing good farming practices—not for conservation, in the sense of saving the soil for future use. Most of the payments go to the higher-income farmers who ordinarily farm according to approved methods. Relatively little goes to the poorer farmers who do not use up-to-date methods. Thus, the ACP payments are primarily an outright cash subsidy to high-income farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BURDICK. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, it has been said here that Mr. Kline, head of the Farm Bureau, has recommended this amendment. I received Mr. Kline's telegram. I also received more than 100 telegrams at the noon hour from farmers of my own district, including members of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, every one of whom has said that he was in favor of retaining the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment to reduce the authorization for the agricultural-conservation program for the year 1952. The committee in reducing this item to \$225,000,000 has, in my judgment, cut it far too deep. To reduce it further to \$150,000,000 would be one of the gravest errors this Congress could make at this time.

I am personally familiar with the benefits of this program in my own district. Through the aid which farmers have been given we have seen worn-out soil reclaimed and good soil saved.

The Government is calling upon American agriculture this year to produce record crops for the defense effort. Fertilizer is scarce and expensive. Unless farmers receive this assistance I am fearful that they will not be able to attain the goals set by the Department of Agriculture.

We hear a lot about the high cost of food and fiber. The only way to remedy this situation is through abundant production. Abundant production, in turn, is dependent upon the fertilizer and food and fiber-producing chemicals that are placed in the soil. This phase of the agricultural-conservation program is in every respect a defense measure. It is an anti-inflationary measure as well.

Many of the practices which have been approved by committees in my State and across the Nation are of a type designed to conserve the soil for the fu-

ture benefit of this country. Many of these practices require years before dividends are returned to the farmer. The average farmer simply cannot tie up his small capital in a long-term investment. He is forced to realize a profit from year to year in order to feed and clothe and educate his family. Unless he is assisted by the Government, he will not be able to undertake many of these practices. If he fails to do so it will not be his loss so much as it will be a loss to future generations of Americans. This is not just a farm program. It is a program for all the people of this country, a program for the continuation of a strong and productive America.

The program which this Congress has been sponsoring during recent years is going to pay dividends during this emergency. Soil-conservation practices have stored up a reservoir of mineral and organic substances in our soil which will enable our farmers to produce far more of the necessary food and fiber than they would have been able to produce had we not had an agricultural-conservation program. The big crops that will be planted and produced this year are going to take their toll. They are going to tap this reservoir. We will be making a mistake that we will live to regret if we start out on a program of taking more and more from the soil and putting less and less back into it. That is going to be the precise result of an agricultural policy based on stepping up production and simultaneously reducing the agricultural-conservation program.

I sincerely hope that the amendment to reduce this item will be defeated and that this Congress will go on record as being in favor of continuing at least on an even keel the great program which during these postwar years has become a standard policy of our Government.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think it might be said that inasmuch as the Des Moines Register said something that should not necessarily make it so. It might be that the writer of the editorial could have been influenced by their neighbor, Mr. Kline.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman may have a point there.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it may seem paradoxical for someone from New York City to stand in the well and talk about a farm bill. But when one considers it and gives it some thought they must recognize that we in New York City would starve without the help of those hard-working people who till the soil. During my service in this body I have supported my friends who have advocated the various agricultural projects such as this one of soil conservation. Our tall buildings may be fine as long as they are filled, and our factories are useful as long as they are working, but when human beings leave these places, they must be fed and their food is sent to them from your State and your State and your State.

So today I rise to support the committee and take issue with my distinguished

colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

I was impressed, as I sat in the back of the Chamber and heard a member of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] say, "Let us have no coalition in reverse." I agree with him. Let us have no coalition at any time. It was the Democratic Party that won. Only a few days ago when the people of my city suffered because of the vote on the housing bill, I am afraid we had what looked like a coalition. But that is past. Let us work as a united party because it is not your district that counts or my district alone. It is the United States of America. We want the city people to have homes as we want the farmers to be prosperous. We want the farmers to be economically strong, and I call upon my friends from New York City, and the metropolitan districts, to support the committee and support the gentlemen from the farm areas.

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

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish the gentleman would understand that the coalition did not include all of the Representatives from agricultural districts.

Mr. McGRATH. I appreciate that, and if the gentleman remembers, I said it looked like a coalition. But I am sure I was a bit naive.

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

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Does not the gentleman feel that at a time like this, I know the gentleman very well and know how he feels, we ought to speak not only of one party, but of one House of Representatives as Americans because that is what we are here for?

Mr. McGRATH. Why, definitely. I agree with the gentleman. The gentleman knows full well that in every speech that I have made in New York I have urged national unity. I have made some nice speeches about him, too, he has crossed the party line and done very fine things because he did that which he thought was for the good of the country. So I call on my colleague from New York City and Members from the big cities to support this bill. I am sure if we do that, the time will come when we can reason with our fellow members from the agricultural areas and they will understand our problems a little better.

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

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. We farmers from the Midwest are eternally grateful for the fine statesmanlike support we receive from gentlemen, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], now addressing the Committee. We sincerely appreciate it. I would further like to call the attention of the gentleman that in setting aside this money and saying that this is a program for farmers we are a little bit at fault when we use that term because this is a program for all of the people of the country.

This is also a program that will not only safeguard our soil but will provide a great deal of security to the city districts in the future.

I would like to think when we speak of this appropriation that it is not an appropriation for farmers, but an appropriation for America.

Mr. McGRATH. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I wonder if the gentleman does not mean that when we keep the soil the soil will keep us, whether we are from the farm or from the city.

Mr. McGRATH. The gentleman is correct. If we lose the soil we will be completely lost.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], and extend to you the appreciation of the farmers of the South for the great interest which the gentleman from New York shows in the welfare of all the people in the country.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Let me remind the Committee that the farmers of America are patriots. They are deeply concerned with the peril in which this country finds itself. Like all good Americans they are demanding economy and the elimination of all unnecessary spending. They are willing to do without some of the things to which they may feel themselves entitled until this emergency is over. A good many references have been made here to an amendment offered by me last week reducing public housing. I propose to be consistent and I am supporting this amendment for many of the same reasons that I supported a reduction in public housing.

I have always contended that we need a good farm program. I shall continue to support a floor under farm prices and I think that floor should be at parity. I am as strong in favor of soil conservation as anyone. However, let us not make a shibboleth of soil conservation. Let us not waste any money in the name of soil conservation. This amendment has nothing to do with the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. Chairman, I grew up on a farm, all of my people have been farmers for generations. The stability of the family-size farm is necessary to the stability of the Nation. This appropriation has nothing to do with the stability of the family-size farm. A reduction in this PMA appropriation will not hurt food production. It will eliminate some of the so-called soil-conserving practices. In my part of the country it will reduce tank building, fence building, and mesquite clearance for the time being. If we are going to reduce all other civilian spending, as I think we should, then we can well reduce this spending. A majority of the farmers in my district agree with this viewpoint. The farmers are willing to set an example for others to go by in the matter of economy.

This amendment has the official support of the Farm Bureau and numerous

other farm organizations who wisely contend for reduced spending and a balanced budget. It ought to be adopted.

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

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to my colleague from west Texas, a rancher.

Mr. FISHER. I also represent a district which is almost 100 percent agricultural and livestock raising. Practically every land owner is the recipient of benefits under this program. I associate myself with the gentleman from Texas in supporting the Taber amendment.

If the gentleman will bear with me for a moment, I should like to point out that all this talk about the farmers and producers being so strong for this program should be examined. A lot of them are realistic and know that we cannot afford everything we might like during this grave emergency. A few months ago a newspaper in my district asked me for an expression of how we can cut expenses. I told the paper, among other things, that a substantial cut could and should be made in the program which we are now considering. Following that time the directors of the Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers' Association, numbering some 11,000 members, every one of whom are recipients of benefits under this program, unanimously approved my position. The directors of the Tom Green County Farm Bureau Federation met and unanimously commended me for the position I then took. The Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association in their convention in Dallas 2 months ago unanimously took a similar position. The New Mexico Cattle Raisers' Association did likewise. These people are all recipients under this program, but they are deeply concerned about the plight of the Federal Treasury. They are disturbed about the solvency of this country and they want to do something about it.

As the gentleman has pointed out, this reduction will have very little to do with soil conservation, as such. We have approved the soil conservation in a preceding section. It will go on as it should. It is a great program and one in which I am intensely interested. But this is another thing, a program that can be reduced without doing any violence whatever to food production or the productivity of the soil during this emergency.

It is often said that economy is a good thing if it is applied to the other fellow. Here is a chance to apply it across the board. I have been one who has voted consistently for reductions in Federal expenditures when other appropriation bill have been brought here. I have not hesitated to vote against nonessentials in other measures. So why not apply it here and cut this appropriation by \$75,000,000. Most of the work will still go on. It is not going to hurt food production to any noticeable extent. I recognize, of course, that a lot of people like to get Government checks. But let us worry a little about the magnitude of the public debt. Let us look around for a chance to do some cutting, even though it affects us from the farming and ranching areas. Let us not say, "I am for retrenchments so long as it does

not affect my own people." Let us let it apply across the board.

Mr. Chairman, the people down where I come from are genuinely alarmed about the magnitude of the public debt. They are disturbed about the solvency of this Nation, and they want to make necessary sacrifices in order to put our house in order. But they do not want their money wasted during this emergency on non-essentials, things that are fine but which they can get along without. This reduction can be justified. It is sound. It is a little hard to take by some, I realize. It may not be good politics to advocate cutting such aid to one's own people. But I have an idea the people do not want all this as bad as some who have spoken here today claim. These producers know what the score is. They know about the public debt and the need for retrenchment. They know it should apply to all, and they are willing to take their share, regardless of what some of the statements amount to that we have heard here today.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

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

Mr. GOSSETT. I will yield briefly, but not for a lengthy statement.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say in reply to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], who has just spoken he spoke for the sheep raisers, the goat raisers, and the cattle growers, none of whom plow the land, and therefore their soil does not wash away.

Mr. GOSSETT. They get a large part of this money for so-called soil-conserving practices.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. If they do not need it, let the farmers have it who do need it.

Mr. GOSSETT. They are not going to get but very little out of this appropriation.

Mr. RANKIN. If they do not want it, they do not have to take it.

Mr. GOSSETT. There is a great deal to be said for the viewpoint of the gentleman from New York, with whom I do not always agree. However, in this instance I am compelled to agree with some of his observations. There are about five different farm organizations in every county in the country. There is the Production Marketing Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Extension Service, and usually the Farm Credit Administration. If we are going to be consistent, and if we are going to save this country from continued inflation due to reckless spending and save the country from economic collapse, we have to induce some efficiency entirely across the board. I, for one, intend to be consistent. When it applies to farm organizations, I say we can take it, and we will take our part of the cuts where necessary in interest of economic stability.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes, the last 10

minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, in 2½ minutes I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that they are going to follow Mr. Kline who does not have 100 percent support of the Farm Bureau.

Mr. JENSEN. How does the gentleman know I am going to follow Mr. Kline?

Mr. SUTTON. I was not talking about you; I was talking about the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JENSEN. I am not following Mr. Kline in this instance.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield.

I may say to my friend from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that Mr. Kline was against the 75-cent minimum hour wage; he was against public housing; he was against the cotton bill last year, against liberalizing it to take care of hardship cases. Now he is against this just because he is a disappointed office seeker. He was in hopes that he would be Secretary of Agriculture under Tom Dewey. Personally I would much prefer to see some man like CLIFF HOPE as Secretary of Agriculture rather than a man like Allen Kline.

Mr. Chairman, this is something that will bring down prices for you people in the city, because if you improve the soil you will get more production. So if you people will go along with us we will produce more for you.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] is a little drastic in raising it to \$285,000,000. I think we should stick to the committee figure of \$225,000,000. We should maintain this, for it has already been allocated. We have made the commitment to the farmers and we should not go back on our promise to these people, because it would prove embarrassing not only to the Democratic Party, but to the Republican Party everywhere, in Congress and out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, it is not the purpose for which this money is appropriated that my people back home object to; it is the way it is being used. I represent more cranberry farmers than any man in the world, and we raise more cranberries in my district. You came down there and paid men who had anywhere from \$10,000 to \$200,000 invested, paid them for sanding their bogs, when there was not a soul in my district believed that they ought to have done it or who believe that they ought to do it today. Certainly if a man can afford to invest \$100,000 in a cranberry bog he can afford to put sand, fertilizer, or whatever

it is they put on cranberry bogs, to make it grow.

You do not need to worry about the farmers; they will get along this year and next year; and you will not need to worry about production because plenty will be raised.

We are not destroying this soil conservation program; all we are doing is cutting down a little so that we may buy guns and munitions of war to protect our lives. No one should think the whole program is gone because the gentleman from New York moves to cut it down a little.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a question that will confront the American people for generations yet to come. We have been very slow in realizing just what we are really confronted with in the washing away of our soil.

There is as much soil in the world as there ever was; it is just at the wrong place. The time will come—listen to this—the time will come when the American people will be using the facilities and inventions of our modern civilization to take the muck, the soil that is washed down into the mouths of our streams, and return it to the land.

Let me give you an example. In the Philippine Islands they have been using rice terraces for 1,500 years. Every fall they would go down into the valley and dig the muck out of the bottoms of the ditches, put it in bags or sacks, and take it back and put it on the land. In that way they have been able to produce rice throughout the centuries on land that otherwise would have been washed away probably centuries ago. Their soil would have been entirely gone in many areas if this had not been done.

I realize that some of this money may be wasted, but I should hate to turn the fate of the farmers I represent over to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and let him try to teach them how to milk ducks.

He would probably be like one fellow who came down from the city and decided he would do a little farming. He bought a milk cow. When he went out to milk her she kept switching her tail; the flies were pretty bad. He took out his book and read where it said, "If the cow switches her tail, tie the tail to a leg."

He misunderstood that, and tied it to his leg. She broke and ran, and he said later that she had not gone 200 yards with him until he saw his mistake.

I represent more small farmers than almost any other Member in Congress. The average farm in my county is around 60 acres. It is one of the most productive counties in America. I know what this soil erosion means. I know it is something to which the Congress had better turn its attention, rather than giving billions of American money to Europe, Asia, Africa, Israel, or Japan, or to some other country that is not interested in the welfare of the American people.

As far as I am concerned, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL],

and if that fails I shall support the bill as reported by the committee.

We have waited too long now about rebuilding the soil for the American people now and for generations to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, this is one time when I rise to speak where I have no personal interest in the matter. I live in western North Dakota, one of the last virgin spots of prairie soil in the United States. Our soil has not started to deteriorate. Maybe 100 years from now we will have to dredge the Gulf of Mexico and bring our soil back, but we are all right at the present moment, but we are here legislating for the entire country, the North, the South, the East, and the West.

I know what the soil is in the East—while in Congress I live down in Maryland and you could not raise an umbrella on that soil without fertilization and soil conservation. The farmers there are too poor to afford to rest their lands and practice soil conservation without some aid from the Government. Many old sections of the United States are in the same condition.

You Members do not understand, or many of you believe, that we are engaged in world war III, but I believe we are. Do you want to shut off that weapon that will win this war? It has won every war this country was ever engaged in—I refer to food. If it appears to you that this is the thing to do go right ahead, in the name of economy which you preach this afternoon, and do it. We can live longer in my section of the country on our wheat than you can in the East on your manufactured articles.

I listened with great interest to the speech of that bonanza tractor farmer from New York—where his broad acres of waving grain are contained within city limits—the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and I hope I may be excused if I chance to depart from his advice on this bill. I was also eager to learn the position to be taken by that other prominent power farmer of New York where his vast acreage of waving corn flourishes on Fifty-sixth Street. From his actual experience in large farm operations I felt I must follow his advice. He said to me, "Do you know anything about this bill?" I said, "How could I? You know it all, so there is nothing left for me."

But alas! I could not follow the advice of either of these noted and distinguished farm operators.

If you want to curtail production of food in the name of false economy you can save \$75,000,000, but tomorrow or next week you will not hesitate to vote another \$500,000,000 to Yugoslavia, to try to win Tito away from Stalin. I do not know how these two gentlemen will vote on appropriations for foreign countries which will soon be before Congress, but it is a sure thing that many Members, who now preach economy, will vote for billions to be given away to foreign countries. Those who vote billions for foreign countries shout "economy" and almost shed tears over appropriations to

assist the people of the United States. This same situation must have arisen in Shakespeare's time for he remarked once, "Consistency! Thou art a jewel."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I think this appropriation should be cut below what we have been spending for this activity, but I do not believe it should be cut 40 percent as proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Neither do I believe it should be increased at this time as would be the case under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. You can say what you want, but this is a sound program. There may be some money wasted. I expect anyone could go out and find some instance of waste just as he could in the case of any Government program. But it is becoming a better program all the time and one in which the country is getting its money's worth for the amount spent.

It has been said before, but I think it can well be emphasized, that the reason for our high standard of living in this country is in the main, because we have had a soil originally so rich, and farmers so competent that 15 percent of our people living on the farms can produce enough food and enough other farm products to take care of the rest of us. You can go to China and India and the backward countries of the world and it takes 85 to 90 percent of the people to feed 100 percent. Here 15 percent can do it, leaving 85 percent of the people to produce the luxuries and conveniences which give us the high standard of living which we enjoy.

But we can do this only as long as we can maintain the fertility of our soil. Much of our topsoil has already been lost, much of the original fertility is gone. But thank God we are restoring it through sound conservation programs as provided for in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Does the gentleman remember when he was chairman of our committee and that great committee made a trip all over this country from coast to coast interviewing farmers, large and small, and, as I remember their reaction to all of the programs that had been inaugurated, they were more in favor of soil conservation, is that not correct?

Mr. HOPE. That is absolutely correct and I am glad the gentleman calls

attention to that matter because I can sincerely say that this trip convinced me as I had never been convinced before of the value of this program. We went into every part of the country, in New England, in the South, in the Southwest, in the Corn Belt, and out on the Pacific coast. We found there might be differences of opinion among farmers on other subjects but there were no differences of opinion on the value of this program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I was privileged to take that particular trip out West with the gentleman's committee, and that is my recollection. Practically every man or woman who got up to address this committee on that trip, at those three or four occasions, Denver, Salt Lake City, and Spokane, among others, were in agreement as to the good work of this particular program.

Mr. HOPE. My recollection, of course, is the same as that of the gentleman. At every 1 of the 12 formal meetings we held, as well as many informal meetings, the testimony on the part of the farmers was the same. They wanted this program continued.

And if the 85 percent of our people living off of our farms are smart they will want it continued also because they can only maintain their high standards of living as long as the farms of this country continue to produce abundantly.

I think the committee has acted wisely in making a moderate cut in this appropriation. Farmers want to do their share in balancing the Federal budget. But there is no logic and no real economy in making a 40-percent cut as urged by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I know of no legislative body which is more conscientious in its approach to questions involving appropriations than the Vermont Legislature.

In a sense each member sets himself up as an individual committee to weigh the pros and cons involved in the expenditure of public funds. The members are not niggardly or parsimonious. They can be and, on occasion, are very generous but they are aware, too, that there are times when appropriations are not in the general interest regardless of the worthiness of the purposes for which they are intended. Vermont appropriates funds to carry on the activities of government on a highly selective basis, and all such proposals have to be justified beyond a reasonable doubt before they are approved.

I mention these characteristics of the Vermont Legislature because it seems to me that it adds emphasis to its action in passing a joint resolution advocating that Congress appropriate \$285,000,000 for the conservation and use of agricultural land resources. This resolution was adopted only after the most searching analysis and I am sure it represents a studied conclusion that in Vermont, at

least, the merits of the program have been proven by results.

Some twelve to fifteen thousand Vermont farmers are participating in the program and in most instances they are spending far in excess of the funds received from the Federal Government.

To my mind even more important than the incentives provided to farmers for proper land use is the growing recognition of the urgent need for sound measures to conserve our natural resources as a result of this program.

The annual growth of our forest resources equals only about two-thirds of annual consumption. Nature requires anywhere from 300 to 1,000 years to create a single inch of topsoil, and about a third of this Nation's has been allowed to blow or wash away. It has been estimated that the annual cost to the United States as a result of uncontrolled erosion and water runoff amounts to about \$4,000,000,000 annually, and that only 100,000,000 of the Nation's 460,000,000 acres of cropland can be counted secure against erosion.

In a very real sense modern agriculture and industry are undermining the very essentials necessary to their continued existence, and it is most important that we recognize this fact or the time may come when we shall be unable to produce enough for our people to eat and wear.

It seems to me that to reduce the appropriation to a level at least below that recommended by the committee would be a great mistake, because this would have the effect of drastically curtailing efforts to meet one of our greatest national needs, and at a time when increased production is so vital.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

(Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. HALLECK.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, in my time here in Congress I have voted for most of the agricultural programs. I voted for the Soil Conservation Act. I did not vote for the Compulsory Control Act of 1938, and I have lived long enough to have many people applaud me for that action.

In the years I have been here, and more in recent years, I hear Members get up and talk about the great things these programs have done for the farmers and what a great deal has been accomplished by the Administration program. I am something of a farmer myself. I have owned a farm since 1935. I have a couple of them now. They are good, black, flat land out in Indiana, that produce very well. Practically all of that land is in cultivation. So when I talk about some of these things I speak from practical experience. I have here my north farm book, in which I have been writing down from year to year the prices I have been getting.

Let us not criticize the programs but let us keep the record straight as we see first just what happened in respect to farm prices until World War II came along. Of course, when you get in war

you cure about everything as far as prices are concerned.

I had that farm in 1938. Would you be surprised to know that that year I sold my wheat for 53 cents a bushel, my oats for 19 cents, and a lot of my corn for 33 cents? That is after we had had 5 years of these programs. Those prices are practically those of the depth of the depression.

Let us go on to 1939. I sold wheat for 57 cents a bushel, oats 23 cents, and my corn crop that I had that fall went for 40 cents a bushel. You farmers that know about these things do those sound like great big prices accomplished by some very efficient administration that rushed to the aid of the farmers? They are a little higher than they were at the depth of the depression, but not very much.

In 1940 what happened? I sold my corn for 51 cents. I sold oats for 26 cents a bushel. That is the record, and it ought to be borne in mind.

As to this particular amendment, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I supported a similar amendment—only an amendment that went further than this—back in 1947 and 1948. I took the trouble then to break down the payments going to my 12 counties out in Indiana, and they aggregated about \$1,000,000. But I supported the amendment to cut it to \$150,000,000 the following year and then to do away with it completely. I do not recall getting any substantial criticism for that action.

The trouble with this economy business is that we are all for economy if we will take the "me" out of it. That is the reason, knowing as I do that of this amount here to be appropriated, a very considerable amount will go into my district, that I am going to stand up in the House and say that it ought to be cut. I am going to vote to cut it.

I do not know how we are going to keep this country solvent unless we do that very thing. I could go into greater detail on this subject because, as I say, I am something of a telephone farmer. I know that out there we have learned if you sow clover with the oats and let it go to hay and seed, the second year you can raise two wacking corn crops right after that. You do not have to pay the farmers out there to plant some of his land to clover in a good crop rotation practice. He is going to do that anyway.

The cuts here proposed will leave plenty of money to carry on this program wherever it needs to be carried on.

Again may I say I do not know of any way we can meet the challenge which confronts us here as duly elected representatives responsible for the solvency of our Government—yes, and for the value of the dollar—unless we are willing to make these cuts and to make them even where it may hurt a little.

Very shortly we are going to struggle again with the question of price controls and wage controls. A great many farm people are disturbed about price and wage controls. They see what they do to them. One of the things basically which needs to be done is to put our financial house in order. When we do

that we will begin to preserve and protect the value of the dollar which in my opinion is No. 1 on the domestic agenda for this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, coming from that great nonpartisan State of California, I hate to see partisanship brought into the discussion on this measure. We have been giving, or rather the Democrats have been taking credit for the soil-conservation program. We should go back a little further, some 85 years ago when Mr. Lincoln was President of the United States. He had enacted the soil-conservation measure and for some 70 years following that nothing was ever done to start soil conservation. If we are going to give anybody credit for this, you might say that out of the depression was born soil conservation, because it was primarily started to take care of the unemployment throughout the country.

I had two ranches in the Gold Ridge Conservation District which was the first district to be formed in California. I know what this program is and I have had the benefit of some of it. I believe, however, the amendment to increase this fund should be defeated. The farmers in my district are asking for economy and they are willing that economy be practiced in the field of agriculture as well as elsewhere. I just received a copy of a letter from the secretary of the Gold Ridge Soil Conservation District, and I would like to read it to you. It is directed to Mr. Waters S. Davis, Jr., National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

The letter is as follows:

GOLD RIDGE SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Sebastopol, Calif., April 30, 1951.

WALTER S. DAVIS, JR.,
National Association of Soil Conservation
Districts,
League City, Tex.

DEAR SIR: We directors of the Gold Ridge Soil Conservation District, Sebastopol, Calif., are of the belief that the Conservation District movement is the democratic way of doing the conservation job. The entire program is directly in the hands of the farmer. We now have 75 percent of the Nation's farms and ranches within soil conservation districts. These districts if given a free hand and the time, can complete the conservation job ahead without farmer-conservation-subsidy. Conservation farming is profitable, and we are therefore interested in making conservation work pay its own way. At present there are two methods of selling conservation farming to the farmer; one is the soil conservation district method which fundamentally is adjusting farming to fit the land and may involve several farming practices on the same acre of land, the other method is the practice subsidy program which does not necessarily give the farmer a portion thereof sufficient consideration for a sound land use and farming economy.

We believe that the soil conservation district program should be given the chance to do the job for which it has been equipped without interference from any other program which divides authority on conservation.

The soil conservation district program is working. The program does not come from Washington and as farmers learn to differentiate the Government program from their

own district program they find a distinct and enduring liking for the latter.

Sincerely yours,

GOLD RIDGE SOIL CONSERVATION
DISTRICT,

D. H. FOUTS,

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,

By D. H. FOUTS, Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] is recognized.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Taber amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to protest against the efforts of those who would curb us who are trying to maintain the fertility of our soil during this period of emergency. We are asking the farmers of this country to produce beyond anything they have ever done. The Department of Agriculture says that it will take more than 21,000,000 additional acres in soil-depleting crops than we had last year. This means we should increase our attention toward the preservation of the fertility of our soil. After all this soil conservation payment is only a payment in that it is a contribution toward the cost of soil-improving practices. Prior to the time of this program this country had wasted its resources at a faster rate than any country in history. Under this program the Government puts up about a third of the cost and the farmer puts up about two-thirds of the cost, but the total amount goes into the restoration of our soil and its productive capacity. This Nation has expended billions of dollars since the last war in foreign-aid programs. Many of them I have voted against. Nevertheless, we have through that means required in the spending of counterpart funds much larger sums on the restoration of the forests and soils of foreign nations than is involved in the present appropriation.

Today we have large food shortages in our own Nation, and yet a big part of available food comes from the fact that we have in the last 10 or 12 years given attention to increasing the ability of our pastures, through pools and grasses and other means to support more and more cattle. Through these programs we have increased the production of our soil. We have gained 19,000,000 people in the last 10 years. At that rate of increase the demands upon our soil will become ever greater as the years go by.

Prior to the present emergency we had very strict limitations upon the production of cotton and many other commodities. In my section of the country it meant that many farmers had to convert their farms to other commodities rather than cotton. The soil program helped tremendously to meet that need of converting over to beef or some other commodity which was required by law passed by this Congress.

I plead with you not to be short-sighted as to reduce this program. In my judgment it should be strengthened. Other countries are in the shape they are in today because they have consistently taken more out of the soil than they put back in. For the period of our history we have been more guilty of that than any other nation in history. A few years ago we set out to stop the drawing

out of more than we put back into our soil. Now of all times we should strive in every way to continue that policy of preserving for future generations the ability and capacity of this country to give us adequate food and fiber to maintain the high standard of living which we now enjoy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, my record in voting for economy in the operation of Government will, I believe, stand the test of severest scrutiny. I am just as much in favor of eliminating wasteful expenditures in our agricultural program as I am in other and unrelated Government undertakings. In supporting the position of the committee on this amendment, I am thoroughly convinced that the ends of economy will be served, but that further reductions in appropriations for this program, such as proposed in the Taber amendment, would, in the end, react against the cause of economy, and would, to all intents and purposes be an act of false economizing.

No program ever undertaken by a department of the Government has met with such signal success and general acceptance as has our program of soil conservation. God has blessed us with the gift of fertile soil; the maintaining of that fertility is a responsibility which we must assume ourselves. We owe it not only to ourselves, but to future generations, to see that their inheritance will not be a land devoid of fertility and incapable of producing the food and fiber necessary to sustain life. Mr. Chairman, I intend to oppose the Taber amendment and the Marshall substitute; and, instead, to support the bill as originally presented to the House by the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, on which may able friend and colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], has done such a magnificent job.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I, of course, understand that the soil-conservation program is not the program of any person or political party. This great program came into being because Members of Congress of both parties were impressed with the importance of protecting and conserving the soil of this great Nation. During the consideration of the legislation which finally was enacted and culminated in this very worthwhile activity, partisan politics did not once lift its ugly head. In the success of the soil-conservation program all Members of Congress can take just pride. No one person or political party should claim full credit. It might well be said that this agency of the Government is a child with two parents, the Democratic and Republican Party.

The gentleman who has just preceded me mentioned Abraham Lincoln, the patron saint of the Republican Party. It was exactly 89 years ago today that

Abraham Lincoln signed the bill which created the Department of Agriculture of the United States Government. In considering the matter now before us we should not be actuated by the spirit of partisan politics.

As I have listened to this debate and to the arguments which have been submitted for and against the pending amendment, I have been keenly conscious of the meritorious activities of this great agency of the Government. A distinguished North Carolinian, Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, is frequently referred to as the father of soil conservation for the reason that he has done more to make the people of our Republic soil conscious. Dr. Bennett, as no other man in all history, aroused all America to the sad realization that we were rapidly depleting the fertile topsoil of our farm lands. Once aroused, the people of the country sought to do something about the situation. Under this great program farmers have been taught something about the arts of agriculture and the value of diversified farming and soil-building practices. While I appreciate the fact that the soil-conservation program we are now discussing is not the program of the Soil Conservation Service, the agency which Dr. Bennett directs, it is nonetheless a program of importance and one which goes hand in hand with all of the programs of the Soil Conservation Service. Unfortunately, on account of a lack of both money and manpower, the Soil Conservation Service has not been able to reach or to serve all of the families of the Nation, but it is making great progress and bringing great lessons to all of the people of America. Through the program we are now discussing we have reached more farmers and have encouraged better practices on more farms than the Soil Conservation Service has been able to reach or to serve. Actually this program working alongside of the Soil Conservation Service has just about revolutionized agriculture in my district and in my State. Our people have been encouraged to diversify their farming and to preserve their soil and to engage in soil-building practices. They have not only been encouraged, but by these payments have been induced and persuaded to engage in many activities beneficial to their farms and better farming. North Carolina farmers have been encouraged to increase their pasture lands and to go into the business of producing beef cattle and building dairy herds, and under the program we are making magnificent progress.

Perhaps this program should be refined or altered or changed, but this is neither the time nor the place for us to make such modifications or changes. If the program is to be improved, the matter should be considered first by the legislative committee charged with the responsibility of drafting legislation. If certain farmers are receiving benefits which they should not receive, that is a matter which should be considered, and I assure you that it will be considered, and if it appears that legislation should be presented, I can assure you that our committee will present it. I urge you not to destroy or to peril this program

which has meant so much to the farmers of the Nation and which will mean so much to generations yet unborn.

We must look down the long corridors of time; yes, down the road a thousand years from now, to evaluate this program properly. No man knows the value of an acre of land. Not all of the mathematicians, economists, and experts in all of the departments of the Government can tell us the actual value of the top soil of even one acre of American farm land. If it is protected through the years, it will be a blessing to generations yet unborn. We are here engaged in a program, the primary purpose of which is the storing up for future use of the fertility of the farm lands of our country, and, I repeat, the richest resources of our Nation.

If this Nation is to continue on the road of progress, we must maintain our agricultural economy and we must protect the foundation upon which that economy must be built, and that is upon the farms and ranches of America.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate our good friend the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, and the members of his subcommittee. Yes, I want to congratulate all the friends of agriculture and all of the farsighted members of the Appropriations Committee. They have made a contribution to the cause of economy and have, in a scientific way, made many reductions and accomplished many economies. I urge you again not to use an awkward meat ax on this important appropriation. I hope that the Taber amendment will be defeated and that you will stand by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and his committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is to be complimented for dragging this discussion above the partisan level. I certainly cannot understand the kind of political argument that dragged us back to the days of 1931 and 1932, when we had a Democratic House and a Republican in the White House and laid all the ills at the White House door, but when you come to talk about the Republican Eightieth Congress and a Democrat in the White House, that same gentleman seeks to lay all the ills of the country at the door of the Congress instead of the White House. In the same kind of partisan vein we hear this appeal against a coalition. If I ever heard an appeal for a coalition, and a disgraceful coalition at that, it was the argument on the part of the city folks, "We are going along with you and vote for this, but don't forget us when public housing comes around," a disgraceful coalition to raid the Treasury of the United States.

I think I represent as good an agricultural district as lies beneath the sun in this country, but I do not think the dairy farmers of Wisconsin want me here to be for economy for everybody else but

to consider the dairy cows of my district as sacred cows. I concur in what the Farm Bureau has said, that the need for economy is so great that we must all bear a share of the burden that has to come from it, and I am going to support the Taber amendment down the line.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this amendment should be an illustration of the importance of trying to do the reasonable thing rather than trying to do the spectacular thing. Of course, we are all for economy. I think most of us sincerely want economy. I think we would all like to see the expenditures of government reduced. But is the pending Taber amendment likely to result in any reduction of Government expenditures? If a majority of this House votes for it this afternoon, it will look good in tomorrow morning's papers, but do you really expect such a meat-ax cut to be sustained in the other body? Is it not reasonable to suppose that by accepting the committee figure you can actually reduce governmental expenditures by \$60,000,000, whereas by passing an extreme amendment you may well achieve nothing more lasting than your name in tomorrow morning's papers? Do you want to cut expenses or do you want publicity?

I think we can reduce the expenditures of government. I think this committee has done a splendid job in reducing expenditures. It has brought in a bill which consistently reduces the sums appropriated for about every agency of the Department. It has made a \$30,000,000 cut on a very vital activity of the Department. That is a very large cut, almost 25 percent. It is a much larger cut than we have made on most other items. Now it is urged that we record ourselves as favoring a gesture of a 50-percent cut, which would probably never be more than a gesture. It seems to me you get over on the ground of being ridiculous when you cut that far. Let us keep our promises within the realm of our ability to deliver.

Let us not get off on wild extremes; let us not try to make this a matter of partisan advantage or of personal advantage. I think that it must be fairly said that within the last 6 years we have had two great chairmen of the Committee on Agriculture, the present chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and our immediate past chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. One is a Democrat, the other a Republican. Under both these men we have had, I think most intelligent, enlightened, and progressive leadership of agriculture in this country. The same can be said for the two gentlemen who have during the same period served as chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

I think it is a sad day when anyone appears on this floor and tries to use a program of this kind to promote votes for either the Democratic or the Republican party; I think it is a sad day when the extreme left wing or the extreme right wing comes out here and uses this great program of maintenance

of the fertility of our soil as a means of keeping someone in or putting someone out of Congress. I think it is far better that we try to follow a policy that will feed our children for a thousand years, a policy that will guarantee to America the ability to maintain a high standard of living for generations yet to come.

If you go so far as to destroy this program, you jeopardize the whole future of this country. If you go to the other extreme proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], I fear we might indeed halt all of the desirable trend toward real economy. We must cut appropriations. We must cut those which mean most to our own interest if we are to expect any reductions to the appropriations in which we are not directly interested. I have been voting for cuts all along the line. I propose that we join with the committee in making a \$60,000,000 cut on an item which is especially dear to me and to my people, but I cannot concur with those who would single out our conservation program for a cut of nearly 50 percent when I know that the results of this program are probably the most lasting of any for which we make appropriations. I urge you to follow a reasonable, a common-sense, and a nonpartisan course of action.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Taber amendment. First, I would like to echo what my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], has just had to say about the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. If you have examined the report which accompanies the bill and the analysis of the various items which appear in the back of the report, you will not find a single plus mark opposite the amounts appropriated. With the exception of a very few items, each and every recommendation made to the Appropriations Committee by the Bureau of the Budget was materially reduced by this economy-minded committee. The committee has made substantial cuts in almost every item and increased none above the budget recommendation. Those of us who advocate and fight for economy should express our thanks to this committee.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has just said, this committee reduced this particular item not by just a nominal sum, but by \$60,000,000. I am one of those who has been voting for a majority of the economy amendments that have been offered on this floor. And I want to say to you that I would be voting for an amendment to reduce this appropriation if the committee had not already done a good job itself. Now when the subcommittee has recognized the necessity for a reduction in appropriations and has acted accordingly by reducing this item by \$60,000,000 and the over-all appropriation bill by more than 12 percent, then I think that is all we or the public can reasonably expect.

I think it is rather unfortunate that some of the officials of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which I think is one of the outstanding farm organ-

izations of America, have gotten themselves involved in support of this amendment.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. I wish to point out that the Farm Bureau Federation is taking the position it takes by virtue of a one-vote margin. Had other members of the committee been present they would not have taken the position they are taking. I know that from the Farm Bureau people in my State.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to my former chairman, whom the Republicans would do well to follow on this amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not the position of the Board of Directors of the Farm Bureau rather than the position of the members of the Farm Bureau?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Both of my friends are correct. As I was saying, I think it is most unfortunate that the bureau has become involved in this amendment. I have a very high regard for Allan Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau. I credit him with having done much for the good of American agriculture. There are times, however, when I must differ with him and this is one of those times. In passing, I think I should say that, in my judgment, a vast majority of the Bureau members would oppose this amendment. It so happens that I am a member of the Bureau, in good standing, I hope, and I certainly oppose it.

A few years ago, the House Committee on Agriculture under the able leadership of my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], traveled from one end of this country to the other. We visited in New England, the Middle Atlantic States, the South, the West, and far West. We traveled by bus so that we might make frequent stops. We met farmers in small towns, on the farms, and on the roadsides. At every stop we asked questions about this program. There were differences of opinion on several of the programs inaugurated for agriculture but this is the one program on which we found unanimous agreement. It has remolded American agriculture. It came almost too late but our farmers and the country as a whole are thankful that it came in time.

Land fertility is our greatest natural resource. It must be preserved. Year in and year out, in good times and bad, so long as this Nation shall exist, people and productive land will be the principal elements upon which we must depend for prosperity and security. It might be a fair statement to say that the world position of the United States a century hence may be foretold now by the manner in which we guard our resources, particularly our people and our land.

By comparison with Europe ours is a young country. By comparison with the ancient civilizations of Asia and Africa, it is still younger. Yet, in the century and a half since our people began to sweep

over the Alleghenies, across the prairies of the Middle West, through the Rockies and Sierras and on to the Pacific, we have run through vast stocks of productive land and timber. We have depleted our basic wealth faster by far than any other nation in history. Another century and a half of equal waste could make the United States a historical "has been," unable to feed its own people adequately, much less to use its food and fiber, as now, to encourage peace and democracy on the earth.

Our cropland has remained remarkably stable for a quarter of a century indicating that we have at long last reached the approximate limits of net expandable cropland. What we have gained by taking in new cropland during the past 25 years, we have lost to an equal extent in land discarded for crops due to loss of soil fertility.

We thus face the cruel truth that we can no longer expand onto and exploit virgin fertile soils; but must face the necessity of husbanding our soil resources in the future to even maintain our land supply in the face of a large prospective expansion of mouths to feed.

The seriousness of the situation is further accentuated by the fact that we have not learned to check our frightful waste of soil. Erosion damage is still going on at a rate of \$2,000,000,000 of impairment of our farm lands per year. We have already practically ruined for further tillage a fifth of our tillable land.

I know that you have heard over and over these startling facts told in various ways. I repeat them only to emphasize that this waste is continuing in the face of a still growing population and a rigidly stable crop acreage for the past quarter of a century.

With few exceptions there are no more virgin lands. It is therefore of extreme consequence that the loss of soil fertility be checked. May the day never come when this great country of ours will become a mass importer of food as are many countries of the world today. But it can happen. May the day never come when our farm people will be forced to further crowd into our already overcrowded cities for a livelihood. That, too, can happen. Why, in the last 10 years approximately 20 percent of the people have left the farms and moved to the cities. Many left because they had permitted their lands to become so depleted that they could no longer be profitably farmed. With a little more incentive they might have remained and restored the fertility required to make the land economically productive.

There is new hope now through soil conservation. We are checking this terrible waste of our natural wealth and restoring farm life to the enviable independence which it offers.

Mr. Chairman, it is in the interest of the farmer and the consumer, it is in the interest of this and generations to follow, it is in the interest of everyone, that our soil be preserved.

Mr. Chairman, the Taber amendment which concededly will reduce and hamper our soil-conservation program is a step in the wrong direction. It should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I wish to compliment the committee for the good job it has done on this bill as a whole. I yield to no Member of Congress in my support for funds for genuine soil-conservation practices. Mr. Chairman, I honestly believe that the farmers of America as a group are the deepest thinking people in America and are to a degree more concerned about the future of America than most any other group in our Nation. They know we must reduce our staggering Federal expenditures and they are willing to take their share of the cut. I am sure that is a correct and a fair statement of their position. So I shall support the amendment to reduce this appropriation for next year in the sum of \$50,000,000 below the amount recommended by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is very apparent that some of the folks from the city districts do not understand the value of the farm to the welfare of all. May I remind those Members that for every dollar the farmer takes in, labor received \$4.20 in wages and for every dollar the farmer takes in the businessman receives \$4.10 in trade and that the national income over the past 20 years since our farms have become mechanized has been almost exactly seven times the farm income. Please remember that all wealth springs from the soil. It follows that if the farmer does not get along then certainly the city folks will have a bad time. If we do not conserve our precious soil certainly our children and their children will suffer no end. But I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers of America are willing to take a cut in this appropriation and they will still conserve the soil. They know this House has made cuts already in many Federal agencies, and the farmers are ready and willing to take their share of cuts under present conditions in order to stave off national bankruptcy. I know that is a fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] to close the debate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, General MacArthur, when he was testifying before a committee of the Senate was asked about China by Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and this was his answer:

It is a country of poverty. The slightest dislocation in their normal processes of distribution causes the greatest convulsions in various sections of Chinese society. If you, for instance, disturb in the slightest degree the distributive systems of their food, you might well have 50,000,000 men, 50,000,000 people, starving at any one time.

They live only a couple of jumps ahead of starvation. In other materials, they are almost as bad. They have practically no indigenous products that they can manufacture; they have no great manufacturing centers whatsoever.

They are peculiarly vulnerable to the process of blockade. And the process of internal disruption by bombing.

You may say that is not going to happen in the United States of America, but let me say that in the brief period of

175 years of our existence we have exhausted our natural resources to a greater extent than did the nation of China in any 2,000-year period you can point out, according to the best judgment of people that we have who have made a study of that situation.

Every time this program comes up we have to meet the argument that this is a payment. If this were a payment to the farmers under present conditions I would say, "Cut it out." But this is a question of soil conservation. Under our laws we do not use the power of Government as did Hitler and Stalin. We do not say by law to the farmer, who is a trustee of our very means of existence, that "You have got to maintain the fertility of the soil." May that day never come. But, if we do have as a Nation an interest in the fertility of the soil, and in its productivity and if we are not going to require that it be taken care of by law, the only way to do it is by a system of leadership, by a system of Federal recognition of its responsibilities; yes, by a system of the Federal Government paying a part of the cost. I am not happy at the figure \$225,000,000. It is a \$60,000,000 reduction that we are making in next year's program. The fact that our subcommittee made that reduction does not mean that it is lessened in the least in its belief in the value of soil conservation and of the real dependency of our people, as well as future generations upon it. But how much the Government can spend depends upon what it can get the farmers to do, and I say to you if you were to put a billion and a half dollars in this bill for this purpose, there is a serious question whether you could get more soil conservation that you can for the \$225,000,000 contribution toward the costs. Why? Because with the present shortages of labor, shortages of fertilizer, shortages of equipment, when the farmer finds it hard to do his regular day's work, it is hard for him to do those things so badly needed for soil fertility. The amount of money in this bill is not necessarily the measure of what we can get him to do. Now, you may say "Well if that be true, why will not \$150,000,000 be enough?" I want to say to you that we need every bit of soil conservation we can help bring about. There was a period in this country when we did reduce soil-conservation practices of \$150,000,000. Oh, you heard the argument here today that the farmers will carry on, but I would like to get them to look at the records. In 1947 over my protest we did reduce this program, and in 1948 the number of dams to conserve water for irrigation, for livestock, to control erosion, was reduced 45 percent. The number of range and pasture seedlings was reduced 33 percent; contour farming by 49 percent; closed range fell off 41 percent; irrigation ditches, dikes, and laterals fell off 52 percent; improving pasture and range land by eradicating poisonous plants fell off 52 percent, and we had approximately 50 percent falling off in the practices of soil conservation.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. There has been talk about coalition and there has been talk here about the effect of what Mr. Kline says, that it does not necessarily present the position of the Farm Bureau. I received a telegram from Mr. Kline in which he says that he specifically urges support of the Cox amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill to reduce the fund for 1952 to \$150,000,000. Is not that the effect of this amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman heard the amendment read. The amendment said \$150,000,000, so the figure is the same. I am no party to a coalition. I am willing to join with anyone at any time when they are acting in what I believe to be the best interest of the country, but to join anyone against everything, is not my way, and as long as other folks are doing what they think is right, that is for them to determine. But back to this matter, and this is vital to us: It is not a case of saving money here; it is a case of whether we have a little bit of long-range interest and a long-range viewpoint in regard to the future of this country. I heard the gentleman from Indiana—and there is no brighter or abler man in this Congress, in my judgment—and I heard my close friends, the two distinguished gentlemen from Texas talk about farming. I also heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] speak on this issue. You know, the only real good ways to make lots of money farming that I know are these: One is to strike oil on your land, and lots of people in Texas have done that, I hear. The other good way to farm, and that is the way the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Indiana and myself farm, is to have a good salary on the side, and I cannot help but say, the people of the Nation would be in a bad way if they had to depend upon the production of those kind of farmers for their food and clothing. But this program reaches further than that class of farmer. This program reaches back to the interest of the people of this country, in the productivity of this country, yes, in the future of this country. True, a man cannot go out and spend money on his own land without improving that which he holds, but the folks dependent upon his production, are you and I and others in our cities and elsewhere, and all over this country. The ones dependent upon what kind of shape we leave this country in are those generations who will follow us.

In the last 10 years the population of this country increased by 19,000,000. This country has existed for 175 years. In history, what is that in the history of the Chinese people? What is 175 years in the history of the Italian people? It is only a moment. If we have wasted this great country of ours to the extent we have in that short period, what can we look to in the future if we keep it up, if our population keeps climbing at the rate of nineteen to twenty million every 10 years? This is a more serious matter than many of you think.

I grant you that many people will carry on soil conservation for 2 or 3 years, but the generating force that has been behind the efforts of private individuals, the thing that has caused lots

of people to bring about soil conservation on their own farms at their own cost, has been the fact that you have had some agency pushing and pressing for it.

I happen to have a farm but I never drew a dime out of this production payment contribution in my life. Perhaps it is because I knew I was going to be up here and I did not want to be vulnerable, but I want to be honest about it, I have not done one-tenth of the soil conservation I should have done, either.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I think the gentleman is right in pointing out the fact that we have had an increase in this country. I think the statistics are that in the past 37 years we have gone from 100,000,000 to 151,000,000. That is an increase of over one third in the population in less than 40 years time.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is correct and I thank him for his contribution. We have our high standard of living because it takes mighty few of us to grow the food and fiber for the rest of us, leaving great numbers of our people to supply the automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and the thousands and one things we enjoy beyond that of any other country in the world. But you let the soil fertility go down and you are bound eventually to have conditions such that a bigger and bigger percentage of your people have to till the soil to provide the food and fiber for the rest of them. This is not a 5- or 10-year period we are talking about. The very future of our children is involved.

There is not a man within the sound of my voice that is more disturbed about the financial structure of this country than I am, but it is a financial structure. May the day never come when we have to wipe it out and start all over again, but if we have to wipe out the financial structure of this country, bad as it would be, as long as we have the soil and the natural resources and the ability to produce, it is not going to wreck us if we have to change the medium of exchange. It is the country that lets the soil go down that gets itself into the fix of Italy, France in some places, China, Greece, and India, where the medium of exchange will not work because there is too little production to exchange.

Do not let that happen to us in this country. Let us have vision. Let us have confidence enough in our future to recognize that if we are ever going to get out from under a \$270,000,000,000 debt it is going to be because of our ability to produce.

In this program we are not giving the farmer anything but we are urging him to protect that soil fertility. If he will spend \$3 the Federal Government will spend \$1 so that our soil will be kept for future generations.

Through the Marshall plan we have put up the money to require these depleted countries to spend, in counterpart funds many times the amounts in this bill, to restore the natural resources of those countries. We required them to do that because their recovery must be based on their productivity.

Let us not gradually destroy our own country by taking out more than we put back in when we reach the place those countries are now in, there will likely be no nation like the United States with its Marshall plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the Chair was in doubt.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and tellers reported there were—ayes 120, yeas 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, 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. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war materials to Communist China.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF LAND BY THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, ETC. (H. DOC. NO. 133)

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

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3096, a bill "relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration."

This bill would impose certain restrictions on the real estate transactions of

the military departments and of Federal Civil Defense Administration. In general, it would require those agencies to come into agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to the acquisition or disposal of real property, including leases involving an annual rental in excess of \$10,000, and including transfers of real property between the military departments or to other Federal agencies, or to States, with certain minor exceptions. A recital of compliance with the Act in an instrument of conveyance, including a lease, or a recital that the conveyance or lease is not affected by the act would be conclusive evidence of the fact so recited. The bill would also repeal section 407 of Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, which requires the authority of an act of Congress enacted subsequent thereto in order for a military department generally to dispose of real property. It would also repeal a proviso contained in the Act of April 4, 1944, requiring the Secretary of the Navy to come into agreement with congressional committees prior to the acquisition or disposition by the Department of the Navy of any land acquired for naval use.

On January 15, 1951, I sent a message to the Congress urging that it repeal section 407 at its earliest opportunity. In that message I stated that that section, if permitted to stand, may seriously impede our mobilization effort by causing unnecessary and unwarranted delays in the transfer for other governmental uses of property excess to the needs of the military departments.

While H. R. 3096 would effect the repeal of section 407 of Public Law 910, it would subject to the decision of congressional committees, not only those transactions that are covered by section 407 of Public Law 910, but also transactions involving all phases of the real-estate transactions of the Department of Defense and of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, with exceptions applicable for the most part to minor and relatively unimportant transactions.

While the Congress or its Members have a special interest in a number of real estate transactions by the executive branch of the Government, full information with respect to those transactions has in the past and will in the future be made readily available to the interested committees of the Congress. However, a legal requirement for the submission of countless real estate transactions to the scrutiny of the congressional committees in an effort to furnish them with information on the relatively few transactions as to which those committees have a special interest, would result in the imposition of a severe and unnecessary administrative burden on the Department of Defense. It would not only result in the diversion of personnel from other vital tasks to the preparation of the innumerable reports that would be required but would also result in continuing delays that might well prove to be a serious impediment to the defense-procurement program. The delays that would be effected are not only the delays involved in the physical

preparation of the reports required, their presentation to the congressional committees, and the review of those reports by the committees or their staff, but much greater and more serious delays resulting from the inability of the Department of Defense to plan its operations in the future until the congressional committees have acted. The transactions that would be required to be submitted to the committees are not isolated transactions unrelated to other transactions in the future, but have a definite relationship to future as well as other current transactions and affect the whole planning program. The uncertainties and delays inherent in the securing of congressional approval can only operate to the detriment of such a planning program.

One of the effects of the bill would be to force to a substantial degree the centralization in Washington of real estate operations that could otherwise be more efficiently handled in the field. A very substantial portion of the transactions by the Department of Defense originate in the field, since the real estate operations of the Department of the Army, the most active department in this field, are on a highly decentralized basis. The requirement that would be contained in H. R. 3096 would have the effect of destroying that decentralization and canceling the savings in time and money that have resulted in the past. Moreover, it would destroy the flexibility that now exists with respect to those operations that permits rapid changes and revisions of plans. Under the procedure contemplated by H. R. 3096, changes and variations in plans would have to run the whole gamut from field office to congressional committee and back again. Thus the delay will be significantly greater than would be apparent on the surface. The acquisition of general purpose space in many cities throughout the United States is handled by the General Services Administration rather than by the military departments. In those cases the military departments submit their needs to the General Services Administration, which acquires or leases space on behalf of the military department concerned. In those cases no report can be made to the congressional committees until it has been determined from the General Services Administration the form in which it proposes to make the space available. A delay thereafter might have the unfortunate effect of causing the Government to lose the opportunity to acquire the space sought.

It may well be expected that the delays that would be encountered under the present bill would be greater than that experienced by the Department of the Navy under the act of April 4, 1944. That is true because the number of significant transactions would be much greater under this bill than under the 1944 act. The requirement of review by congressional committees in the matter of acquisition and disposal of real property would to a large degree duplicate existing machinery in the agencies directly involved as well as those in the General Services Administration. It would hinder the orderly management of

Federal property as contemplated by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, which was recently enacted by the Congress. Moreover, the requirement of a review of the transfer of property between the military departments of the Department of Defense is, in effect, a contradiction of the principle of increased interservice utilization of property by the military departments, which is an essential feature of unification.

Moreover, the enactment of this legislation would seem to be particularly inopportune at this time in view of the current international situation and the increasing demands for expeditious action in connection with the defense procurement program. I cannot help but feel that the Congress would not knowingly place unnecessary obstacles, such as that inherent in H. R. 3096, to the expeditious consummation of that defense procurement program.

Finally, I am concerned by what appears to me to be a gradual trend on the part of the legislative branch to participate to an even greater extent in the actual execution and administration of the laws. Under our system of government it is contemplated that the Congress will enact the laws and will leave their administration and execution to the executive branch. The delays discussed above, which would inhere in the enactment of H. R. 3096, testify to the wisdom of that constitutional policy. It would seem particularly inappropriate to depart from that policy in the field of military procurement during a period of national emergency when expeditious action may be vital to the survival of our Nation.

For these reasons I am returning this bill without my approval but with the assurance that the agencies covered by the bill will cooperate with the appropriate congressional committees in furnishing the information they desire in a manner that will not interfere with the orderly operation of their real estate transactions.

I again recommend that section 407 of Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, be repealed for the reasons set forth in my message of January 15, 1951.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 15, 1951.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be entered at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill printed as a House document.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that further consideration of the veto message on the bill H. R. 3096 be postponed until Thursday, May 17. The reason I do so is on account of the lateness of the hour, and I think there should be full debate on this important measure.

The motion was agreed to.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House on the third supplemental appropriation bill may have until midnight tomorrow to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

ARMS EMBARGO AGAINST CHINA

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 101, urging the General Assembly of the United Nations to take action with respect to placing an arms embargo on Communist China, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may state that an identical Senate concurrent resolution has just arrived at the desk. It is identical with the exception that it does not contain section 2. Does the gentleman still desire to pass the House resolution or would he prefer to pass the Senate resolution?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my consent request and instead ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, favoring an embargo by the United Nations on shipments of war materials to Communist China.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, so that the Record will show the whole situation, section 2 of the Rogers resolution related to the transmission of a copy of the resolution to the State Department for transmittal to certain officials of the United Nations. While that is not in the Senate resolution, it would automatically follow as a matter of course. That is my understanding. I think the Record should show that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the United States has initiated a proposal, under the terms of which the General Assembly of the United Nations would (1) call upon all member nations of the United Nations not to send to Communist China arms, ammunition, or any other material which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China; (2) urge that steps be taken to guard against circumvention or nullification of such embargo through loopholes which might enable the Chinese Communists to acquire the banned materials; and (3) establish a special committee to receive periodic reports from the complying member nations and to take other measures aimed at making the embargo as effective as possible; and

Whereas Communist China has long since been branded an aggressor by an overwhelming majority of the member nations of the United Nations; and

Whereas more than a dozen member nations are participating directly with the United States in the heroic military action against the common enemy in Korea, and the troops of such nations are being shot at, and killed, by the Chinese Communists; and

Whereas no United Nations soldier should be the target of a bullet manufactured in the free world, or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress

of the United States hereby requests and urges that the General Assembly of the United Nations take action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Concurrent Resolution 101 will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATION OF CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 96, opposing the admission of Communist China to membership in the United Nations.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of House of Representatives that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS: Page 1, line 2, strike out "Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China" and insert "Chinese Communist authorities shall not be permitted to represent China in the United Nations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point on these two rather historic resolutions.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the action of this House in taking up House Resolution 96, which I introduced in January of this year, is in my opinion a historic one. It is, however, most appropriate and even more important now than when introduced.

If there was ever a time when this Congress should speak for the people, it is now. We should not only make our position firm and decisive but let the world know that we will not submit to appeasement with Communist aggression.

The action of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives in reporting this resolution is to be commended. It is an expression of that great committee, as it is with this House, in unanimously approving this resolution, that we want the United Nations to know that we are opposed to the Chinese Communist authorities having a seat in the

United Nations, proposing to represent the great Chinese Nation.

I appreciate the action of the committee and this House. I think the clarifying language is appropriate. It not only states our opposition to the Communists being permitted to represent China in the United Nations but, in my opinion, it makes it even more clear that we do not even recognize a Communist Chinese Government. This, in my opinion, is highly significant.

Toward the close of World War II, determined efforts were made to bring about a way for peace and a definite policy for maintaining peace. This attitude as expressed by the Congress and the American people time and again was obviously a result of the position pursued following World War I, and believed by so many to have culminated in the disastrous and devastating World War II.

Determined efforts, in cooperation with our then allies and under the leadership of our great Nation, were made for the formulation of a program through international cooperation of nations. This became known as the United Nations Organization.

We recall the enthusiasm and the encouragement of our people and the reports from other nations when the Charter was signed yonder in San Francisco, pledging these nations to a policy of peaceful relationship and a settlement of the problems among nations within the framework of that organization.

We have now reached a point which in my opinion will determine whether or not the efforts of these years will have been in vain. It appears that what happens now and in the immediate future is going to determine whether or not we will have a United Nations Organization and certainly one that will be effective.

Out of the developments, the tragedies, and the seriousness of the crisis that faces not only this Republic but other free nations of the world, momentous decisions must be made.

In view of these developments, this House in January adopted a resolution—House Resolution 77—which stated "that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nation should immediately act and declare the Chinese Communist authorities an aggressor in Korea." This resolution was brought up by unanimous consent in the House, sponsored by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

I voted for the resolution, as did most of the Members of this House. It was another expression of this House that we must take firm and definite action, but within the framework of the United Nations Organization, and through that organization we should say to any aggressor that we meant what we said when we pledged ourselves to international cooperation for peace. The United Nations has since taken similar action, and appropriately.

It will be remembered that when the North Koreans started their armies on

South Korea the United Nations was hurriedly called into session and immediately adopted a resolution declaring the North Koreans to be aggressors.

As a result of this action we were immediately drawn into the Korean debacle. It was not only through the action of the United Nations, but it appeared to be the predominant feeling of the American people that such aggression must not be permitted and that we must answer the challenge.

It will also be remembered that when our gallant fighting forces destroyed and disintegrated the main forces of the North Korean Army and reached the thirty-eighth parallel, the United Nations adopted a resolution that the United Nations forces should pursue the North Koreans to their ultimate destruction throughout all of Korea. That is, the aggressor forces in Korea should be disintegrated.

Whether this action was a mistake or not and I think it was, we had destroyed the organized aggression, disintegrated the enemy, nevertheless, it was a decision taken by the United Nations.

We have an entirely different situation, even more serious, that we must deal with now. It was the North Koreans then, even though directed by Russia. It is now the Chinese Communists with their hordes likewise directed by Russia. Then since the United Nations said the North Koreans were aggressors, we could take no other position than to declare the Chinese Communists aggressors.

We should make these firm decisions and pursue a course of action, keeping in mind our objectives to which we are pledged, our hopes and desires for peaceful relations among the Nations of the world, the preservation of the rights, privileges, and freedoms of Nations, thereby preventing aggression.

Some time ago the Senate adopted a resolution concurring in the action taken by this House. Thus the Congress of the United States, representing the people of this country, has said to the United Nations, it should take the same course of action against one aggressor as against the other.

Mao Tse-tung and his crowd have flouted the United Nations in its request for a cease fire and aggression in Korea. He laid down his own terms, obviously directed by Moscow. To accept such a truce would be a travesty. It could only lead to a policy of appeasement and inevitably another world war that would be more devastating and tragic than anything like experienced in World War II or I might say, a devastation and perhaps a destruction of civilization to the extent that any of us have little conception of what it would mean.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was so incredible that we have the reports that Mao and his gang have altered its true position, but he has said, so it is reported, that a cease-fire truce could be arranged by a meeting of certain nations, which he proposes to name.

It is quite obvious that the main objective now of Russia is that Mao and his Chinese Communists be admitted to membership and recognized in the United Nations as the representative of China,

unseating Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists of China. Some of our supposed-to-be allies seem to lean that way, too.

At the same time of trying to gain this recognition they are aggressors in Korea and actually at war against the United Nations.

The Senate went a step further and adopted another resolution. It said it was the sense of the Senate that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

I heartily concur in this action. The House of Representatives should concur and thus the Congress saying that the United Nations should not admit or recognize any group while at the same time they are pursuing a policy of destruction and aggression.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, introduced a resolution which says:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

Any action short of this resolution stating the position of this Congress and of our Government would, in my opinion, be appeasement.

To pursue this course of action may very well cause our withdrawal from Korea. Even so, we would maintain the principle to which we are committed in pursuing a policy toward the preservation of our freedoms and liberties. It would not mean that we were giving in to the aggressor and adopting a course of appeasement.

I emphasize again that we have an entirely different situation and a far more serious one now with the Chinese Communists in Korea than we had last June.

As a matter of fact and being realistic we should not and cannot engage in land warfare with the Chinese in China. Our resources, our manpower, would not permit and neither would our future security require it. It would seem to me a rather hopeless task which would be most inadvisable to undertake.

I do not know and do not suppose anyone knows to what extent the Chinese Communists will continue in South Korea. If they continue to pursue their obvious intentions by sending great hordes of their armies, we should get out and stay if we are going to continue to prohibit our forces from bombing the concentration of their supplies and armies on the Manchurian border and certainly if we are not in a position to adequately provide the forces in Korea that will give our boys at least a fair chance.

Some might contend that Mao and his crowd are the Government of China and that in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter should be recognized as China's representative. As a matter of principle, I am not one of those that would recognize such a dictator of force and violence as a representative of the people of that Government. They could not in my opinion make any more contribution toward peaceful re-

lationship among nations than has Communist Russia.

I voted against the aid to Tito or Yugoslavia at the close of the last session of Congress. I might have been wrong in that decision but as a matter of principle I believe I was right. It was contended that that action of the Congress was not a matter of principle but strategic militarily. It was strategic militarily when we joined up with Stalin and Russia in World War II but we can all see where it has led us.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can lay aside a matter of principle in any of the actions of this Congress and our Government without reaping the result of what we sow.

I believe this course of action of the Congress is in keeping with the principles and the policies which we believe to be right. The world knows that we do not seek conquests or want war; we should continue to let the world know that we are going to be firm in our position, determined in our efforts to prevent aggression and bring about a just peace. We must be consistent in our action as I believe right will prevail.

We have a force that would enslave the world, trample on free nations, and free people, and the only way we can meet it is to take such actions as this and prepare ourselves for this most difficult and unfortunate task.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the ugly head of aggressive communism undertakes to force and subvert its way over the world in four main moves, to wit: First, militarily; second, politically; third, economically; fourth, ideologically.

Voting our greatest budget in the history of our Nation on account of having to meet this threat militarily; recognizing the political moves as we do of aggressive communism; knowing that economically we could be swamped if we were not vigorous and vigilant; I, too, speak that these measures should have our unanimous and cordial clear-cut approval. Having voted for this ban and embargo relating to our economic processes, must make us realize it only weakens the false ideology of aggressive, subversive communism; but does not defeat it. It must be defeated by a better ideology. Being a member of the Un-American Activities Committee in this Congress, I speak for the utmost and sincere consideration for every Member of this House to the proposition that the world is at war now, with relation to ideologies. Military policies or economic measures will not eventually or enduringly win wars. The existence of heart, mind, and soul, is a battle of ideals and ideas. Chiefest of these ideas and ideals must come to the threshold of the fundamental principle, that what is right must triumph.

It is right that we vote as we are this day, because it is right to do so. We are now being guided by principle, rather than personalities or partisan politics. When we live on a high enough plane as American citizens, to let our daily conduct be mainly guided by the same principle in doing what is right, rather than thinking in terms of who may be

right, we will then have arrived at a level of national thinking which, in my humble judgment, will be a premise for enduring victory, over the ideological and false philosophy of aggressive subversive communism.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the House has just taken action that will have momentous significance all over the world. Without any debate at all, and with but the briefest of explanation here on the floor, this House has unanimously gone on record as urging a United Nations embargo on Communist China, and declaring that the Chinese Communist authorities should not be permitted to represent China in the United Nations. It was sufficient that the text of these two resolutions be read; no argument was needed; although any Member could have stopped action, or delayed action to insist on explanation or to make a speech, the House, by common consent, gave instant, unanimous support to these resolutions.

We are in the midst of a great debate on foreign policy in this country. Columnists and commentators and others, here and abroad, are wringing their literary hands and shedding rhetorical tears, some of them crocodile tears, at the division, the indecision, the partisanship in Congress. Communists here and over the world have been gleefully making propaganda over this. Then along come these historic resolutions, and they are passed with lightning speed, and unanimous support. This was no accident; it was no surprise action. We all knew what we were doing. There had been full consultation between the leadership on both sides; there had been full consideration of both resolutions in the Committee on Foreign Affairs this morning. The language of the Harris resolution was changed to eliminate any possibility that we might be recognizing any "Chinese Communist government," and instead we used the phrase "Chinese Communist authorities," which had been used in the House resolution, which passed January 19, urging the United Nations to declare the Chinese Communist authorities an aggressor in Korea. Of course, most of us Republicans had long advocated the policies involved in these resolutions so it was easy for us to sponsor prompt action, but there was no gloating, no recrimination, no delay here on the floor, to redebate how we all happened to be together. Everyone realized that instant, united action on this would speak louder than many, many words.

I think this action can be a lesson to our friends, and our enemies, overseas; a comfort to nervous people here at home. When something is right, and needed quickly, we have a way of getting together in a hurry, and getting it done.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the contents and purpose of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31.

It points out that the United States has initiated a proposal, under the terms of which the General Assembly of the United Nations would, first, call upon all member nations of the United Nations not to send to Communist China

arms, ammunition, or any other material which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China; second, urge that steps be taken to guard against circumvention or nullification of such embargo through loopholes which might enable the Chinese Communists to acquire the banned materials; and, third, establish a special committee to receive periodic reports from the complying member nations and to take other measures aimed at making the embargo as effective as possible.

Communist China has long since been branded an aggressor by an overwhelming majority of the member nations of the United Nations.

More than a dozen member nations are participating directly with the United States in the heroic military action against the common enemy in Korea, and the troops of such nations are being shot at, and killed, by the Chinese Communists.

No United Nations soldier should be the target of a bullet manufactured in the free world, or required to fight against the free world, or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from the free world.

The resolution, expressing the will of the Congress of the United States requests and urges that the General Assembly of the United Nations take action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipment to Communist China of arms, ammunition, and all other materials which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China.

This expression of the desire of the Congress is in full accord with the thought and in recognition of the unanimous demand of the people of the United States.

In the summer of 1950, shortly after the Korean War started, I brought to the attention of the House facts that demonstrated that certain European countries, supposed to be our allies, were engaged in this nefarious trade. It was almost incomprehensible to believe that these nations who called themselves our allies would ship to Russia and countries behind the iron curtain, as well as Red China the strategic materials and war commodities that enabled Red China to carry on the war against our boys fighting in Korea, and assist Communist countries in building their war machine against free nations. But the facts were so plain that they could not be successfully denied. This should have been a subject of protest by our State Department long ago, but until recently it failed to take any aggressive steps to stop this double dealing.

The hearings held last summer by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce revealed that there was a great hesitancy on the part of our departments of government to take any action. It seemed as if they were of the opinion that it was too delicate a matter for this country to object to how other countries, although our allies, carried on business, even with our enemies. It is gratifying to realize that there are now signs of an awakening to the injustice that has been done to our fighting men in Korea. Let us hope that we will from

now on have a more realistic policy that will do justice to the boys who fight our battles.

Another resolution—House Resolution 96—that has my full support provides in effect that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the representatives of the Communist Government in China should not be entitled to representation in the United Nations. This resolution goes hand in hand with the previous resolution to which I have referred. Its adoption will go far in demonstrating that the United States does not intend to sit idly by and permit our enemies to gain recognition to which they are not entitled. Let us continue to be realistic, cease being namby-pamby, and assert our rights as a nation. Other nations, friend and foe, will have more respect for us when we do.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in order to make an explanation of House Concurrent Resolution 101, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been concerned and deeply disturbed in that some of our allies, yea, even some of the members of the United Nations, have been shipping arms, ammunition, and strategic war materials to Communist China and to other nations through which Red China eventually received these war materials. I have wondered why some steps or measures had not been taken by our Nation or the United Nations to place a ban or embargo on the shipment of such materials, certainly when it is evident that these war materials are being used by the forces of Red China or Communist China to kill and destroy our boys engaged in the fight to prevent aggression.

I saw a gleam of hope in the proposal of our delegate in the United Nations wherein our representative offered a resolution calling upon all member nations of the United Nations not to send to Communist China arms, ammunition, or any other material which might add to the war-making potential of Communist China; I thought that the Congress of the United States should contribute everything within its power to endorse, urge, and bring about the successful passage of this resolution because it will be as a clarion call for the support of the other members of the United Nations and it would prove that the people of the United States, through their elected representatives, stand as one great force back of our delegation in the United Nations in calling for an embargo.

Whereupon, on Sunday afternoon, May 6, while in my apartment reading the current news I ran across an editorial in the Evening Star commenting upon the proposal of our United Nations representative. After the reading of it I came to the conclusion that the Congress should take concurrent action in the form of a resolution urging and requesting that the General Assembly

of the United Nations take affirmative action as speedily as possible in launching an embargo on the shipment of arms, ammunition and all other war materials to Communist China.

Then on Monday morning, May 7, I prepared and introduced House Concurrent Resolution 101 and at the same time made a short talk advising the Membership of the House that I was introducing such a resolution. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I was delayed in appearing before the Foreign Affairs Committee for action on this resolution on account of the sudden death of our beloved chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia, Hon. John Kee, and I was advised on May 8, that no committee meeting would be held prior to May 15. It was imperative and important that speedy action be had on this resolution because of the hearing before the committee of the United Nations, and I therefore consulted with my colleague, the distinguished and able Senator from Florida than whom there is no abler and more influential in the Senate, Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, concerning his introduction and his leadership in the passage of this resolution in the Senate, and the Senator being vitally and deeply interested in the purpose of this resolution introduced a companion resolution in the Senate, joined by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on May 14 and speedily passed the resolution under unanimous-consent rule.

However, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], who succeeded as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, called a meeting of the committee on Tuesday, May 15, at which time my House Concurrent Resolution 101 was considered and unanimously recommended for passage. Whereupon, on Tuesday afternoon it was called up for consideration by unanimous consent by Chairman RICHARDS. While House Concurrent Resolution 101 was being considered in the House, the Senate concurrent resolution had been passed and had just reached the House and both resolutions being identical resolutions, with the exception of section 2 having been stricken in the Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 was substituted for House Concurrent Resolution 101 and the same was adopted by the House.

In the passage of any legislation there is always mutual help and assistance, and I particularly desire to express my appreciation to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], for the part he played in cooperating for speedy action. I also commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. LAURIE BATTLE]. Without their cooperation action could not have been obtained on this resolution so quickly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to congratulate the gentleman, but I am sorry that we did not act several months ago.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the other members of his party. They have cooperated in every way and we had no difficulty whatever in getting this measure passed when it was brought to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to make just a few short observations of the value and effect this resolution could have.

First, this resolution, which is a unanimous verdict of this Congress, will be a great force in upholding the hands of the American representatives of the General Assembly of the United Nations to bring about action leading to the placing of an embargo on the shipments to Communist China of war materials from any of the United Nations.

Second, it will have a great moral and salutary force on the action of the member nations in supporting the American proposal in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Third, it will protect our soldiers and all United Nations soldiers from becoming the target of a bullet, bomb, or tank manufactured in the free world or required to fight against troops supplied with materials coming from a free world, and surely our boys who are fighting in Korea should not be killed and murdered with arms, guns, and tanks supplied by member nations of the United Nations for whom these soldiers are fighting; and it will serve as further proof of the United Nations unity against aggression.

Fourth, this concurrent resolution will not only give physical protection to our boys but it will give them confidence and consolation to know that the Congress of the United States is endeavoring to throw around them every means of protection.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this is a most constructive step to let the United Nations know that this Congress is behind that organization in putting an embargo on war materials and arms that can be used in the killing of our boys.

HOOR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday.

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

There was no objection.

CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. STEFAN. 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 Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, May 20 is Cuba's Independence Day.

Neither you nor I, nor the people, nor the Congress of the United States of America may rightfully pay tribute to our proud and gallant neighbors to the south. We cannot pay tribute because the very word tribute is anathema to free men who have dedicated their lives to the cause of liberty.

We can—and we do—honor Cuba, Cubans, and Cuba's independence.

It lacks only 1 year of a half century since, in 1902, on May 20, Cuba's independence—which had been for so long a martyr's dream—became a citizen's reality.

There are historians within the sound of my voice who are already asking questions: "Why?" I can almost hear you say, "Why, if the Spanish-American War was victoriously concluded in 1898, was not Cuba free until 4 years later?"

You are entitled to your questions. You are living under a Republic. You are also entitled to your answers.

True. This Nation went to the aid of the valorous Cubans and helped to rid them of a tyranny of oppression. But there is still another tyranny besides that of oppression. I refer to the tyranny of friendship.

Let us look to our own history as an organized people for understanding of the history of a kindred organized people.

There was a vast difference between the 13 Colonies of 1766 and the 13 Colonies of 1776. The last of the major French and Indian wars had brought security and prosperity to the sparsely populated Atlantic seaboard settlements. Peace was here. The threat of Indian attack was behind us. Our great store of raw materials and the demand in Europe for those raw materials brought wealth to a few and comfort to many.

The weight of government over us by England was light. Tax after tax was removed by the English parliament. We were permitted to govern ourselves—with a slight nod to English authority by having governors, in name only, over us. Many of the colonies operated under their own provincial constitutions. The much-maligned Stamp Act was not nearly so severe a burden as the multiplicity of taxes which now rest on American wage-earners.

Then—if the burden was light—and it was light—why did Americans object to it?

Massachusetts gave a ringing answer in: "Taxation without representation!" South Carolina—with her "rattlesnake flag" cried out: "Don't tread on me!" Yes. This was the answer—the colonies wanted complete freedom; not partial freedom. All kinds of tyranny—even the tyranny of friendship—was still tyranny.

I am an American. I am a citizen of the United States.

Even as the Colonies were in the decade before 1776, just so was Cuba between the time when Spanish domination ended and the memorable May 20 when the Stars and Stripes were lowered and Cuba's own flag broke proudly on the breeze.

Cruel domination? Benevolent occupation? What are these but other names for alien control?

To be free of enemy and of friend, to be liberated from cruelty and from kindness—that was what Cuban Independence Day meant almost half a century ago. Who among us may not feel as they did the wordless exultation, the fierce glory, that all Cubans felt when the dead hand of foreign rule was—we fervently pray—lifted forever from free Cuba?

Free people have their mistakes, their failures and their tragedies. These are the results of groping—endless trial and error—to find a practical basis for their own government. The people of the United States have been thus tested by adversity. So have the Cuban people. But, when we sweep away the wreckage of some of our dearest hopes, both peoples can say to themselves: "We can begin again. We still have our freedom."

In other words, our sister republics have everything.

We can contemplate the future without fear. Freedom is our common denominator. If the freedom of Cuba should be endangered, Cuba needs no written treaties to know who would join in the defense of her liberty. If the free Government of the United States should be threatened, we know our friend from the south would range herself by our side.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the modern miracle—the solidarity between peoples who have thrown off tyranny's yoke and who glory in governing themselves.

July 4, 1776.

May 20, 1902.

Two bright beacons guiding all men everywhere to the safe harbor of a better tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ANTHRACITE COAL STOCKPILING

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to authorize, for a temporary period, the purchase by the Government of anthracite in amounts sufficient to maintain normal production and employment in the anthracite region, to promote the general national welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has a great burden of responsibility to the anthracite industry. To a great extent, the major part of the economy of the Northeastern United States is dependent upon the mining of anthracite in the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania. And my congressional district, centered in the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton metropolitan area, is the very heart of these coal fields. Here lies the principal source of energy and heat for the most densely populated and most intensely industrialized section of our Nation.

To prevent the loss to the national economy of this vital natural resource and economic disaster to millions of our citizens, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this bill.

The problems of this vast mining industry are not alone those of economics and technology—preservation, readjustments, improvements—these call for legislative assistance.

Use of abundant supplies of energy resource materials has made the United States of America the great world power it is today. In times of peace and war these materials have multiplied the strength of our manpower to provide for us the highest standard of living in time of peace and the greatest degree of strength in time of war.

A major readjustment in the fuel-energy economy of the country has been taking place during the past several

decades. Economic factors and the necessities of international affairs, rather than the sound dictates of industrial prosperity and security have been at work adversely affecting our coal industry.

War and the postwar over-all prosperity for a time mitigated the degree and effects of these changes. Lately, however, the seriousness of the situation has reflected itself so forcibly upon the anthracite industry that it threatens the industrial and civilian economy of an important segment of the country.

Last year anthracite production dropped to a point lower than at any time since 1902. In 1950 the industry supplied only 3.2 percent of the national energy requirements, compared with bituminous coal, petroleum, natural gas, and hydroelectric power, on an equivalent heat-unit basis, as shown in the following table:

National supplies of energy requirements

Source of energy	Percent supplied	
	1950	1949
Anthracite.....	3.2	3.5
Bituminous coal and lignite.....	38.2	36.4
Petroleum.....	35.4	36.7
Natural gas.....	18.7	18.5
Hydroelectric power.....	4.5	4.9
Total.....	100.0	100.0

Within recent years a definite trend has been established toward a petroleum and natural-gas economy. Unfortunately, this represents great national dependence upon two fuels of limited reserve, but more importantly, fuels which are of special strategic significance to direct military and security defense.

The national fuel economy is in a dangerous condition. Indications are that the situation will worsen before adequate readjustments can be made. A further deterioration in the international affairs leading to shrinkage of oil availability from the Middle East would spell out the beginnings of a nearly catastrophic collapse of our industrial economy.

Nationalization of the Iranian oil fields and recent riots in that country are in line with the Communist pattern of acquisition. Reduction of oil from that area means a serious weakening of Western European strength. Urgent supply from United States would be the only answer to European needs. Such a drain on our domestic production would be immediately reflected in rationing and allocation of a stringent nature. In addition, such trouble in the Middle East might soon establish a new war front, with all the dangers of a world-wide conflagration.

The Munitions Board of the Department of Defense in its recent statement of policy on the availability of fuels for the military services has already sounded the warning. It would be the height of folly for us to bury our heads in the sands. Oil supplies are restricted by inadequate production facilities, insufficient tank cars, tankers, oil lines, and refineries. Gas availability is limited by lack of transmission pipelines and dis-

tribution facilities. Coal production is limited by shortages of freight cars. In general, the national fuel economy is out of balance and practically incapable of correction in the time remaining between now and next winter.

Recent trends and happenings in domestic and international affairs have given serious emphasis to the urgency for an early improvement in the situation. National over-all industrial production rate is at an unprecedented high level under the impact of mobilization demands upon the peacetime economy. Expanded universal dependence upon fuel oil creates a double burden for our security. Our closest allies are now on a liquid-fuel economy requiring our assistance and our potential enemies are becoming well equipped with mobile equipment.

Coal, petroleum, and natural gas are the basic resources upon which we have built our great industrial power and upon which our whole military strength now depends. A weakness in this group is a flaw in our armor.

Added to the current disbalance of our fuel economy is the increasing difficulty to effect correction because of the enormous drains upon steel, transportation, manufacturing facilities, and services to meet the demands of mobilization and foreign aid.

Recent Middle East affairs tending to lessen the availability of petroleum to Western Europe, together with a decline in coal production in England, greatly magnify the seriousness of our own fuel situation.

Outbreak of war would tremendously increase our responsibilities to aid our allies with all possible supplies of replacement fuels. Such a task might come suddenly at a time when our domestic production is already straining.

Scarcities of fuels are already seriously handicapping the mobilization effort and jeopardizing our military position in Korea. Ordnance plants of World War II are ready for reactivation and in several instances are unable to obtain appropriate kinds and types of fuels. Supplies for these plants when ultimately provided must in many instances be at a sacrifice of fuels for other essential industries and the domestic economy.

Chemical demands for aviation and jet fuels, plastics and synthetic products in many instances must be met by the fuel industries. Distribution of this load upon the various fuel resources is urgently needed so that each will provide that which it can produce to the best interests of the economy and security.

Worthy reviews and studies of the national fuel economy have been made in the past. Demands of our time require that new policies be established but more importantly effort must be made to give effect to such policies. The situation today requires prompt remedial action.

In the last decade revolutionary changes have taken place in our whole economy. International responsibilities heretofore undreamed of have been accepted, national industrial economic situations have played havoc with the fuel industries.

Preliminary data for 1950 indicates that both bituminous coal and anthra-

cite continued to lose in the competition with other fuels. If the war years, 1942-45, average is used as a reference base, bituminous-coal production has dropped 15 percent, anthracite 26 percent, while fuel-oil production has increased 25 percent and gas 65 percent.

Caught with the necessity for large-scale mobilization during the period of this unprecedented shift in the fuel economy, our fuel industries are seriously disbalanced and in a dangerous plight, all are practically unable to arise to the full demands of a war emergency.

No authority disputes the ultimate return of the country to an enlarged coal demand. Just how far away this day may be no one accurately knows, but in the two-world pattern of today it is imperative that immediate effort be directed to preserve the anthracite industry and the potential industrial capabilities of this region.

A sudden reduction of the importation of foreign oil or a war emergency would place considerable of the northeastern section of the United States in urgent need for anthracite. Accordingly, something must be done to keep this industry healthy and strong for the job which might be placed upon it while it is readjusting itself.

The production of 42,664,000 tons of anthracite estimated for 1949 is about 20 percent lower than during the depth of the 1933-36 depression. Employment during the year was approximately 74,000 men.

Total reserves of anthracite are estimated at between 160 and 180 years of expected life. For petroleum and natural gas comparative figures are 12 and 30 years, respectively.

In 1947 fuel oil for the first time surpassed anthracite consumption in the primary anthracite market area and in 1948 accounted for 52 percent of the total consumption of fuels there.

The impact of these changes upon the fortunes of anthracite producers, on national security and defense planning strikes heaviest and first on the civilian economy. In the event of a sudden war emergency wherein importations of oil would be restricted and considerable amounts of domestic oil allocated for war purposes, a shift back to coal would put a large burden upon anthracite production.

Improved metallurgical processes, scarcities of important mineral resources, expanded and adjusted transportation routes, and research and development in entirely new fields all point to opportunities for improvement in the industrial economy of the anthracite industry and area in a distant future.

Today, however, the need for preservation of this industry is urgent. It has been and still is the backbone of our national industrial strength and prowess. Its problems and challenges have been many and varied. Out of this industry have come the techniques and industrial solutions which have made some of our greatest industries. Its mass-production methods have been the basic pattern for our automotive industry; its early flameproof electrical equipment and gas-protective apparatus have enabled the development of our oil and gas

industries; to say nothing of the industry's contributions against poisonous gases in industry and war.

Now the day has arrived when the country is called upon to preserve this industry for the perpetuation of the overall national prosperity and security.

Our national security and defense is predicated upon the development of a strong industrial economy. All across the country we endeavor to strengthen our industries. In the international field we spend billions to better the economies of friendly nations. In doing this we purchase their products, some of which come into competition with our industries, such as is presently the case with the importation of foreign fuel oil. These are the things we must do to create a better and safer world. It was not the intent or purpose of those who designed our foreign-aid program that these efforts should redound to the detriment of our own industries. Instead, it was and is intended that our own economy and industries should adjust themselves and rise to greater success and importance.

Under these circumstances, the direction in which the anthracite industry must go to recapture its share of success and position for the betterment of the national economy is clear. But to attain this end it must have a new partnership with the Government. It seeks not a dole but an opportunity to contribute that which is peculiarly its part.

During 1949 production of anthracite fell 25.3 percent below that for 1948; similarly bituminous-coal production dropped 27.4 percent. Production figures for these two fuels during 1948 and 1949 are as follows:

Coal-production statistics

Year	Anthracite	Bituminous
	Tons	Tons
1948.....	42,664,000	435,000,000
1949.....	42,701,724	437,868,036

In 1918 anthracite supplied approximately 12 percent of the national energy requirements, but in 1949 it accounted for only 3.4 percent, representing a loss of about 70 percent in its relative position. In actual tonnage this was a reduction of from 98,826,084 tons in 1918 to 42,664,000 tons in 1949, or a 57-percent decrease in production.

This slumping off of the anthracite industry is a serious matter to the peacetime economy and security of the country. It has dragged down with it a most important area of the country and a segment of its population which once was industrially and technologically on a pinnacle.

One could argue long and bitterly the reasons why the anthracite industry and area are so distressed today. However, for the job of reconstruction ahead only those points which can set the course for repair and progress need be considered.

The world today has approximately 2,000,000,000 people. Using only rough estimates, it is clearly evident that numerically we have recently moved rapidly into reverse in our race against communism. The Soviet with about 250,000,000 people, China and Northern

Korea with nearly 500,000,000 people, the satellite and doubtful states with 150,000,000 people, and India, Burma, and other Far East countries already close to communism with another 500,000,000 people. This gives the Communists a potential control of 1,400,000,000 people. It also leaves only a mere 600,000,000 people for us to consolidate for our side. With these odds, and many others already against us, is not the need to spur ourselves great enough? Can we afford the luxury of a blighted fuel industry and its ghost towns?

Hence the opportunity exists and the occasion demands that a constructive and objective course be set for the rehabilitation of the anthracite industry.

A forward view of the anthracite area envisions a pleasant region of high-level, well-organized industrial power in the channels of trade and commerce, across the country and seas, again setting the pattern of progress in the production, engineering, construction, and research fields, as it did in the past.

No panacea for anthracite industrial ills exists or can be concocted. Though that is true, certain palliatives can be administered which hold promise of restoration of a high degree of health.

Luckily, for this area it is strategically located where neither those interested in the prosperity of the national economy or security can long avoid giving it appropriate consideration. The area is located where its strength and position is the keystone of our whole national power.

Specifically, the more I study the difficulties of the anthracite region the more sure I am of the theory that its recovery and restoration of health depends upon its integration with other projects, programs, and plans possible of being brought to bear on this country's ills by no one person, corporation, or industry. The day has arrived when the problems of this industry require the guidance and aid of Government surveys, direction, and aid just as surely as it exists today for wheat, potatoes, and eggs. Fortunately, however, the correctives to be employed for the anthracite industry are of a type which when properly correlated lend strength and security to the country on a self-paying basis.

In the world of today we tread a difficult road, and we would be unwise to add to our difficulties by neglecting to husband the strength of the various parts of our great industrial economy, or fail to build back into it those things which have made it so great.

Let us not forget that this anthracite area, at the turn of the century, provided approximately 23 percent of the national energy requirements which gave the Nation its present great industrial strength. The country does owe the anthracite area and its people a chance under the sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNSIDE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, old soldiers may never die, as the ballad goes. But

young soldiers do. That is the tragedy and the shame of our day.

The violence of our age threatens to destroy us, for science has made us masters of destruction, while we remain dormant in our human relations.

"Our reach exceeds our grasp," wrote Vincent Sheehan. We stumble and talk, accuse and vilify, justify and explain—while young soldiers die, young American soldiers, in a far-away land.

Much has been said that were better left unsaid. As one of my old constituents recently advised me when I explained to him that I was a United States Representative in Washington, "I didn't rightly know what you wuz. I just knew you wuz up there where they do a lot of talking." And so they do, Mr. Speaker, so they do. We talk a lot—too much. We discuss so many things that mean so little to men committed to battle. We speak of war in terms of degrees—police action, limited war, enlarged war, extended war, and all-out war. To soldiers, however, and their dear ones, war remains very much the same—violence, death, and destruction.

The foreign policy of the United States and Russia is a very personal concern in every home, in every heart, in every land. Its formation can no longer rightfully be delegated to the few. And out of the present high-level discussions and testimony in a committee of the other body we pray may come an understanding of a foreign policy adaptable to the realities of this violent world.

You and I have a part. Shall we honestly face the grim realities of Korea? A part of each of us is dying there now, and it is war in all of its ugly self, without a regard to resolutions or the manner in which we became involved. We cannot escape responsibility by engaging in what seems to be now a popular pastime of accusing, impugning, vilifying, and opportuning, and then to walk away with our chests stuck out, saying "Boy, did I tell 'em off. Nor can we, with honesty and decency, say as Mr. Clarence Budington Kelland, a national Republican committeeman from Arizona, is reported to have said:

The conduct of the war in Korea is President Truman's responsibility. He took us into the war. His far-eastern policy, or lack of it, was responsible for the building of the Chinese Communists, and so for the war of aggression, started by Reds in North Korea.

He further stated:

I do not believe that the Republican Party should tie itself to the issue of military action as developed between General MacArthur and Mr. Truman.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford the luxury of peace at home and war in Korea—peace and plenty for the many and war and glory for the few, unrestrained enthusiasm for the battle in the political arena and lukewarm interest in what unthinking people would call the "Truman" or the "Democratic" war. It is our war, and it will not leave one American untouched. Our hands are not clean, nor can we escape responsibility.

My wife recently said, with the understanding and sadness only of a woman who has sent a man to battle, that she could not understand what seemed to be

a lack of concern or interest for the soldiers, the young soldiers in Korea. She reminded me that we seldom heard men of responsibility speak with concern and interest in the few who are doing so much. She reminded me, Mr. Speaker, that as a veteran of World War II, I had but one claim on the responsible place that I hold in Congress, and that was that I should have a full grasp and understanding of war and the young soldiers who fight it, its horrors and destruction, and that I might, with that understanding, contribute a small measure to peace.

You would not be offended, I am sure, if I suggest that we whet our interest in Korea, and with all of our hearts and our experiences and our combined power, join our soldiers in their fighting of our war. Part war and part peace is not a condition acceptable to any American. The commitment of troops to combat leaves but one course—to seek victory. The supply of more than a sufficient number of men and matériel necessary to achieve such victory quickly, decisively, and with a minimum of loss, is an obligation, a moral obligation and a national obligation that cries for payment.

No foreign policy experts, no military experts, are necessary to the simple decision of this Congress to make available to our field commanders an abundance of troops and matériel sufficient to achieve the destruction or surrender of the enemy. How much? You and I do not know. Assuredly, however, the answer would be easy to obtain.

We entered Korea to win a victory or we are fools—fools with the blood of thousands of valiant men upon our hands—and I emphasize, our hands, not Mr. Truman's hands, for this Congress has resolved in favor of the war in Korea as surely and as definitely as if it had passed a resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in Manchuria and other sanctuaries of our enemy are to remain inviolate for any reason, good or bad, military or political, we are relegated to produce a force that can and will overcome the enemy in the assigned arena. All of our field commanders are agreed that our present effort is a magnificent one. That being true, could not twice the amount of troops and matériel do a better job? Or three times the present effort assure a decisive victory in Korea?

No doubt the question arises in your mind as to what is meant by victory. The diplomats would give one answer, perhaps the politicians another, but the answer of the soldier is the one that is important.

I am certain his answer would be that victory would result when we have so decisively punished the people we are fighting in Korea that the fighting would cease; that the soldier might sleep and rest and live; that he might return to the world of human dignity, to his home, his family, to the things that he loves, the same as you and I. Moral victory, or any other type of platitude, would not be appealing to him—only a solid and decisive destruction of the enemy in Korea will justify the blood price we have paid.

The buying-time philosophy may sound all right to some, but it does not

appeal to me; nor does it, I am sure, appeal to your sons and brothers who are called upon to make the payments in the violence of battle.

Buying time is a meaningless phrase when we are as smug and content and cantankerous and as undecided and as peaceful as too many of us are here at home. If Korea is but a preliminary bout, a prelude to a major or world conflict, then the actions of this Congress, the executive branch of the Government, and the people of this country generally and of our allies are but criminal.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are acting in a criminal way if we are buying time with young lives, for certainly we are not going all out to prepare for a major war. At this very moment a bill lies dormant between the two Houses, a bill that would increase the manpower of the Army, the so-called draft bill.

I am certain that we have not reached a point in our national history that we have so dulled our consciences and our perceptions that we accept as necessary the periodic tribute of American lives, and certainly we cannot sit idly by and wait for developments or inner collapse, for so few make so many and so great sacrifices.

I do not believe that we can avoid war by warring in degrees. American soldiers in battle in whatever degree of war under any flag are entitled to the full power and might of our great country and its great people.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a portion of the front page of the Washington Star where, in one column, Draft Director Lewis B. Hershey is quoted as saying that we are in a soft period of manpower needs. In an adjoining column one of General Van Fleet's commanders is quoted as saying, "We are in good shape with what we have, but we could use more troops." I have on my desk, Mr. Speaker, a clipping wherein a soldier returned from Korea has stated that we are short on men as well as matériel, and that our equipment is not of the best type.

Can we justify peace at home and war in Korea? Can we—Democrats, Republicans, Americans—discharge our responsibility without going all out?

Mr. Speaker, our troops, our American troops are committed under the United Nations banner. They have committed with them small complements of troops of other countries. When troops of different countries are committed in a common cause they deserve the full-time allegiance of all countries involved.

As badly as we need allies, as earnestly as we may desire not to go alone, we cannot in honor or in safety accept part-time allegiance from our allies. Those who play with a common enemy commercially can never be expected to fight him wholeheartedly. Such allies are a luxury and a burden that we cannot afford. Certainly the time is now when other nations must decide their course of action, choose their friends or their would-be conquerors.

Communism is the world public enemy No. 1. Its objective is world domination and slavery. In such a fight there can be no neutrality, no interested observers. Our country did not draw the line. It was drawn by Russia.

"Which side are you on?" may not be in diplomatic language, but it is a question which demands an answer in keeping with the stark realities of this period of international violence. Traffic with the enemy is immoral and world-wide guerrilla warfare cannot be a steady diet.

Mr. Speaker, we have no alternative. We must achieve victory in Korea. If we cannot do this, then it would appear utterly ridiculous while we talk of buying time to talk, at the same time, of preparing for a so-called big war.

I know the flood of stock answers to such a statement, such answers as "That would be an entirely different matter," that "in such a war we could bring to bear all of our mighty resources," and so forth. But such answers are not satisfactory.

Little war or big war, the death of our boys is real, the liberty and the freedom of our land is imperiled. We must decisively win or we lose. Little war or big war, the arena may be different, but the game is the same. It is played for keeps.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called big war can come only as a result of the actions of Russia, directly or indirectly. Only fools would look with favor on a war with Russia, but only fools could conclude that we are at peace with Russia. Her present Government is evil and untrustworthy, without principles or decency.

It is my considered judgment that there can be no peace upon this earth so long as the present Government of Russia exists, and follows its avowed objectives, world domination and world slavery. Such a conclusion leaves little leeway. The present Government of Russia is one that must fall or be replaced by one that can live in the community of nations, or she must be outlawed, isolated, or destroyed.

The United Nations was born out of the hope and ideals of average people throughout the world. It was a prayerful expression shared by every good heart that man would abolish war as a means of settling disputes among nations. It can survive and be useful only if its courage matches its idealistic birth.

The United Nations cannot be indecisive, fearful, or the tool of any great power. It cannot condone aggression under whatever ruse it is perpetrated. Outlaws, world outlaws, strong or weak, must be branded as such and brought to justice.

The United Nations must participate in a world-wide mobilization of physical and moral strength to defeat the enemy. If it has not the character or the strength to do this, then it is a useless failure. Peace is an objective worth striving for, living for, and dying for. It is forth sacrifice, but one thing is certain, the striving, the sacrifice, and the dying must be equalized, shared by all, to bring true and lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, neither this Government nor any other government has the right to buy time with other people's blood and remain, at the same time, a half-alerted people and government. Our war is against communism, whose chief proponent is Russia.

All of the available evidence leads to but one conclusion, Russia is responsible

for the invasion of South Korea and the intervention of Chinese Communists.

Russia will go to war when she feels that she can defeat the United States and other free peoples. The only peace that the present Russian Government can tolerate is one in which she can continue her conquest. To this day the only defense advanced is that the free nations develop such a military posture as to discourage Russia from attacking anywhere in the world.

There are few who would choose war over peace, few who would fail to support with money and enthusiasm a sound plan for peace, but it must be a sound plan, and not a dream. It must be gaged to realities, the realities of a cruel world. It must be a plan that we, the common people, can understand and approve. We understand war and we hate it, but we do not fear it, Mr. Speaker, for out of it has emerged our country and its freedom.

We do not understand diplomacy and we put little faith and trust in it. So often diplomacy seems to consist of elements of governments trying to keep peaceful little folks in a stew and a fight. The truth is that world-wide responsibility in an atomic age caught us unprepared. For weeks high level investigations are being conducted, and yet men die in Korea.

It seems to me that our present task is simple. We ought to quit talking so much and start working and fighting with and for those who fight for us.

Mr. Speaker, I realize all too well that I have not solved all of our problems, or perhaps, not any of them by making this statement. I do sincerely hope, however, that I have called to your attention what I believe to be the most compelling and urgent problem—victory in Korea. As I stand here now—at this moment—the Communists are massing men and matériel in Korea, hoping to destroy our armies. Have we provided and sent sufficient planes? Have we provided and sent sufficient tanks, guns, men, and matériel? Have we, Mr. Speaker, done our best? Have we joined the war with our troops in Korea? I think not.

Old soldiers may never die, but young soldiers do. Is not it time that we momentarily forget old soldiers and remember the young ones?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had the honor yesterday afternoon of having as a visitor one of our distinguished American soldiers, who commanded a famous regiment in South Korea. Although a young man of only 38 years of age, he is already a brigadier general. I sat in the presence of that fine officer, that brave man, that fine American, and asked him many questions. What noticeably impressed me was his pride in the American soldier. He said, "Those boys over there are great fighters. Their morale is high. There is no finer fighter in the world than the American soldier who is fighting in Korea." That came from the lips of one who is just back here, who was in Korea prior to June 25 of last year, who commanded a famous regiment, who was

sent on special missions and special work, and who goes over to Europe in the near future for service with General Eisenhower. I should like the record to show the great pride he had in and the great tribute he paid to the American soldier who is serving and fighting in Korea.

Mr. LYLE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I might say that if the Congress of the United States had half the courage and the guts of the American soldier we would get this thing over with in just a little while.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I also had a thrilling experience within the last few days. I went out to Walter Reed Hospital last week and communed for a time with those boys who have their legs off and their arms off, and who recently returned from Korea. They, like the gentleman in the well of the House, want this war to end in victory, a real victory, not in any stalemate.

Mr. LYLE. Yes. I am sure they would join the gentleman and me in saying that they are tired of hearing all of the bickering and the accusing and all of the senseless talk, because it is an American problem, and only a solid, decisive victory and destruction of the enemy can justify the blood price we paid in Korea.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I have a high respect for the gentleman from Texas. I want to be sure I get his point. I wonder if he could not be a little more specific as to what he calls the senseless talk. I certainly appreciate there is some senseless talk, but does the gentleman mean to say that the Congress and the committees of the Congress should not concern themselves with the question as to whether the strategy which has been used in Korea and the limitations that have been placed upon our troop movements and so forth in Korea are sound or not? Does the gentleman believe we should not be going into those things at this time?

Mr. LYLE. No, I do not believe we should not.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I just wanted to be sure that I was not misunderstanding the gentleman.

Mr. LYLE. The gentleman knows what I am talking about. I mean in the sense of the cheap political profit that has been tried to be made out of this terrible situation in which young Americans are dying. Of course, I want the Congress to understand all of the problems. Of course, I want the Congress to have full hearings and full discussions. But I would like to see honest and sincere and decent investigation and discussion, because only that sort of conduct is worthy of the soldiers we have over there. Cheap political chicanery and statements just are not part of the American system that we have at this moment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. May I say I concur fully in that statement by the gentleman.

Mr. LYLE. I am sure you do. I am sure you do.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman wants to see these men who have so grievously suffered and been wounded so badly have every benefit that they can receive and all of the benefits that World War I veterans have received.

Mr. LYLE. So much so that I would like to give them back their legs and their eyes and their arms, but of course that is something that we cannot do.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But we can give them everything we can to approximate giving them back what they have lost.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I am reluctant to interrupt such a fine speech by the distinguished gentleman from Texas. I think we can all appreciate very much the speech he is making at this time, the timeliness of it and the challenge that is in it. I feel very strongly, and I think the gentleman will agree with me, that the hour has come when we should use every weapon at our disposal inside Korea to bring victory there. Does the gentleman agree with me?

Mr. LYLE. Anything else is criminal.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for his remarks. I value his remarks highly on any subject and especially on the subject he is now discussing. I well remember that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] spent a long time in the front line of battle in World War II. He is an outstanding American patriot and the Members of this great body are proud of him. It was from the battlefield in Italy during the latter part of World War II that he was elected to the Congress of the United States although he was not a candidate. He knows war firsthand. He served as an enlisted man and served as an officer in many battles where American soldiers were killed and injured all around him. He knows their problems. He knows what an old soldier who never dies thinks as well as a young soldier who gets killed upon the battlefield. I personally appreciate Major LYLE's remarks. I would like to ask the gentleman one question. Does the gentleman believe that although the Korean war is not a declared war, it comes nearer being a war that was initiated, at least commenced by unanimous consent of the American people and especially the American Congress, than any other war in history?

Mr. LYLE. I think so.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman for the remarks he has made in the well of the House this afternoon and for the calm, dispassionate way in which he addressed himself to the subject. I hope that our friends

among the United Nations will take note of the two very important resolutions approved unanimously by our body this afternoon and will understand that we, the representatives of the American people, feel very deeply on those subjects and that they, our friends among the United Nations, will follow through in behalf of the free peoples on this earth.

Mr. LYLE. They have little choice. I think that with the world situation as it is there is not any middle ground; there is not any ground for neutrality; they are either with us or they are against us. It is a fight for the survival of freedom and decency and human dignity.

Mr. CANFIELD. In the vernacular of the street, the chips are down, and they must produce or else.

Mr. LYLE. The gentleman is correct.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BURNSIDE]. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an article from the New York Times.)

DANGERS OF FASCISM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of today, Tuesday, May 15, 1951, contains the following very interesting article about Fascists organizing a world alliance:

FASCISTS ORGANIZE A WORLD ALLIANCE—NEO-NAZIS FROM EIGHT COUNTRIES SET UP INTERNATIONAL BODY AT RALLY IN SWEDEN
(By George Axelsson)

MALMOE, SWEDEN, May 13.—A new neo-Nazi international movement was founded here today by 30 Fascist leaders from eight different lands to the accompaniment of clanking Hitlerian jack boots, shouts of "Heil Hitler" and theatrical salutations with outstretched left hands.

The leaders were supported by about seventy other representatives from Sweden, Germany, Italy, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Trieste, Denmark, and Norway, and by 350 steady and 150 casual supporters.

The rank and file are mostly students, who applauded ostentatiously, intellectuals and simple workmen from the local textile, shipbuilding, and municipal undertakings.

The hosts of the meeting were the New Swedish Movement of the Swedish Opposition, which has its roots in the naive Swedish National Socialist organization started at Upsala University and elsewhere in the early days of Hitler in 1930. This parent body dwindled about 1940 when the Swedes were dumbfounded by the Hitler-Stalin pact. It was refounded in 1941 on a strictly anti-Communist basis when Hitler invaded the Soviet Union only to fade away when Hitler perished in 1945.

With the weakening east-west wartime alliance, the movement was founded again in 1949 and acquired its present name.

The motivating force of the movement is Per Engdahl. He is a small ascetic man with abnormal short-sightedness.

During the war, Mr. Engdahl was backed by many wealthy Nazi sympathizers but he says the movement is now self-supporting. He edits an extremist periodical *The Way Forward* and boasts of 4,000 followers.

Yesterday's march along Malmoe's main square was followed today by the annual general meeting of the Swedish opposition with foreign guests present. Tomorrow the new international organization will go into committee and will choose a name. Tuesday

an international agenda will be drafted and the gathering will break up.

The leading foreign representatives present are Dr. Franz Richter, member of the West Germany Parliament for the Socialist Reich party; Henri de Bonifacio, chairman of the National French Committee representing 14 assorted Nationalist movements; Jean Walther, editor of the French Student Organ Occident; Signor Lanciari of Italy, who according to Per Engdahl regards Mussolini as "a portent of a timeless tradition of which fascism was not the last word"; Mr. Jordan, propaganda chief of the Danish Reform Movement; Helge Gronstad, general secretary of the Norwegian Social Betterment Movement, who served a sentence for quislingism; and Arne Bergsvik, another Norwegian extremist.

Among those who expressed solidarity with the Malmoe rally but did not manage to get here are Sir Oswald Mosley, leader of the British Union of Fascists; Otto Scorzeny, who rescued Mussolini from an Alpine fortress and planned Hitler's last stand; Johan van Dyck of Belgium and Captain Larum of the Danish National Socialist party.

Beside the national flags with which the movement marched through the streets yesterday and stacked at headquarters today are the Stars and Stripes, the Union Jack and St. Andrews banner of Czarist Russia.

One of the main objectives of the movement is to penetrate United States and British democratic organizations by taking advantage of the rising tide of anticommunism.

I want you to notice that last phrase: "By taking advantage of the rising tide of anticommunism."

On the floor of this House a number of times I have commended the Members of Congress for their fights against communism. I know that we should have done everything, and we did, within our power to destroy the threat of communism in this country. We do not like communism at home or abroad, and we have been right in our opposition to communism and fighting communism every inch of the way, but at the same time I was warning the Congress of the danger of an approach of an enemy from the right as the Communist enemy approached us from the left, that this enemy from the right could be just as devastating and destructive as the enemy from the left. There is no difference, or at least there is slight difference, between communism and fascism; they both lead to dictatorship. In arriving at that dictatorship there is a difference in the method used, it is true; but when they get to the goal, communism and fascism are exactly the same, because each is a totalitarian government. Personally I think that the Fascist-minded people and the Fascist people in the United States look with great favor upon the rise of the communistic movement in this country and they do not look with great favor on the destruction of communism for the reason that they want communism to remain for the purpose of having something to fight and hold up as being so horrible no decent American citizen could embrace it and having that feeling the American people will be softer and will submit easier to fascism approaching us from the right.

I think that is exactly what happened in Italy. I think that is what happened in Germany. The people were led to believe that communism was so bad and the leaders were right in teaching the people how horrible and how bad communism was, but these same leaders

failed to teach them that fascism was just as devastating and just as destructive. So when they reached that proper point it was easy for the people hating communism to the extent they did to gladly and willingly embrace the alternative of fascism. That is exactly what they did in those two great countries and what will be attempted here.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. I was thumbing through the Record a few days ago and I was startled to find that communism appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some 5 to 10 times more often than the word "Americanism." I wonder if we cannot make a better contribution to the future young Americans who must carry these burdens if occasionally somewhere down the line we put in some of the elements that make for Americanism and what it is. Would the gentleman let me cite one example?

I had a young lady working for me; she was very satisfactory. She came into my office the other day and asked: "Do you know I am a Catholic?" I said, "No, I did not know you were a Catholic." She laughed. Just think of it, nowhere in all the world can people go to work for the Government, do satisfactory work, and others not even know what religion they have. That is an element of Americanism. We should not overlook other Americanisms when we get so enthusiastic in chasing communism around because our Americanism is the one great saving in the world and we ought to put something in the RECORD occasionally about it.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

This last phrase here I again invite your attention to. In fact I will read the sentence again:

One of the main objectives of the movement is to penetrate United States and British democratic organizations by taking advantage of the rising tide of anti-communism.

In other words, these Fascist groups believe that the American people have become soft, they are distrustful, they have too much bickering, too much disunity, too much confusion to resist a strong Fascist movement at this time. They have been interested in fighting communism, so these people say, and now is the time to walk in with fascism as the alternative.

We certainly hope it does not happen here in the United States, but it can happen here. There are many things happening today that will be water on the wheel, so to speak, of the Fascist movement in this country, starting abroad that is true, but there are lots of Fascist-minded people as well as Fascists in the United States.

DEPRESSION POSSIBLE

It is possible for us to have a depression right here in the grand old United States when we are enjoying a time of the greatest prosperity in our history. It is possible for us to slide into one of the worst depressions and panics this country has ever had. Many things are happening that could be cited as evi-

dence that something like that is possible and it fits right into the Fascist fight.

I shall not go into it in this discussion, but in conclusion I want to warn the American people, I want to warn the American Congress, that communism is not the only threat we have; that fascism is just as devastating and just as destructive, and while we shall continue and we must continue on the alert against any efforts of the Communists to get any kind of a hold on our country, let us remain on the alert against the Fascists getting any kind of hold on our country. Many people are quick to condemn communism, and I am certainly glad that they do, but it would be more pleasing to me if they, in the same breath or in the same sentence or the same speech, somewhere, would also condemn fascism. They are working hand in hand, and, although their methods are different, the goal of each is the same and it leads but to one goal, and that is totalitarianism, which we must not have in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

APPRECIATION OF THE SPEECH MADE BY THE GENTLEMAN FROM TEXAS, MR. LYLE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak with deep appreciation of the very fine speech made by a great soldier and patriot, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE]. It was one of the finest speeches I ever heard and one of the finest speeches of appreciation of the men who are fighting and dying for us. I know it will mean a great deal to them, because I believe today they wonder why more people do not talk about them; why more is not done in the way of giving them the—I do not call them benefits—services that the men of other wars have received, and I know the gentleman is so interested in having them receive every benefit. Twelve of them are coming to the Capitol tomorrow regarding legislation pertaining to automobiles. It seems rather strange that they have to come and speak for themselves, but such seems to be the case.

FOREIGN POLICY—ARMING OF THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS

During hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in the Seventy-ninth Congress as a member of that committee I asked the present Secretary of State some questions which are still unanswered and which I am hopeful will be asked and answered before the investigations of our far-eastern policy in this Congress are completed.

The reason I think these questions have a bearing today is that under the policies which the State Department adopted toward China at that time, and which have continued until, at least, the Chinese Communist intervention in the Korean war, we have suffered some 70,000 casualties and more than 10,000 dead.

I have talked to wounded victims of this Korean war, and I know they are confused and puzzled as to how this conflict came about and its background.

The hearings I refer to were on H. R. 6795, a bill presented by the Secretary of State, which purported to provide military advice and assistance to the Republic of China, but which, the hearings brought out, was designed also to give military training and equipment to Chinese Communist forces, so that they could be amalgamated into a new non-political army, as Mr. Acheson, then Under Secretary of State, described it in his testimony.

I wish to say that to the very great credit of the Congress no final action was taken on this particular bill, but policies advanced by Mr. Acheson then were pursued, and questions asked by members of the committee were never answered.

The hearings were never published, and for that reason I think it is particularly pertinent to bring portions of the testimony to the attention of the House today.

During the hearings the following colloquy took place, while the then Secretary War, Mr. Patterson, was testifying:

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Secretary, the War Department did not write this bill?

Secretary PATTERSON. I believe the bill was prepared in the State Department, is that not right?

Mr. ACHESON. In the State, War, and Navy Coordinating Committee; by the three Departments.

Mrs. ROGERS. Who actually wrote it?

Mr. ACHESON. The whole committee.

Mrs. ROGERS. Who is on the committee?

Mr. ACHESON. I think the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Dunn, Assistant Secretary of War Patterson, and Assistant Secretary of the Navy, now Under Secretary, Mr. Sullivan.

Mrs. ROGERS. Who was the legal adviser?

Secretary PATTERSON. I do not know.

Mrs. ROGERS. Was it the Under Secretary?

Secretary PATTERSON. There is no scarcity of lawyers in that committee, or any other.

Mr. Speaker, my Congressional Directory for June 1946, the time these hearings were in progress, fails to list a State, War, and Navy Coordinating Committee. It does list a State Department Coordinating Committee with Dean Acheson as chairman. Among its members were Alger Hiss and John Carter Vincent. Mr. Hiss also is listed as Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs. Mr. Vincent is listed as Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs. Both positions, as you know, had an important bearing on the matter before the committee at that time. I think my question, which was never answered, was pertinent then and that it is pertinent today in the light of the tragedy we are undergoing now in Korea.

I stated in my interrogatory, and I quote from the transcript, the original transcript and the only copy that I know to be available:

Mrs. ROGERS. I would be interested to know who actually drafted it.

Referring to the bill.

Further on I commented:

There is no protection in the bill against giving away military secrets.

To which Secretary Patterson replied:

It says that if any information of that character is turned over it is under condition that it be not circulated by the Republic of China.

Further on in the record, I commented:

Mrs. ROGERS. If the State Department is going to run our military policy I think it is a very good time to bring the matter up.

Referring to the size of our own Military Establishment, which Mr. Patterson had stated could be reduced from 1,550,000 in July of that year to 1,070,000 by July of the following year:

Secretary PATTERSON. The State Department has never said we could not have more men than that.

My colleague on the committee, Mr. VORYS, then asked:

Is there fighting going on now in China?

To which the Secretary replied:

I believe there is fighting going on sporadically in Manchuria.

Now I think we should turn to Mr. Acheson, which brings us to the nub of this controversy.

Mr. Acheson presented a telegram from Gen. George C. Marshall, then in China, dated June 18, 1946, the day previous to the hearing, in which General Marshall stated:

The purpose of the bill presented to the Congress by the Secretary of State is to support the American program of creating a stable and friendly China.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that General Marshall made no reference to a State, War, and Navy coordinating committee. General Marshall continued:

The assistance to Chinese ground forces authorized in the bill would be carried out in accordance with the program of reorganization and integration of National government and Chinese Communist armies agreed upon by Government and Communist representatives.

Without passage of the bill the President and myself would lack authorization to carry out a phase of American policy toward China which appears vital to the success of our announced policy.

American assistance as contemplated under the bill to supplement the efforts of the Chinese themselves, would serve to create in China ground, air, and naval forces modern in character and of sufficient strength and effectiveness to contribute materially to stability in the Far East.

Further, Secretary Acheson states—and this is from the official transcript:

The Communist forces were lacking in the type of organization, training, and equipment which would have made practicable their incorporation into a new nonpolitical national army.

Mr. Speaker I think it is important to note that from Mr. Acheson's own lips the Communist forces in 1946 were lacking in the type of organization, training, and equipment to fulfill the role the State Department had assigned to them at that time.

I continue to read from the official transcript of Mr. Acheson's testimony:

The Communist leaders have asked, and General Marshall has agreed—

And this is Mr. Acheson speaking—that their integration with the other forces be preceded by a brief period of United States training, and by the supply of minimum quantities of equipment.

Further on Mr. Acheson stated:

I can only emphasize to this committee the very great concern of the State Department

that General Marshall's task be facilitated in carrying out the program he has proposed.

I think the House will be interested in some of the subsequent questioning in this hearing, and in Mr. Acheson's responses, particularly in view of the fact, as I said before, that the hearings have never been printed, and that no extra copies of the transcript are available to any Member of Congress, including members of the committee. Let me repeat an answer to a question asked at that time by my distinguished colleague [Mr. EATON].

Secretary—then Under Secretary—Acheson contributed a four-and-one-half-page statement, in which he said, in part:

The Chinese Army is now estimated to contain approximately 300 divisions of some 10,000 to 12,000 men each. The strength of the Communist army is estimated at present to be one-fourth as great. To effect a solution and to combine these forces into one Chinese Army will require a flexible and adequate authority. Under the reorganization which General Marshall proposes this enormous number of troops will be integrated into a new and well-trained peacetime army of reasonable size. It is impossible for me to give you in detail this proposal at this time but the ultimate goal is an army of some 60 divisions.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson recommended taking in the Communists into the Chinese Army which was one-fourth the size of the Nationalist Chinese Army?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am reading a direct quotation from Mr. Acheson.

Mr. O'KONSKI. He actually recommended that?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is in the direct quotation. The reason I am giving it at this late hour is because I want the Record to have it so that we may be forewarned for the future. Further, Secretary Acheson states, and this is from the official transcript which I am quoting:

The Communist forces were lacking in the type of organization, training, and equipment which would have made practical their integration into a new nonpolitical national army.

Think of that.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note from Mr. Acheson's own lips the Communist forces in 1946 were lacking in the type of organization, training, and equipment to fulfill the role the State Department had assigned to them at that time.

Continuing to read from the official transcript of Mr. Acheson's testimony, I quote:

The Communist leaders have asked and General Marshall has agreed—

And this is Mr. Acheson speaking—that their integration with the other forces be preceded by a brief period of United States training and by the supply of minimum quantities of equipment.

Further, Mr. Acheson stated:

I can only emphasize to this committee the very great concern of the State Department

that General Marshall's task be facilitated in carrying out the program he has proposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNSIDE). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection on the part of Members who have special orders following, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Do I understand the gentleman to tell us that the testimony she is now reading indicates that Mr. Acheson recommended the training of Chinese Communist troops by American officers?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; I am reading the quotation. This is in the transcript of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and is taken from that transcript:

The Communist leaders have asked, and General Marshall has agreed—

And this is Mr. Acheson speaking—that their integration with the other forces be preceded by a brief period of United States training and by a supply of minimum quantities of equipment.

Mr. Acheson states further:

I can only emphasize to this committee the very great concern of the State Department that General Marshall's task be facilitated in carrying out the program he has proposed.

I think the House would be interested in some of the subsequent questioning in this hearing, and in Mr. Acheson's responses, particularly in view of the fact, as I said before, that the hearings have never been printed and no extra copies of the transcript are available to any Member of the Congress, including the members of the committee.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Will the gentleman be kind enough to put this full transcript into the Record and the source of it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, I am giving you the direct quotations and when the gentleman reads it in the Record he will see the direct quotations, particularly of my own questions and the answers of the witnesses.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Has any publication ever been made of this before?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Not that I know of. I made a short statement and the papers carried it pretty much all over the country, but it was not so complete a statement.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think the gentleman has contributed more in digging out the background of the mess that we are in than has been accomplished by the hearings of the other body so far for the past 2 weeks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was very anxious at the time regarding

the arming of Communist China, as my questions indicate, and I have been very anxious steadily ever since to know what has been going on in the way of arming and helping the Communists the way England has been arming and helping the Communists.

On Saturday two people of English descent told me that they did not want General MacArthur, which I thought was a great impertinence. He has been winning their battles for them, but they have insisted on arming Red China.

I notice on page 3 of your statement, Mr. Secretary, that General Marshall arranged for the training by our American people, with the use of American equipment, of certain Communist leaders who are to be incorporated into the national army. Are those fellows now fighting the national army in Manchuria?

Now listen to this answer by the Secretary. I quote:

Mr. ACHESON. No.

Then he resumes:

I think the situation is this, Mr. Eaton, I do not believe that any such training has gone on in the past or is now going on.

Mr. Acheson continuing:

What General Marshall was asked to do, and agreed to do, and what is necessary to be done, is that when the plan for the amalgamation of the two armies is accepted, and begins to go into effect, those units of the Communist army which are going to be amalgamated with the national army will receive a period of training from 60 to 90 days before they march out to join their opposite numbers in the other army. The plan roughly contemplates that a certain number of months from the day it is to go into effect, certain divisions of the Communist army and certain divisions of the Nationalist army will be amalgamated. When that occurs, it is essential that the troops from the Communist side which go into the troops of the new Chinese army have a minimum of the same sort of training that their compatriots have had. Some of the divisions in the present national army have been trained by United States forces. These American training forces that we are talking about will be forces that will take a Communist outfit which is to be amalgamated with the new army and put it in shape so that it can readily go into the outfit. That is the program.

I asked the Secretary this question, and quote from the transcript:

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Secretary, how many Communists is it anticipated will be trained under the proposed plan?

Mr. ACHESON. I think that they will try to take all the units that are going to be put into the new army immediately preceding their joining the new army and give them a 60- or 90-day schooling.

Mrs. ROGERS. But can you give us any approximate number that will be trained?

Mr. ACHESON. I do not know. If the total size of the army is going to be 60 divisions, I do not know what proportion of the personnel would be Communist.

Mrs. ROGERS. Could you get that proportion for us?

Mr. ACHESON. The information that I have handed me is that of the 60 divisions which are contemplated, the personnel which would be equivalent of 50 divisions will come from the national army and the personnel which would be equivalent of 10 divisions will come from the Communist army.

I asked the Secretary also:

Do you think that China will turn to Russia if we do not offer the assistance—

To which he replied:

Mr. ACHESON. I have no views on that subject. I am sure that we will assist China. I do not think I want to speculate on what would happen if we did not.

Mrs. ROGERS. Is there any way we could have an agreement with China—and remember we are talking about training and military equipment for the Chinese Communist forces—Is there any way we could have an agreement with China whereby she would not use our arms against us?

Here is Mr. Acheson's reply, and I hope the Members of the House will take particular note:

Mr. ACHESON. Well, I suppose that we have that in the United Nations Charter. There all the nations agree that they will not employ force against any country except in accordance with the principles and under the procedure of the Charter. Under the principles and procedure of the Charter, if anyone wished to employ force against us, I am sure we would veto that. They will not do it. That is the technical and legal answer to your questions. I think we can rest assured that the Chinese will not do that.

Mrs. ROGERS. I suppose a fight could start before that was decided, could it not?

Mr. ACHESON. Do you mean that the Chinese would attack us? I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that we should not go into that.

Mr. ACHESON. I am sure that we do not need to worry.

Mr. Speaker, there we have the record, and the assurances given to a highly important committee of this Congress by Mr. Acheson, as long ago as 1946, that we "do not need to worry."

Well, we have many wounded boys lying now out at Walter Reed, and at the Bethesda Naval Hospital, and in service hospitals all over the country as a result of our—shall I say—misguided State Department policies. I think we did need to worry then, and I think we do need to worry now.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentlewoman just described to us what appears to have been an American project undertaken by the State Department back in 1946.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As proven by the testimony, undoubtedly.

Mr. CANFIELD. She has made reference to a bill before her committee which was the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And which the House never passed.

We had assurances then that we did not need to worry and that if the Chinese Communists made any moves toward aggression we would veto that—and I am quoting Mr. Acheson—in the United Nations.

Some of the defenders of Mr. Acheson and the State Department are making a great to-do today over their claim that Gen. Douglas MacArthur did not believe the Red Chinese would intervene in Korea. Whether he did not believe so is obscure, and we have only a purported and partial record obtained by eavesdropping at Wake Island.

But this statement by Mr. Acheson that I have quoted is on the record, and on the record before this Congress.

As long ago as 1946 Mr. Acheson was giving this Congress complete assurance that we need not worry, that China would never attack us, and that we would veto that if and whenever they might move in that direction.

I think it is time that Mr. Acheson explain what inspired his beliefs then—and his evasions—and what his views are today in this tragic matter so that we may know if he still believes as he did then, and I quote again from the official transcript:

Mr. ACHESON. I am sure that we do not need to worry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GRAIN FOR INDIA

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, President Truman asked Congress to pass an aid to India bill to provide grain for the relief of that starving country.

A bill can be kept in a state of suspended animation for months, but most of the 340,000,000 people who barely exist in the Republic of India cannot manage this feat.

Nearly 5 months ago, the Government of India appealed to the United States for 2,000,000 tons of grain in order to avert a famine.

The stark facts are these:

Fifty million tons of grain were needed.

Due to floods, drought, earthquakes, and the locusts, only 44,000,000 tons could be harvested. New Delhi only had enough cash to buy 4,000,000 of the 6,000,000 ton balance required to meet minimum needs. Moreover, there are no reserves on hand. Wheat shipments are rushed to hungry areas and are consumed immediately. When children cry for food, some mothers give them mud, because there is nothing else. These are not isolated cases. The 2,000,000 tons they ask from our surplus would keep 100,000,000 Indians who get a pathetic grain ration of 9 ounces a day alive for 2 months. It would also help to build up a little reserve against shipping delays and avert mass starvation.

Must so many die from undernourishment simply because of political differences between the Governments of the United States and India?

This was not our policy toward Yugoslavia, even though that country is a Communist state, while India is not. It is one thing to be provoked by the failure of Pandit Nehru and his government to give us at least moral support in the struggle to contain aggression. I do not believe that this attitude should be carried over to the poverty-stricken people of India. Nor should the aid we can give be used as a not-so-polite form of pressure to gain concessions from them.

We, with our abundance, are the ones who are really on trial before nearly half the world's population that is but one meal away from starvation in Asia. While we defer or debate, and are kinder to our dogs and cats than we are to our fellow human beings, these millions who wither on the bone cannot stomach the "word meals" that we offer them.

No wonder we are losing the propaganda war in the Far East.

It should be apparent to everyone by now that communism thrives on hunger and misery. And the way to check its spread through distressed areas is to send the grain that is urgently needed. After that we can help substandard areas to build up their own economies so that there will be food and gainful employment for their peoples.

If we who have the extra food, fail to help the people of India, they may turn in desperation to the Communist regimes of China and Russia who may promise wheat and rice—and even send a little—in exchange for hidden concessions. Even a promise, partly fulfilled, is better than the interminable delay that will be regarded as denial. There is no time, when a man is starving, to criticize him lengthily, because his political opinions do not exactly coincide with ours. He is more apt to respond in friendly fashion after the gnawing pangs of hunger have been eased, because we have been a friend to him in his need.

All the peoples of Asia have the notion that our high standard of living is the result of the raw materials we bought from them at a beggar's price. They believe that we got abundance in exchange for the coolie wages that dribbled down to them. If we do not erase this misconception, communism will sweep over Asia, and then it will be too late for us to prevent this tragedy and this danger. There is still a little time left in which we can regain the initiative. And the first step is to provide food for the famine-stricken areas.

I should like to see this done for humanitarian reasons alone, for that would be true to the neighborly character of the American people.

On the sidelines of this vast misery, however, and anxious to exploit it in a manner that bodes no good for the people of India, is the Communist conspiracy. Its methods are cynical, devious, and unrelenting. To checkmate them, we must be realistic.

That is why I bring up the factor of manganese, and the vital role it plays in the production of the weapons necessary for our defense.

Soviet Russia is the prime producer of this strategic mineral, while the United States is able to scrape up within its borders only 9 percent of the quantity that it requires, for the manufacture of steel. Since the spring of 1948, when we cut off shipment of war materials to the Communist sphere of influence, exports of manganese from the Soviet Union to the United States, have all but ceased.

It was then that we turned to India, poor in food, but able to supply us with one-third of the manganese ore that we need for industry, for defense, and for the emergency stockpile. If it had not been for transportation difficulties, we could have obtained more. Using ships for one-way hauls is wasteful.

Happily, by shipping food to India, we will have empty bottoms which can be used to bring back a basic industrial material which we lack. Helping India's food needs will help our own need for critical manganese.

If grain is sent to India only at a price, or if we insist that its purchase be financed by a loan, we will not be able to get sufficient manganese which is essential as a steel-hardening agent.

When you come right down to cases, we cannot adopt a superior attitude in this crisis. Events could take the power of decision away from us and we would then be the victims of our own procrastination.

In answer to those who say that grain should not be given as an outright grant, the State Department informs us, and I quote:

India has no funds and no possibility of earning funds which could be spared to pay a debt for food. If the United States nevertheless responds to India's request by making food available only on a loan basis, it would inevitably be cited both by Soviet propagandists and by pro-Communist influences in India as demonstrating a lack of true friendship for India.

When the billions we have spent through the Marshall plan to halt communism in Europe is contrasted with our failure to help the peoples of Asia to raise their subhuman living standards, the proposal to give emergency assistance to India becomes imperative.

If we do not fill the void with food and faith, the Reds will beat us to it, and the global scales will be tipped hopelessly against us.

When our Nation has a surplus of food products as in this case, it can afford to give in the name of humanity.

When it has a shortage of industrial goods, it should expect other nations to pay in part for such of these goods as they want.

I believe that we should help India to build up her negligible trade balance on the positive side, so that she can buy from us the machinery, drugs, and fertilizer imports which she needs to build up her agriculture and industry to a self-sustaining level.

We cannot ruin this prospect at the very start by exacting payment for the food grains that are shipped to her for relief purposes.

Even though the government of India has indicated its preference for the simpler terms of the House bill, I think that we are in a better position to be generous.

We can save hundreds of thousands of lives from the starvation which has already claimed so many victims, and at the same time deal a heavy blow to Communist propaganda in Asia by furnishing emergency food aid to India without strings and without equivocation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

IS ILLINOIS CHAPTER OF NSA COMMUNIST DOMINATED?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the student body at Bradley University, Peoria, Ill., will on Friday, May 18 hold a referendum to determine if Bradley shall or shall not withdraw its membership in the National Student's Association. The NSA is a student organization consisting of representatives of over 300 American college and university student govern-

ments. Bradley University joined the NSA in February of 1950, with the understanding that it was organized to accomplish several objectives, including:

First. Promotion of beneficial aids for students in colleges and universities throughout the Nation.

Second. Sponsorship of the purchase-card system, which provides cooperative methods to obtain student discounts on purchases.

Third. Filling the long-existing need for a representative intercollegiate organization designed to serve the American student community, and to promote student interests and welfare.

The Bradley University Student Council voted to hold this important referendum next Friday as a result of a report made by Warren Reynolds, who was a delegate to an Illinois NSA convention held at Chicago on last April 22 and 23. Delegate Reynolds, according to the May 10 issue of the campus newspaper, the Bradley Scout, reported substantially as follows:

Illinois colleges and universities in attendance, included De Paul, Rosary, Rockford, Roosevelt, Chicago, Mundelein, North Central, St. Francis, University of Illinois, and Bradley. Despite the strong opposition of Delegate Reynolds, the convention voted to stand opposed to five bills to control subversive activities now pending in the Illinois State Legislature. The convention also passed the following resolutions, which were opposed by the sole Bradley delegate:

1. To implement NSA student bill of rights on campuses.
2. To oppose all bills to prevent Communists from teaching.
3. To oppose all loyalty oaths.
4. To urge repeal of the McCarran-Wood Communist Control Act.

Delegate Reynolds reported that all of these pro-Communist resolutions were sponsored by the large delegations from the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College.

An astute editorial writer for the Bradley Scout comments as follows on this report:

In the face of the publication of the Reynolds report on NSA, it is difficult to fail from noticing the organization's definite Roosevelt College-Chicago University domination with very pink trends. Since Bradley is a member of this organization, which may very well have started with fine ideals only to be shattered by a group of radicals, that would make every Bradley University student in a sense a part of it. Therefore, it is very important that every student should strive toward finding out all information concerning NSA, both pro and con, and then vote accordingly. The Scout feels that since this organization has opposed ideals of the American way of life and has asserted itself as being subversive, it is the duty of every student to aid the movement toward the abandonment of NSA; but, nevertheless, before you make your decision, consider both sides. We will publish additional information next week.

It is a well known fact that powerful elements of the Illinois Communist Party, Young Communist League, and the American Youth for Democracy have in the past concentrated their efforts to influence students and faculties of the University of Chicago and Roosevelt College in the Communist movement. These subversive elements have, through their treacherous and un-American maneuvers, been able to place Communists and Communist-sympathizers in

control over many student organizations on the Roosevelt College and University of Chicago campuses. They apparently have been able to gain control of the local chapters of the National Student Association in these two institutions. These two chapters in turn have, through the usual Communist technique of divide and conquer gained control of the offices and policies of the Illinois Regional Chapter of NSA.

The National Student Association was originally organized for perfectly legitimate purposes and there seems to be little evidence at the present time that the Communist Party has actually taken over control of the NSA on a national level. It is equally a well known fact that drastic attempts by the Communist Party and the AYD to infiltrate the organization on a national level were made from its very inception. This attempt is proven by a review of the files of the Un-American Activities Committee. Mr. Walter S. Steele stated in testimony before the Un-American Activities Committee in July of 1947 as follows:

Young reds are evidencing considerable interest at the present time in a comparatively new youth movement, the National Student's Organization which was conceived at a congress of youth held in Chicago late in 1946.

The interest of the Communists in the NSA is further shown by articles concerning it in the west coast Communist newspaper, *People's World*, and the Communist monthly, *Political Affairs*, which describes itself as "a magazine devoted to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism," both articles appearing just after the national constitutional convention to the NSA in 1947. *People's World* of September 10, 1947, claimed that the organization embraced all points of view to be found among students and, "by a vote of 401 to 36, decided to seek affiliation with the students of other lands banded together in the International Union of Students."

Political Affairs of October 1947, contained an article by Marvin Shaw, who claimed:

The founding constitutional convention of the United States National Student Association . . . marked a milestone in the development of the postwar American student movement . . . if the National Student Association is effectively to carry out its program, it must develop some formal means of close contact and cooperation with the long-established, active national organizations, e. g., the National Intercollegiate Christian Council (YM-YMCA), the National Federation of Catholic College Students, Students for Democratic Action, Young Progressive Citizens of America, American Youth for Democracy, Association of Internes and Medical Students, the Council of Student Clubs of the Communist Party, and others. These organizations were among the founders of the NSA.

He claimed further:

These two representatives of the Council of Student Clubs of the Communist Party, in democratic contrast to the procedure on many campuses, were able to participate actively in the convention, contributing both to the constitution and to the program.

While at the present time it appears that the NSA is free from Communist domination on a national level, all the

State and regional divisions, as well as local chapters of the NSA have reason to become increasingly vigilant in view of the pro-Communist resolutions passed at the Illinois regional convention at Chicago on April 22 and 23. Certainly the fact that all of the resolutions passed at the Illinois convention expressed opposition to Communist-control legislation of national and State scope furnished evidence of the Communist domination of the Roosevelt College and the University of Chicago chapters. Students at Bradley University have recognized this undeniable truth. They realize too that these two delegations, in sponsoring the pro-Communist resolutions, were actually not so much interested in preserving academic freedoms as they were in following the Communist Party line which has for its purpose the ultimate destruction of all individual rights and freedoms.

Bradley University students face one simple problem next Friday:

Shall they withdraw from the NSA and thereby weaken the Communist influence, or shall they stay in the organization and attempt to place loyal students in official control of the Illinois chapter who will actually be interested in furthering the stated purposes of the organization?

Having studied and watched the Communist Party technique over a period of the past 10 years, I am of the opinion that Bradley students would be wise in voting to withdraw its membership in the National Student Association and allow Roosevelt College and the University of Chicago chapters to stew in their own juice. Much can be said, however, for the contrary position.

I am extremely proud of the Bradley University student body for choosing the really representative method of solving its problem. I urge every student at Bradley University to express his or her opinion at the polls next Friday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; in one, to include an address by Charlotte Baruth.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances.

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. WIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a petition from a number of his constituents on taxes.

Mr. DENTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. REDDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include editorials.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two

instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HEBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MCGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; in one to include an address he made on Sunday, and in the other to include an excerpt from the Great Connecticut Second Regiment March.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BAKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of a bill he introduced.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] before the Republican National Committee at Tulsa, Okla.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. BUDGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and insert certain extraneous matter.

Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances; to include in one an article from *Pathfinder* magazine, in the second a telegram and letter, and in the third an editorial from the *Brooklyn Eagle*.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include an editorial and a speech.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials from the *Brooklyn Eagle*.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two letters.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial written by Walter F. Wright, Jr.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include a newspaper article.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SHEPPARD, for May 17, 18, 19, and 20, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARVEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), on account of a death in the family.

To Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for today, on account of official business.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table, and under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 588. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of William Bergen;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho;

H. R. 656. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Al Parker;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of the estate of D. A. Montgomery;

H. R. 849. An act for the relief of the estate of Henry W. Savidge;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Clarke; and

H. R. 3297. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 14, 1951, present

to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3336. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 16, 1951, 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:

455. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 132); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

456. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

457. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (44 Stat. 403); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 100. Concurrent resolution to provide for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol in honor of Constantino Brumidi; without amendment (Rept. No. 446). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 158. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (c) of the Rules of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 447). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3091. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1181. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records; with amendment (Rept. No. 449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1203. A bill to amend the act of October 30, 1941, as amended, to authorize Air Force officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to take action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of Government property; with amendment (Rept. No. 450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2737. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, ob-

servers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries; with amendment (Rept. No. 451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1179. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; with amendment (Rept. No. 452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1199. A bill to amend section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, relating to travel by dependents and transportation of household and personal effects; with amendment (Rept. No. 453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1201. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), as amended, so as to provide that a mess operated under the direction of a Supply Corps officer can be operated either on a quantity or on a monetary-ration basis; with amendment (Rept. No. 454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1215. A bill to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1216. A bill to authorize the President to convey and assign all equipment contained in or appertaining to the United States Army Provisional Philippine Scout Hospital at Fort McKinley, Philippines, to the Republic of the Philippines and to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain Philippine Scouts hospitalized therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1200. A bill to correct an error in section 1 of the act of June 28, 1947 "to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States"; without amendment (Rept. No. 457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2735. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain military prisoners and confinement facilities to the control and management of the Attorney General; with amendment (Rept. No. 458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2736. A bill to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Armed Services. S. 927. An act to amend section 6 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949; with amendment (Rept. No. 460). Referred to the Community of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3399. A bill to amend certain titles of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 96. Resolution opposing the admission of Communist China to membership in the United Nations; with amendment (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATTLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 101. Concurrent resolution urging the General Assembly of the United Nations to take action with respect to placing an arms embargo on Communist China, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. 464). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAMSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2395. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," to provide basic authority for certain activities of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 465). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RIBICOFF: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 57. Concurrent resolution, reaffirming the friendship of the American people to all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union; with amendments (Rept. No. 466). 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. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 662. A bill for the relief of William O. Stevens; without amendment (Rept. No. 461). 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. BAKER:

H. R. 4089. A bill to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 so as to provide for control of rents charged by the Atomic Energy Commission for housing accommodations at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4090. A bill to authorize the payment by the Veterans' Administration of increased compensation on account of service-connected total deafness to veterans in receipt of compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4091. A bill to liberalize the basis for establishing wartime service connection for active tuberculosis and the psychoses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4092. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4093. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4094. A bill to provide for research in child life; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4095. A bill to provide the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies of United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4096. A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, relating to reinstatement of war risk yearly renewable term insurance and United States Government life insurance by service-connected disabled World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4097. A bill to raise the limit placed on the monthly disability compensation payable to veterans suffering from service-con-

nected quadriplegia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4098. A bill to authorize, for a temporary period, the purchase by the Government of anthracite in amounts sufficient to maintain normal production and employment in the anthracite region, to promote the general national welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4099. A bill to readjust postal rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4100. A bill to provide that in certain cases newspapermen shall not be required to reveal in Federal courts the source of their information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 4101. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4102. A bill to amend section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 (which establishes a preference for World War II veterans in the sale or rental of certain housing accommodations) so as to establish a similar preference for gold-star parents; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 4103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, so as to make nontaxable certain stock transfers made by insurance companies to secure the performance of obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4104. A bill to amend section 117 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the income-tax treatment of sales of livestock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4105. A bill to provide that, in the application of reduction-in-force regulations promulgated under section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to locomotive engineers employed by the Panama Railroad Company, service performed in other civilian positions shall be disregarded; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 4106. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" by adding a new section thereto known as section 1732b to permit the photographic reproduction of business records and the introduction of the same in evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RA3AUT:

H. R. 4107. A bill to extend to certain persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, the benefits of titles II, III, and IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4108. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), as amended, to include persons whose service-connected disability is rated not less than 40 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4109. A bill to amend section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 4110. A bill to provide for the classification of the public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4111. A bill to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and disbursing officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4112. A bill to amend the Armed Services Leave Act of 1946 to provide leave credit for National Guard personnel undergoing training under provisions 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4113. A bill to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act to provide that distinctive mark or insignia shall not be required in the uniforms worn by members of the National Guard of the United States, both Army and Air; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4114. A bill to amend section 81, National Defense Act to provide for the reorganization of the National Guard Bureau; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 4115. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Reserve officers, formerly in the Regular Army and Navy and who were appointed prior to August 24, 1912, and March 4, 1913, respectively; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 4116. A bill to provide for the administration and sale of certain lands held by the United States in the Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 4117. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 4118. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in devising ways and means in preventing the destruction of Plum Island, Mass., by erosion and storms; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to create a Commission on Government Security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sympathy of the Congress and of the people of the United States to the President and the people of El Salvador; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 229. Resolution to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 230. Resolution to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, requesting the enactment of the legislation embodied in H. R. 3341, which relates to a repeal of certain provisions of the Social Security Act, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California relative to amending the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 802) to authorize crediting service of cadets and midshipmen for purposes of pay and longevity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 4119. A bill for the relief of Jan de Bakker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H. R. 4120. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sul Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 4121. A bill for the relief of Rafael Alemany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4122. A bill for the relief of James H. Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. R. 4123. A bill for the relief of John G. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4124. A bill for the relief of Fred Ericson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4125. A bill for the relief of L. Ferguson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 4126. A bill for the relief of Ernst Sbaschnik, Sr., Hildegard Sbaschnik, and Ernst Sbaschnik, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4127. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Doris Ellen Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4128. A bill for the relief of Antonio and Francesco Lo Schiavo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 4129. A bill to authorize the appointment of James A. Pfeiffer, chief pharmacist, retired, as lieutenant (junior grade) and lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 4130. A bill for the relief of Caroline Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 4131. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mark Kim; 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:

284. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of Albert Christensen and others relative to the rollback on beef; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

285. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of the Lawrence Institute of Technology, Detroit, Mich., explaining its scholarship program for persons who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

286. By Mr. VAN PELT: Petition of Sheboygan County Women's Club lauding Gen. Douglas MacArthur for his stand and his presentation of the facts to the people of America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 2, 1951)

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

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

Our Father God, who art in heaven and in all Thy works, whose love is un-failing and whose mercies are new every

morning: In the midst of thronging duties and confused issues, we pause to commune with Thee, unseen source of goodness, beauty, and truth, that the light which is the light of the world may shine upon us and illumine our path of action. Grant to us a oneness of purpose that shall bring the supreme satisfaction of rendering to the Nation and to the world our utmost service unsullied by base motives or self-interest.

To this white altar of devotion we bring our pledge to administer the trust committed to our hands with integrity of character, purity of motive, cleanness of hands, and unswerving firmness of purpose in the fulfillment of the high and holy calling as servants of the Republic and of Thine. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 15, 1951, was dispensed with.

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 May 15, 1951, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 998) to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 616. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Zafiriadis;

H. R. 617. An act for the relief of Franz Furtner, his wife, Valentina Furtner, and her daughters, Nina Tuerck, and Victoria Tuerck;

H. R. 629. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 630. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Richard James Brown;

H. R. 631. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Alice E. Williams Sisk;

H. R. 643. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham;

H. R. 651. An act to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee numbered 152,419, for certain land in California;

H. R. 658. An act for the relief of Harold W. Britton;

H. R. 895. An act for the relief of Dr. Giuseppe Mazzone;

H. R. 964. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Percival H. Glenn;

H. R. 1129. An act to validate a conveyance of certain lands by the Central Pacific Railway Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to the Union Ice Co. and Edward Barbera;

H. R. 1233. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vasilla Parselles;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl;

H. R. 1443. An act for the relief of Paul Matelli;

H. R. 1457. An act for the relief of Antranik Ayanian;

H. R. 1853. An act to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands;

H. R. 2310. An act for the relief of Jindrich (Henri) Nosek and Mrs. Zdenka Nosek;

H. R. 2349. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Emil Sbarbori, Edna Perfetti, and Anthony Perfetti;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of Michael Post-Posniakoff and Zinaida Post-Posniakoff;

H. R. 2453. An act for the relief of John R. Harris;

H. R. 2852. An act for the relief of Quon Mee Gee, also known as Loui Siu Lin;

H. R. 2853. An act for the relief of Shizue Sakurada;

H. R. 2854. An act for the relief of Dorothy Fumie Maeda;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Shizu Terauchi Parks;

H. R. 3063. An act for the relief of Rosina Mouradian;

H. R. 3133. An act for the relief of Chin Yuen Ling, minor unmarried Chinese child of a United States citizen;

H. R. 3215. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Crow Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 3216. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lulu M. Whitebear;

H. R. 3229. An act for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack;

H. R. 3442. An act to protect the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in the use of emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases heretofore adopted and to clarify existing law relating thereto;

H. R. 3527. An act for the relief of Morris Tutnauer;

H. R. 3651. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman; and

H. R. 3653. An act for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 77. An act for the relief of Mircea Grossu and his family;

S. 119. An act for the relief of Joseph Girardi;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen;

S. 822. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Sternberg; and

S. 824. An act for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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