(Rept. No. 2456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1876. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2458). 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. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 8494. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in South Ozone Park, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8495. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Ozone Park, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 8496. A bill to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8497. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces who suffer disability or death while performing travel to and from specified types of active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 8498. A bill to provide that a woman taxpayer who must work to support her dependents may deduct moneys paid for the care of her dependents while she works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STANLEY:

H. R. 8499. A bill to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, with respect to the accumulated balances on telephone and telegraph accounts of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 8500. A bill to credit the Oglala Sioux Tribe with the proceeds of Oglala Sioux tribal lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 8501. A bill to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1952; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 8502. A bill to amend section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, so as to prevent allowance or payment of certain debt claims based upon bonds of Germany, Japan, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, or Italy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8503. A bill to amend section 39 of the Trading with the Enemy Act, so as to permit the return of property to nationals of Germany or Japan, or their successors in interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8504. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading with the Enemy Act, so as to permit the return under such section of certain property owned by an alien individual; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8505. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of a demonstration plant at Hazleton, Pa., to produce synthetic liquid fuel from anthracite; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. J. Res. 494. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a sculptural piece known as The Pony Express in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. J. Res. 495. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a sculptural piece known as The Pony Express in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution reaffirming our historic friendship with the Slovak peoples, and expressing our hopes for the early liberation of the Slovak peoples from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to make adequate appropriation for a complete and effective national civil defense organization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature urging Congress to make adequate appropriation for a complete and effective national civil defense organization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HESELTON: Memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urging the Congress of the United States to make adequate appropriation for a complete and effective national civil defense organization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Senate of Massachusetts urging the Congress of the United States to make adequate appropriation for a complete and effective national civil defense organization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 8506. A bill for the relief of Felice Marotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 8507. A bill for the relief of Catherine V. Sindy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 8508. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rachel Soloff Vertman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8509. A bill for the relief of Arthur Weingarten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 8510. A bill for the relief of Miss Elizabeth Herrmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 8511. A bill for the relief of John Jacob Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 8512. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 8513. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Krogsoe Carver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 8514. A bill for the relief of Arthur Neustadt and Mrs. Emma Neustadt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 8515. A bill for the relief of Francesco Mule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 8516. A bill for the relief of Carlo Giovanni Recchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8517. A bill for the relief of Saliba Douaihy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8518. A bill for the relief of Jose Gomes Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 8519. A bill for the relief of Juanita Kloeden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8520. A bill for the relief of Ehstathios A. Spathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 8521. A bill for the relief of Kim Ki Hang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 8522. A bill for the relief of Marlene D. Knight; 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:

787. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of 969 citizens of Port Arthur, Tex., in support of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2188), a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and ban its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

788. By Mr. PHILLIPS: Petition of Mrs. Joseph J. Pausner, president of the California Chapter of Pro-America, containing 17,108 signatures, from all congressional districts of California, petitioning for tax reduction, the elimination of unnecessary spending, and a limitation on the Federal debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 4, 1952

(Legislative day of Friday, June 27, 1952)

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

Rev. Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, the strength of our years and the light of all our days, we turn again from the clash and clamor of our times, from the confusion of voices and the pressure of daily duties to hear again the "still, small voice." We lay before Thee our little lives—our weary bodies, our tired minds, our taut spirits—beseeching the refreshment which alone comes from Thee, the fountain of life and health.

We thank Thee for this new day of duty and service. Grant to Thy servants here clean hands, pure hearts, wisdom in every decision, and fidelity in every dedication. Make known Thy ways to them and grant this body courage to follow therein.

On this day of sacred memory we thank Thee for this good land which Thou hast given us for an heritage and for the freedom vouchsafed to us as sons of Thy creation. We remember before Thee those whom Thou hast raised up for our Nation, to defend our liberty, preserve our union, maintain law and order within our borders, and

to represent us in the far corners of the earth. Regard with special favor the youth of this land who in distant places now strive to uphold the liberties of mankind. Give them strength in temptation and courage in every peril that they and we may ever be an honor to Thee.

O Lord, in whose sovereign will is the destiny of men and nations, wilt Thou in these demanding days make us strong enough and good enough and great enough to be the servants of Thy righteousness.

Through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 3, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

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 the bill (S. 1999) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3066) to amend defense-housing laws, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1180) to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. MAHON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. GARY, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. SCRIVNER, and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1950. An act to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia, of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries;

H. R. 5567. An act to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo; and

H. R. 7317. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 237) authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress, 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. 5458. An act for the relief of Joyce Oerlemans Haug; and

H. R. 8409. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1949, as amended, with respect to the accumulated balances on telephone and telegraph accounts of Members of the House of Representatives.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. SPARKMAN were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. IVES was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning at 4:30 p. m. today, and tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KNOWLAND was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning at 4:30 o'clock p. m. today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MCFARLAND

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I desire to state for the RECORD the high estimate of the capabilities of our majority leader, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], which is held by me and, I feel certain, by Members of the United States Senate generally.

The State of Arizona is particularly fortunate in being represented in the United States Senate by such a capable and conscientious Senator. His outstanding worth to the country at large, as well as to his State, is recognized by all who have observed his sincere efforts.

He is experienced, thoroughly devoted to his constituency, unusually well informed on national and world matters, and a symbol of industry and integrity to all who know him.

As majority leader of the Senate he bears a well-deserved reputation for fairness in dealing with Senators of both parties. In this exacting position, likewise, he has demonstrated a very valuable ability to work out satisfactory agreements on controversial matters. The further fact that he is continually at his post of duty makes him really an ideal majority leader.

The State of Arizona is to be complimented on having such exemplary leadership, and it can be said, without fear of successful contradiction, that the United States Senate and the country at large have been the beneficiaries of the splendid work of Senator MCFARLAND.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

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

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably two bills, H. R. 3268 and H. R. 6558, and I submit reports thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be placed on the calendar in order that they can be taken up when the calendar is called today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none.

The bills reported by Mr. Kilgore were ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

H. R. 3268. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2095); and

H. R. 6558. A bill for the relief of George Blech and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 2094).

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES — REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 2337) to provide for the national defense by enabling the

States to make provision for maternity and infant care for wives and infants, and hospital care for dependents, or enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 2093) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a few remarks on this proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, to meet the threat of totalitarian aggression the American people have agreed to mobilize the national resources and energies for the common defense and to maintain standing forces far in excess of the normal peacetime level.

This mobilization has resulted in serious dislocations in the normal pattern of the lives of many of our citizens. It is clear that some of these dislocations create social problems for which the Federal Government can and must assume the responsibility. One of these areas is the health needs of the families of men who are called to serve in the Armed Forces, and the most urgent aspect of this problem is that of making sure that the children of these men and their pregnant wives will have adequate hospital and medical care.

Under peacetime conditions, military hospitals and medical personnel have been adequate to care for the health needs of the dependents of all members of the Armed Forces. Today, however, with the Armed Forces at several times their peacetime strength, this is no longer true. More than 200,000 babies are expected to be born to the wives of enlisted men in the next year, but it is estimated that only about 75,000 of these births can be cared for in military hospitals. It is essential that each man serving in the Armed Forces be assured that his pregnant wife and his preschool children will be able to get the medical care they need. But tens of thousands of servicemen do not have this assurance now, and that number is expected to increase. If the Armed Forces should be required to go into larger-scale mobilization than at present, the size of this problem would be enormous.

This program is needed now to meet the immediate problem of those dependents for whom military facilities are unavailable. Legislation is needed now to enable the appropriate Federal and State agencies to set up in an orderly way the necessary machinery to deal with the much larger problem which might arise overnight if the world crisis should suddenly become critical.

Mr. President, I urge early Senate consideration and action on this bill which would make it possible for a GI wife to be delivered in a civilian hospital by the civilian doctor of her choice, and which would provide similar arrangements for needed medical care for the children of GI's through the fifth year. This program is based upon the well-tried principles emerging from the experience gained with respect to the so-called EMIC program which was in effect during World War II. Its passage is urged by maternal and child health experts, by the numerous civic and voluntary organizations serving GI families, and by veteran and labor groups throughout the country.

Delay in enactment of this legislation would cause serious hardship to GI wives for whom childbirth care cannot be provided by doctors in military hospitals.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3472. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to George Fishbird; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 3473. A bill to provide for Federal participation in the design, development, and service-testing of jet transport aircraft in the manner recommended by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3474. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Grace Chun (nee Si Chin Wu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3475. A bill for the relief of Jessie Connelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3476. A bill for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3477. A bill to provide severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILLETTE (for himself, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 3478. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 3479. A bill for the relief of Arsenios Peter Gligorievitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTON:

S. 3480. A bill for the relief of Erato Aronopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. NEELY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 3481. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3482. A bill to establish a legislative bureau for the audit, analysis and review of Federal Government programs and projects for the purpose of making recommendations to the Congress with respect to the elimination of unnecessary, wasteful and extravagant activities and for returning to State and local governments or other agencies, public or private, those government activities which they can perform with greater economy and efficiency than the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 3483. A bill to further amend the act of May 26, 1948, entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 3484. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3485. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended.

PROTECTION AGAINST VIOLENCE TO MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3481) to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators) was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "man of the Coast Guard" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "uniformed members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard."

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I am aware that it is on the eve of the adjournment of the session but I am, nevertheless, introducing a bill whose purpose is to prevent unprovoked violence and assault against uniformed members of the Armed Forces. I think it important that a record be made of this bill and that it be available for consideration by the public and by the Congress should it be recalled into special session.

I have been working on this legislation for almost 2 years. I introduced a similar measure, as an amendment to the universal military training bill, in the spring of 1951. Since that time I have been in contact with various departments of the Federal Government, and especially with the Defense Department, with a view to working out some of the difficulties involved in this legislation and to answering some of the questions and doubts raised when this proposal was originally considered a year and a half ago.

The effect of this bill would be to penalize physical assault against uniformed military personnel if committed while such personnel are engaged in performance of duty or on account of the performance of duty. Such assault would be defined as Federal offense and could be tried in a Federal Court.

Our proposal is nothing startling. The protection of Federal law is already extended—and has been for many years—to a long list of categories of Federal officers ranging all the way from marshals and deputy marshals to game wardens and meat inspectors.

Interestingly enough, this protection is also accorded, under present law, to members of the Coast Guard. Our bill merely grants the same protection as is now extended to members of Coast Guard to other members of armed services—to Army, Navy, and Air Force. A bill such as this was originally considered in 1944. It was recommended by the War Department, by the then Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson. It was then favorably reported to the Senate. Today the Defense Department is still in favor of this measure. Many public interest groups are likewise in favor of this measure.

Its purpose is clear—to prevent unprovoked assault upon uniformed members of the Armed Forces in areas where local police protection is either inadequate, unavailable, or unwilling to assure the men in the uniform of our country of their personal physical safety.

The question has been raised as to how far this protection would and should go. We have determined that this protection should be extended only while the military personnel are in uniform and only while they are engaged in actual performance of duty or when the assault occurs because of their performance of duty. I have a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Charles A. Coolidge, in which "on duty" is defined to mean "periods when they are performing official duties." The letter from the Defense Department is as follows:

"ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
"Washington, D. C., May 28, 1952.

"Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
"United States Senate.

"DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Reference is made to your letter requesting the views of the Department of Defense as to the extent which legislation should go in protecting members of the Armed Forces against physical violence, and requesting the Department's definition of the term "on duty."

"It is the view of the Department of Defense that the protection afforded officers and employees of the Government by sections 1114 and 111 of title 18, United States Code, should be extended to members of the Armed Forces for periods when they are engaged in the performance of official duties. Such periods may be more precisely defined as being during the execution of duties imposed by statutes, and regulations and directives of the Armed Forces concerned, and during the execution of specific duties imposed by order of competent authority. It would seem that it would be unrealistic to attempt to extend such protection to members of the Armed Forces for periods not involving the performance of official duties, such as periods of leave, liberty, or authorized absence. It is our understanding that the provisions of sections 1114 and 111 have been so construed in the case of the Coast Guard. The draft of bill furnished you by the Department of Defense on July 5, 1951, would accomplish this purpose.

"Your letter specifically requested an interpretation of the term "on duty." While that term is generally construed by the Department to mean any time during which a member of the Armed Forces is in receipt of basic pay, it should not be used in this sense in legislation extending protection against physical violence to members of the Armed Forces. Any extension of such protection to members of the Armed Forces should be limited, as in the case of the Coast Guard, to periods when they are performing official duties.

"The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this letter.

"Sincerely yours,
"CHARLES A. COOLIDGE."

The question has been raised as to whether there is a need for legislation of this kind. Indeed there is a need. Last year I asked the Army Department to prepare a report of instances of physical violence against Army personnel, committed by civilians, as reflected in the files of the Army Department. I asked that only such data as has been already assembled should be analyzed, being aware that many cases of violence of this kind are never reported to the central files of the Army Department. I also asked that the Army specify the instances in which these offenses have been punished by State law and the instances in which such offenses had gone unpunished. I now attach a summary of the material submitted to me by the Army Department, broken down by Army corps areas in the United States:

"INFORMATION REGARDING SPECIFIC CASES OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE AGAINST MEMBERS OF ARMY BY CIVILIANS

"First Army area (New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Maine), January 1 to August 31, 1951:

"1. Thirty-three cases of simple assault, 4 of which are punished by State laws, 2 are being held for court action, and 27 cases under investigation.

"2. Thirty-one cases of assault and battery, 7 of which have been punished by State laws, 10 are being investigated, 7 are held for court action, and 7 were unpunished.

"3. One case of homicide punished by State law.

"4. Two cases of involuntary manslaughter under investigation.

"Second Army area (Kentucky, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Delaware), November 1950 to September 1951:

"1. Camp Breckinridge reports incidents of alleged mistreatment of military personnel by civil authorities during or after arrest which have not yet been disposed of.

"2. Pennsylvania Military District reports two murders of military personnel by civilians who have been punished by State law.

"3. West Virginia Military District reports two cases of assault of military personnel by civilians who have been fined by civilian courts.

"4. Maryland Military District reports 46 cases of physical violence by civilians against military personnel. Disposition of these cases is not known as no records are kept by the military district. Such information can be procured only by extensive research.

"5. Fort Monroe reports one instance of a soldier being shot and wounded by a female civilian who received a suspended sentence of 1 year in prison.

"6. Camp Pickett reports one case of a soldier receiving knife wounds from a civilian who was sentenced to 5 years' probation and 1 year suspended sentence. In another case of a soldier assaulted with a knife by a civilian, the civilian is presently in jail awaiting trial.

"7. Fort Eustis reports six cases of physical violence against military personnel by civilians. In five of these cases, either no punishment has been adjudged or the culprit has not been found. One case is still pending.

"8. Fort Story reports one case of an officer killed during an armed robbery by a civilian who has been sentenced to death. In another case, a female civilian was acquitted on grounds of justifiable homicide of killing an enlisted man who was attempting to enter her apartment.

"9. Army Chemical Center reports one case of physical violence against Army personnel by a civilian which has gone unpunished.

"Third Army area (Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Florida), January to September 1951:

"1. Fifty-eight cases of violence.
"2. Thirteen punished by State laws.
"3. Twenty-six cases of action incomplete.
"4. Nineteen cases were unpunished.

"Fourth Army area (New Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma), September 1, 1950, to August 1, 1951:

"1. Thirty-five cases of physical violence.
"2. Ten cases were punished by State laws.
"3. Six cases by persons unknown.
"4. Nineteen cases were unpunished.

"Fifth Army area (Missouri, Kansas, Colorada, Nebraska, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland), no date given:

"1. Specific information required not available in the military installations without exhaustive search.

"Sixth Army area (Utah, Arizona, Nevada, California, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Washington), January 1 to September 1951:

"1. Seventy-two cases of violence by civilians against the military.

"2. Thirty-eight of the cases were punished by State laws.

"3. Thirty-four cases were not punished.

"Military district of Washington, January to August 1951:

"1. Eleven incidents of violence by civilians against the military.

"2. Ten were committed by unknown persons.

"3. One was referred to civil authorities and is still pending."

This is a shocking summary. In a period of slightly less than 1 year and on the basis of such reports as were available, we find 111 cases in which assaults were committed against uniformed members of the armed services and no punishment was meted out to those who committed the acts in question.

There probably are extenuating circumstances in some of the cases. In some instances, local law-enforcement offices do not have enough staff to apprehend the guilty parties. In some instances the local police officers are unwilling to apprehend the perpetrators of these acts.

We are calling our young men into the service of our country. We are sending them to camps all over the country far from home. We have an obligation to see that these young men and women are adequately protected. Obviously, when new posts are established in small communities, the communities' facilities become suddenly overtaxed.

If adequate police protection is not available, the Federal Government must provide a means whereby Federal law-enforcement officers can prevent these acts of violence and can apprehend the guilty ones when such acts are committed.

This proposal is, of course, a bipartisan one. It should be considered by the appropriate Senate committee and adopted at the earliest possible time. I hope it will be acted upon in the near future. Certainly our young men and women in the Armed Forces are entitled to as much protection as employees of the grazing division or of the Indian Bureau.

REQUEST OF GOVERNORS OF STATES TO TAKE ACTION TO AFFORD MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. WELKER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. JENNER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. IVES, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MALONE, Mr. McCARTHY, and Mr. BUTLER of Maryland) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 349), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Whereas there are millions of men and women in uniform within the United States and in foreign countries engaged in protecting the security of the United States; and

Whereas these men and women have the inherent right to vote and are entitled to be provided with the means by which they may exercise such right: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should cooperate with the governors of the States in seeing that members of the armed services wherever assigned may exercise their voting franchise in the 1952 National and State elections.

The Secretary of Defense is hereby requested to cooperate with the several States in carrying out the purposes of this resolution.

The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the governor of each State.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1950. An act to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia, of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 5567. An act to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7317. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HISTORY OF THE SENATE SEAL (S. DOC. NO. 164)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 30 seconds, and then to present a unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, several months ago I was sent an early Senate seal. I wondered about its authenticity, because Mrs. Saltonstall was using it in connection with some art work, so I brought the seal to Mr. Emery L. Frazier, Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. Frazier and I became interested in the subject of the history of the Senate seal. To my amazement, I learned that there have been at least three official seals, perhaps four. Furthermore, at different times in the early part of the nineteenth century, various Members of the Senate made their own seals for use in sealing letters.

As a result of these disclosures, Mr. Frazier and I commenced a study of the subject, and mostly with his help, considerable data was assembled. I submitted the data to the Library of Congress. The Library has now published a small history of the Senate seal from 1800 to the present time.

I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and he has agreed that the manuscript may be printed as a Senate document. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, a manuscript entitled "History of the Senate Seal."

Credit for the manuscript should be given to the Chief Clerk of the Senate, Mr. Frazier, who under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Biffle, keeps in his custody the Senate seal, and has much interest and pride in the authenticity of the seal and its history.

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

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS (S. DOC. No. 165)

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD after the adjournment a summary of the legislative record of the Eighty-second Congress, and that the summary be also printed as a Senate document.

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

PERMISSION TO MAKE INSERTIONS IN APPENDIX FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Senators be permitted to make insertions in the Appendix of the RECORD following the adjournment of the Congress.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I inquire how long after the adjournment of Congress Senators are permitted to insert matters in the Appendix of the RECORD?

Mr. McFARLAND. As long as the RECORD is kept open. I can find out tomorrow and make an announcement with regard to it.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 166)

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD after final adjournment of the Congress a statement prepared jointly by the Senate minority leader [Mr. BRIDGES] and Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., House minority leader, together with an accompanying review of the legislative record of the Eighty-second Congress.

I also ask unanimous consent that this statement and the legislative review be printed as a Senate document.

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

(The statement and review will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO SUBMIT REPORTS

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, or the full committee, be authorized to submit interim reports during the adjourned period of the Eighty-second Congress, and that they be printed.

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

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. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by Senator HUMPHREY at the annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, held at Oklahoma City, Okla., June 29, 1952.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Address delivered by Millard Cass, special assistant to the Secretary of Labor, before the twenty-fifth annual Florida State convention of Disabled American Veterans, on June 7, 1952.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him entitled "Congress and the Farmers of Wisconsin."

By Mr. MURRAY:

Editorial entitled "ILO Looks Ahead," published in the New York Times of June 14, 1952.

Article entitled "The Great Gamble," published in summer 1952 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, dealing with the German problem.

Article entitled "The Trickery of the 'Trust Busters'," published in the summer 1952 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, dealing with German cartels.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

Article entitled "Amortization of Defense Facilities," published in Capital Goods Review of the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, for May 1952.

By Mr. FREAR:

Editorial entitled "Dr. Abraham Rosenbach," published in the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News of July 4, 1952.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article in regard to the late Albert D. Lasker.

By Mr. WELKER:

Editorial entitled "The Apology to Lattimore," published in the Idaho Daily Statesman, of Boise, Idaho, on June 30, 1952.

By Mr. MALONE:

Address delivered by him before the State Republican Convention, at Tonopah, Nev., May 9, 1952.

Article written by him, entitled "Is Useful Atomic Power Only a Year Away?", published in the American Engineer, in the May 1952 issue.

Address delivered by him at commencement exercises of a high school in Nevada.

By Mr. HILL:

Statement prepared by him on health progress during the past 20 years.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statement prepared by him in regard to Senate Joint Resolution 169, proposing a study and review of immigration and naturalization policies.

By Mr. FREAR:

Pamphlet entitled "Molecules on the Delaware."

By Mr. MORSE:

Statement entitled "Civil Rights Platform Plank, 1952," issued to the delegates to the 1952 Republican National Convention by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

By Mr. CAIN:

Letter dated June 28, 1952, addressed to the Wage Stabilization Board by Carl H. Berglund, CPA.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article regarding the present steel situation, entitled "Steel Output Drops to 12½ Percent in Strike—Total Loss in Postwar Years Above 34,500,000 Tons," published in Steel Facts, June 1952.

ANALYSIS OF LEGAL PROBLEMS ARISING FROM SEIZURE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, while the current Steel case put the spotlight on the constitutional issues involved in Government seizure, there are various other aspects of seizure of a company or an industry which must be evaluated before consideration can be given to work-stoppage legislation in periods of national emergency.

I have, therefore, requested the Department of Justice to provide information dealing with the Government's experience with seizures ordered under the Smith-Connally Act between 1943 and 1947.

Because of the vital importance of these data for the proper assessment of Government seizure, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks, my letter to the Attorney General, the factual memorandum prepared by the Justice Department under the direction of Mr. Baldridge, the Assistant Attorney General, and an article from the Buffalo Evening News analyzing the many legal problems arising from seizure.

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

MAY 27, 1952.

The Honorable JAMES P. MCGRANERY,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCGRANERY: Apart from the constitutional issue raised in the current Steel case, Government seizure of a company or an industry for the purpose of maintaining operations has lost its novelty by reason of the Government's frequent resort to this device in recent years.

In exploring the subject I find, however, that factual information regarding the various aspects of Government seizure is very scanty.

As your Department has been extensively involved in seizure cases, I assume that comprehensive information is readily at hand in its records. It is on that assumption that I am addressing this request to you. First of all, let me say that I would be wholly satisfied with a reply that is confined to seizures ordered under the War Labor Disputes (Smith-Connally) Act during the period of its effectiveness, 1943–47.

As a means of assessing Government seizure, in its practical effects, answers to the following questions would be greatly appreciated for whatever bearing they may have on legislation that is now before the Congress.

How many seizures took place under the Smith-Connally Act?

What industries, trades, or services were affected?

Was the taking made in any case for a purpose other than averting or ending a strike? If so, what was the purpose?

On what terms was termination of seizure effected in most cases?

On what other terms have seizures been terminated?

In what seizure cases did the Government introduce changes in wages or working conditions during the period of seizure?

In what, if any, seizure cases was acceptance by the private owners of such changes in wages or working conditions made a condition for terminating seizure?

How much have seizures cost the Federal Government in moneys paid to the private owners on the basis of (1) terms offered or negotiated by the Government; and (2) damages awarded to the private owners by the courts?

What seizure actions were challenged in the courts and by whom?

What were the issues raised in such cases?

How were these issues adjudicated?

How many seizure cases under the Smith-Connally Act are still in litigation, and what are the issues in dispute?

If the questions above fail to bring out any facts which you regard as pertinent, please consider that this request also includes them.

A reply at your early convenience will be greatly appreciated in the interest of assuring mature consideration of proposed legislation intended to avert work stoppages in periods of national emergency.

Sincerely yours,

IRVING M. IVES.

MEMORANDUM RE INQUIRY OF SENATOR IRVING M. IVES REGARDING SEIZURES PURSUANT TO THE WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT

Senator IVES' recent letter to the Attorney General requests that he be furnish with answers to certain specific questions. It was further requested that the answers be sufficient to permit a mature assessment of Government seizure. Each of the questions will be taken up separately in an effort to answer these questions directly and as forthrightly as possible, except where the Department of Justice does not have the information needed to provide the answers, in which instances the Government department or agency which should have available the necessary information is indicated in the list attached as Appendix A. In view of the Senator's request that we provide him with any further information which may be pertinent and significant, and yet not within the range of his questions, a short discussion of some of the problems encountered by the Department in connection with seizures is included.

I

How many seizures took place under the Smith-Connally or War Labor Disputes Act?

During the period the Smith-Connally Act or War Labor Disputes Act (act of June 25, 1943, c. 144, 57 Stat. 163; 50 U. S. C. A., App. 1501–1511) was in effect (June 25, 1943 through Dec. 31, 1946), 64 seizures took place. These seizures affected mines, plants, or facilities in a great variety of industries. In some instances, such as the seizures of railroads, other statutes, such as the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 645; 10 U. S. C. 1361) (seizure of transportation systems), authorized the seizure; but, in view of the fact that most executive orders indicate that the action was taken pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the United States, it cannot be stated flatly that seizures authorized by other statutes were not also authorized by the Smith-Connally or War Labor Disputes Act, the terms of which are quite comprehensive.

II

What industries, trades, or services were affected?

Because of the great variety of different industries, trades, or services affected by the seizures between June 25, 1943, and December 31, 1946, inclusive, there is attached hereto as Appendix A, a list of the appropriate executive orders, the dates the executive orders were issued, the plant, mine, or other facility seized, and the Government official in charge of the administration of the respective seized property.

III

Was the taking made in any case for a purpose other than averting or ending a strike?

The Government always takes the position that the seizure was not made for the purpose of ending or averting a strike. We always assert that the seizure occurred in order to prevent interruption of necessary production or service, whatever may have been the reason for the interruption, or threatened interruption, of the needed production or service. We feel that this position has not only been necessary but that it also accurately reflects the true state of affairs, for, generally speaking, the Government performs its administrative and mediatory services through separate agencies whose functions are quite disparate. However, the great majority of the seizures occurred because continuous production or service was interrupted, or threatened with interruption, by a labor dispute. Accordingly, the seizures, listed in Appendix A, which were made for some reason other than because of labor dispute had threatened interruption of production, or service, are marked with an asterisk. Seizures, during World War II, were effected where production of needed war materials was interrupted, or threatened with interruption, by reason of the following, apart from labor disputes: (1) refusal to deliver at "fair and reasonable prices"; (2) unacceptable quality of product; (3) inefficient management; and (4) failure to maintain production schedules.

IV

1. On what terms was termination of seizure effected in most cases?

2. On what other terms have seizures been terminated?

3. In what seizure cases did the Government introduce changes in wages or working conditions during the period of seizure?

4. In what, if any, seizure case was acceptance by the private owners of such changes in wages or working conditions made a condition for terminating seizure?

This group of questions can be answered only by the respective administering agencies. Since this Department has concerned itself with seizures only where seizures have led to litigation and we have not been concerned with termination of seizure other than indirectly, the Department of Justice does not have available the information required to answer these questions.

V

How much have seizures cost the Federal Government in moneys paid to the private owners on the basis of (1) terms offered or negotiated by the Government; and (2) damages awarded to the private owners by the courts.

1. Unless the return of seized properties gives rise to litigation, we have no contact with, or information pertaining to, terms offered or negotiated by the Government in connection with the termination of Government seizure; and, consequently, we are neither in a position to answer this question nor the appropriate agency to do so. Accordingly, it is respectfully suggested that sufficient answers to this question be ob-

tained from the respective agencies listed in appendix A, sources which have the information and experience we do not possess.

2. However, we have had some experience with respect to damages awarded, by the courts, to private owners of seized properties. There follows a brief summary of the salient points involved in our relatively recent experience in these matters. In *United States* v. *Pewee Coal Co.* ((1951) 341 U. S. 114, 116),[1] the Court of Claims (115 Ct. Cl. 626) had awarded Pewee $2,241.26 as the amount of the increased wages paid pursuant to an order issued by the War Labor Board during Government seizure under Executive Order No. 9340, May 1, 1943 (8 F. R. 5695). The Government petitioned the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims in an effort to defeat this claim, which it felt to be wholly unjustified. Pewee did not file a cross petition for certiorari; and, as a consequence, the affirmation by the Supreme Court of the award by the Court of Claims was restricted to the original judgment in the amount of $2,241.26. This fact is significant because the majority opinion by Mr. Justice Black indicates that, in his opinion, and in that of the three other justices, Pewee may have been entitled to a "fair rental" award in addition to the award for the increased wages. It should be noted, however, that four justices felt that Pewee was entitled to no compensation whatever and that Mr. Justice Reed, in his concurring opinion, disagreed with Mr. Justice Black and stated that Pewee was entitled only to compensation for the wage increases and would not have been entitled to fair rental in any event. Thus, the question of fair rental is an open one and a present problem for the Department of Justice in connection with other cases now pending in the Court of Claims which arose out of subsequent seizures under the War Labor Disputes Act.

The situation with respect to the Motor Carrier Claims Commission is considerably more complex. In the first place, it should perhaps be pointed out that the Motor Carrier Claims Commission was established by an act of Congress (Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act (62 Stat. 1222 (1948)), as amended (62 Stat. 1289, 1290 (1948), 63 Stat. 80 (1949)), in order to process claims of various motor carriers arising out of seizure of their properties, pursuant to Executive Order No. 9462, August 11, 1944 (9 F. R. 10071), during the Second World War when a labor dispute threatened substantial interruption of motor transportation in the Middle West.[2]

A total of 103 cases were filed with the Motor Carrier Claims Commission. These 103 claims sought recovery in a total amount approximating $50,000,000. The claim of R. B. Freight Lines, Inc., was the first case determined by the Motor Carrier Claims Commission. R. B. was awarded a rental value computed with respect to each of the component parts of the seized system: for example, (1) "over-the-road" trucks were compensated for at a rate of 7 cents per mile, computed on a basis of 5,000 miles per month; (2) pick-up and delivery trucks were compensated for at a slightly lower rate of approximately 5 cents per mile; (3) office equipment was compensated for at a basis of 10 percent per month of the original cost of such equipment, or 140 percent approximately; (4) $2,500 was allowed for the cancellation of a contract and an additional $13,000 was allowed for excessive wear and tear. Thus, the award to R. B. Freight Lines, Inc., amounted to $121,860.34, plus interest at 4 percent from November 1, 1945, to date of payment. The Government petitioned the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari in the R. B. case, but this petition was denied (342 U. S. 933).[3]

In subsequent cases, determined by the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, the Government succeeded in reducing the rental figure for line-haul trucks from 7 cents per mile to 5 cents per mile and in achieving certain other reduction in the compensation determined by the Commission. The Supreme Court having denied certiorari in the R. B. case, there was no point in petitioning for certiorari in the other cases determined by the Commission. However, in each case finally determined by the Commission, the Government petitioned for a rehearing, and then undertook settlement negotiations. Reductions to two-thirds of the amounts determined by the Commission were obtained through these efforts in those cases in which final determination had been made, and to corresponding amounts in the other pending cases. In 91 cases settlement has been agreed upon under the formula described above and 64 of these have been fully processed through the Commission. At the present time, 13 more of these settled cases are ready for processing by the Commission. All but 6 of the 103 claims filed with the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, in a total amount of nearly $50,000,000, have been determined or settled in a principal amount of about $6,000,000, although the award of interest at 4 percent per year for a period of 7 years has increased this amount to approximately $7,700,000. In view of the fact that the Supreme Court denied the Government's petition for a writ of certiorari in the R. B. case, and in view of the subsequent final determinations by the Commission, it is felt that the one-third reduction of the claims accomplished by the settlements was most fortunate with respect to the Government's interest in connection with these seizures.

VI

What seizure actions were challenged in the courts and by whom?

What were the issues raised in such cases?

How were these issues adjudicated?

The principal challenge to Government seizure was raised in *United States* v. *United Mine Workers of America* ((1947) 330 U. S. 258). This case involved Executive Order No. 9728 (11 F. R. 5593) issued on May 21, 1946, which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to assume the possession and operation of certain bituminous coal mines. The United Mine Workers, before the Supreme Court, asserted that the seizure was a "sham and a fiction" because the day-to-day operation of the various seized properties remained under the immediate supervision of the private managerial forces. This contention was advanced in order to defeat the Government's argument that the Norris-LaGuardia Act (29 U. S. C. 101 et seq.) did not apply where the Government had seized the facility concerned and had assumed role of employer.

In this case, the Government relied upon the traditional equity jurisdiction of the Federal courts to grant injunctive relief (see: *In re Debs* (158 U. S. 564, 599–600)). Consequently, in these circumstances it was found that the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act which divested district courts of jurisdiction to issue injunctions in cases arising out of labor disputes did not apply. In the Mine Workers case the Supreme Court held that the Government retained ultimate control of the seized properties and that, therefore, the seizure could not be said to be a mere sham and fiction. This holding was further explained in Mr. Justice Black's opinion of the Court in *United States* v. *Pewee Coal Co.* ((1951) 341 U. S. 114, 116), where it was said:

"It should not and will not be assumed that the seizure of the mines was a mere sham or pretense to accomplish some unexpressed governmental purpose instead of being the proclaimed actual taking of possession and control. In *United States* v. *United Mine Workers* (330 U. S. 258), there had been a Government seizure of the mines under Presidential and Secretarial orders, which, insofar as here material, were substantially the same as those issued in the present case. We rejected the contention of the mineworkers that 'the Government's role in administering the bituminous-coal mines [was] for the most part fictional and for the remainder nominal only.' We treated that seizure as making the mines governmental facilities 'in as complete a sense as if the Government held full title and ownership' (id., at 284–285)."

Challenges of seizure action have been carried further in cases involving railroad seizures which have arisen since expiration of the War Labor Disputes Act. The various railway labor organizations, which have been the defendants in these actions for injunctive relief, have somewhat amplified the arguments first advanced by the United Mine Workers. Today, in this type of litigation, we usually meet arguments that the seizure is a mere sham and fiction because (1) profits have not been seized, (2) private managerial forces remain in control of day-to-day operations, (3) the governmental agency administering the seized property has not entered into collective-bargaining agreements or negotiations with the labor organization, and (4) various other arguments pertaining to an outward demonstration of governmental control, such as flying the flag, establishing offices for Government representatives apart from those belonging to the seized property.

It should be pointed out that these additional arguments have arisen in connection with the recently terminated railroad seizure, which lasted for approximately 21 months. The railroad-injunction litigation which arose in March in the northern district of Ohio (Civil No. 28926) reached a decisive stage approximately 20 months following the seizure, so that there was available, for judicial examination, evidence pertaining to the administration of seized properties by the Department of the Army. In this sense, the case is most unusual, if not unique. Ordinarily, litigation occurs almost immediately after the seizure action, so that there is no period of administraton of a seized property which can be presented to the court as an indication either of the genuineness of the seizure or the fictitious nature of the seizure. As a consequence, we normally must rely upon the bare terms of the Executive order directing the seizure in order to establish the employer-employee relationship between the Government and

[1] Although the seizure of the Pewee Coal Co. occurred prior to enactment of the War Labor Disputes Act, and, therefore, is not within the purview of the inquiry, still it is felt that this case presented the Department with many of the more important questions involved in connection with compensation for seizures under the War Labor Disputes Act. Certainly, the Pewee case is a pilot in this field of litigation, and it is within the spirit, if not the precise terms, of the inquiry.

[2] The Supreme Court has held, in *United States* v. *Wheelock Bros., Inc.* ((1951), 341 U. S. 319, 320), that the act of Congress, which established the Commission, conferred exclusive jurisdiction on the Motor Carrier Claims Commission with respect to the compensation claims arising out of these seizures. As a consequence of this holding, these cases cannot be heard in the Court of Claims.

[3] Thus, the Government was unable to argue before the Supreme Court that "rental" awards should not be allowed in these cases, and that question remains unanswered by the Supreme Court although, as pointed out above, the Pewee decision indicated that the Supreme Court may consider such awards proper.

the workers, which is necessary to avoid the prohibitive effects of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. In *United States* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers* ((D. Ct. for D. C., 1948), 79 F. Supp. 485); *United States* v. *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, et al.* ((N. D. Ill., 1951), 96 F. Supp. 428; (D. Ct. for D. C., 1951) 95 F. Supp. 1019; and (N. D. Ohio, 1951), Civil No. 27911); and *United States* v. *Switchmen's Union of North America* ((W. D. N. Y., 1950), 97 F. Supp. 97), the Department of Justice was successful in contending that the question as to whether or not seizure was appropriate was one vested exclusively in the President, and, secondly, that the conduct of the Government in administering the seized property apart from questions of just compensation was a matter with respect to which the executive branch of the Government was responsible only to the electorate, in the absence of congressional limitations. In advancing these arguments, we relied, in part, upon the following cases: *United States* v. *Switchmen's Union of North America* ((W. D. N. Y., 1950), 97 F. Supp. 97); *Martin* v. *Mott* ((1827) 25 U. S. 12, 18); *Dakota Central Telephone Co., et al.* v. *State of South Dakota, et rel. Payne, Attorney General, et al.* (250 U. S. 163, 184); *Ainsworth, Commandant Fifth Naval District* v. *Barn Ballroom Co.* ((4 Cir. 1946), 157 F. (2d) 97, 100); *Ludecke* v. *Watkins* ((335 U. S. 160, 163–164); *United States* v. *Carmack* (329 U. S. 230, 242–243); *United States* v. *Chemical Foundation* (272 U. S. 1, 14–15); and *Marbury* v. *Madison* ((1803), 5 U. S. 137, 164–165).

However, in *United States* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, et al.* ((N. D. Ohio—1952), Civil No. 28926), the three labor organizations, which were the defendants, challenged the constitutionality of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 645), which authorized the President, in time of war, to seize transportation systems, on the ground that the action was an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power because it did not establish sufficient standards for the exercise of the powers concerned. Cf. *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company* v. *Sawyer* ((1952), 72 S. Ct. 863). The point that the unions stressed in this connection was that the seizure statute permitted the executive branch of the Government to disturb normal collective bargaining balances by refusing to enter into a collective bargaining agreement, and thereby purportedly relieving the various railroad managements from any real incentive to settle the underlying labor dispute. It is the apparent contention of the unions that a seizure statute must establish standards to govern the executive branch with respect to collective bargaining rights, and that, unless a seizure statute sufficiently prescribes administrative standards in this respect, it would be an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power. In *United States* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, et al.* ((N. D. Ohio—1952), Civil No. 28926), Judge Freed, after a trial lasting more than a week, issued the preliminary injunction on the ground that he was compelled to protect the national interests from irreparable harm pending final determination of the grave and substantial questions inherent in the case. The unions appealed from this order, and, after a denial of a stay from the court of appeals for the sixth circuit and Mr. Justice Reed, filed a petition for certiorari in the Supreme Court. The defendants also filed a counterclaim and a cross claim, seeking to impound the profits of the railroads and to obtain fair compensation for the services of their respective members. They also sought to join as parties to the action each owner of the seized carriers.

However, the case was rendered moot by settlement of the dispute and return of the carriers to their private owners.

VII

How many seizure cases under the Smith-Connally or War Labor Disputes Act are still in litigation, and what are the issues in dispute?

At present there are three just compensation cases pending in the Court of Claims:

1. *Pewee Coal Co.* v. *United States* (No. 49351). Amount of claim: $36,000. This case allegedly arose under Executive Order No. 9393 (8 F. R. 14877) (coal mine seizure).

2. *Pewee Coal Co.* v. *United States* (No. 50140). Amount of claim: $113,900. This case allegedly arose under Executive Order No. 9586 (10 F. R. 3939) (coal mine seizure).

3. *Ralph A. Fox and Jack C. Wells* v. *United States* (No. 49725). Amount of claim: $140,-923. No Executive order alleged. (Coal mine seizure.)

None of these cases has reached a stage at which issues, other than those discussed above in connection with the first Pewee case, can be anticipated.

VIII

Other problems which have arisen in connection with litigation involving seizures.

In addition to the problems outlined above, at least two other problems have arisen in connection with railroad seizure cases which should be considered in any study of problems incident to Government seizure. The first problem is that which arises because the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 645) is restricted to "time of war." In view of the fact that the state of war, in connection with World War II, has now been terminated, the President would no longer be authorized to seize the railroad to prevent a disastrous interruption of essential transportation services, or at least his authority to seize would be highly questionable had Congress not enacted the Emergency Powers Interim Continuation Act (66 Stat. 54).

The second problem involves Government liability under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the actions or negligence of persons performing services on or with respect to seized properties. This problem has been made both real and immediate in connection with the recently terminated railroad seizure. An action was instituted in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (*Gover* v. *United States* (Civil No. 11613)) under the Federal Tort Claims Act, to recover damages from the United States for a wrongful death which resulted from an accident on the Long Island Railroad on November 22, 1950, when the railroad was in the possession, operation and control of the United States.

This memorandum should not be taken as exhaustive in any sense, for each injunction action presents new and different problems, and sometimes old problems present themselves with a new vigor.

APPENDIX A

EXECUTIVE ORDERS ISSUED BETWEEN JUNE 25, 1943, AND DECEMBER 31, 1946, INCLUSIVE, DIRECTING GOVERNMENT SEIZURE AND OPERATION OF MINES, PLANTS, OR FACILITIES

No. 9375, September 3, 1943 (8 F. R. 12253), Atlantic Basin Iron Works, Inc.; Administrator of War Shipping Administration.

No. 9393, November 1, 1943 (8 F. R. 14877), coal mines; Secretary of the Interior. (No copy in Executive Adjudications Division file.)

No. 9395B,[1] November 20, 1943 (8 F. R. 16957), 13 leather manufacturing plants near Salem and Peabody, Mass.; Secretary of War.

No. 9399,[1] November 25, 1943 (8 F. R. 16269), Remington Rand; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9400,[1] December 3, 1943 (8 F. R. 16641), Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp.; Secretary of the Navy (amended by E. O. 9592A).

No. 9408, December 19, 1943 (8 F. R. 16958), Western Electric Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9412, December 27, 1943 (8 F. R. 17395), railroad systems; Secretary of War.

No. 9416,[1] January 21, 1944 (9 F. R. 936), York Safe & Lock Co.; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9420, February 7, 1944 (9 F. R. 1563), 10 textile plants near Fall River, Mass.; Secretary of War.

No. 9426, February 23, 1944 (9 F. R. 2113), Department of Water Power, city of Los Angeles, Calif.; Secretary of War.

No. 9435, April 13, 1944 (9 F. R. 4063), Jenkins Bros., Inc.; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9436, April 13, 1944 (9 F. R. 4063), Ken-Rad Tube & Lamp Corp.; Secretary of War.

No. 9438, April 25, 1944 (9 F. R. 4459), Montgomery Ward & Co.; Secretary of Commerce.

No. 9443, May 20, 1944 (9 F. R. 5395), Hummer Manufacturing Division, Montgomery Ward & Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9459, August 3, 1944 (9 F. R. 9878), Philadelphia Transportation Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9462, August 11, 1944 (9 F. R. 10071), 103 motor carrier transportation systems, Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9463, August 12, 1944 (9 F. R. 9879), certain foundries and machine shops in San Francisco, Calif.; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9466, August 18, 1944 (9 F. R. 10139), certain additional foundries and machine shops in San Francisco, Calif.; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9469, August 23, 1944 (9 F. R. 10343), Philadelphia and Reading Coal & Iron Co., (coal mines); Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9473, August 29, 1944 (9 F. R. 10613), International Nickel Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9474, August 31, 1944 (9 F. R. 10815), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9475A, September 2, 1944 (9 F. R. 10817), Hughes Tool Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9476, September 3, 1944 (9 F. R. 10817), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9477, September 5, 1944 (9 F. R. 10941), Cleveland Graphite Bronze Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9478, September 6, 1944 (9 F. R. 11045), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9480, September 9, 1944 (9 F. R. 11143), Twentieth Century Brass Works; Secretary of War.

No. 9481, September 12, 1944 (9 F. R. 11387), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9482, September 14, 1944 (9 F. R. 11459), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9483, September 19, 1944, (9 F. R. 11601, certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9484, September 23, 1944 (9 F. R. 11731), Farrell Cheek Steel Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9493,[1] October 24, 1944 (9 F. R. 12860), Lord Manufacturing Co.; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9496, November 3, 1944 (9 F. R. 11987), certain companies in or near Toledo, Ohio (machine tools); Secretary of War.

No. 9505, December 6, 1944 (9 F. R. 14473), Cudahy Bros. Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9508, December 27, 1944 (9 F. R. 15079), Montgomery Ward & Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9511, January 12, 1945 (10 F. R. 549), Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9516, January 24, 1945 (10 F. R. 1313), Bingham & Garfield Railway Co.; Secretary of War.

---

[1] The interrupted or threatened interruption of production of service which gave rise to the seizure was not caused by a labor dispute.

[1] The interrupted or threatened interruption of production of service which gave rise to the seizure was not caused by a labor dispute.

No. 9523, February 18, 1945 (10 F. R. 2133), American Enka Corp.; Secretary of War.

No. 9536, April 10, 1945 (10 F. R. 3939), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9540, April 17, 1945 (10 F. R. 4193), Cities Service Refining Corp.; Petroleum Administrator.

No. 9542, April 23, 1945 (10 F. R. 4591), United Engineering Co., Ltd.; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9548, May 3, 1945 (10 F. R. 5025), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior. (No copy in executive adjudications file.)

No. 9552, May 19, 1945 (10 F. R. 5757), Cocker Machine & Foundry; Secretary of War.

No. 9554, May 23, 1945 (10 F. R. 5981), motor carriers in Chicago, Ill.; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9559, May 28, 1945 (10 F. R. 6287), Gaffney Manufacturing Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9560, June 1, 1945 (10 F. R. 6547), Mary-Leila Cotton Mills, Inc.; Secretary of War.

No. 9564, June 5, 1945 (10 F. R. 6791), Humble Oil & Refining Co.; Petroleum Administrator.

No. 9565, June 5, 1945 (10 F. R. 6792), Pure Oil Co.; Petroleum Administrator.

No. 9570, June 14, 1945 (10 F. R. 7235), Scranton Transit Co.; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9574, June 18, 1945 (10 F. R. 7435), Diamod Alkali Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9577A, July 1, 1945 (10 F. R. 8090), Texas Co.; Petroleum Administrator.

No. 9585, July 4, 1945 (10 F. R. 8335), Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Inc.; Secretary of the Navy. (No copy in Executive Adjudications Division file.)

No. 9589A, July 19, 1945 (10 F. R. 8949), Sinclair Rubber, Inc.; Petroleum Administrator.

No. 9593, July 25, 1945 (10 F. R. 9379), Springfield Plywood Corp.; Secretary of War.

No. 9595, July 30, 1945 (10 F. R. 9571), United States Rubber Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9602, August 23, 1945 (10 F. R. 10957), Illinois Central Railroad Co.; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9639, October 4, 1945 (10 F. R. 12592), certain petroleum transportation, refining, and processing plants and facilities; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9658, November 21, 1945 (10 F. R. 14351), Capital Transit Co.; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9661, November 29, 1945 (10 F. R. 14591), Great Lakes Towing Co.; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9685, January 24, 1946 (11 F. R. 989), certain meat production, processing, etc., plants and facilities; Secretary of Agriculture. (No copy in Executive Adjudications Division file.)

No. 9693, February 5, 1946 (11 F. R. 1421), certain towing transportation companies in New York Harbor; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9727, May 17, 1946 (11 F. R. 5461), railroad systems; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9728, May 21, 1946 (11 F. R. 5593), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9736, June 14, 1946 (11 F. R. 6661), Monongahela Connecting Railroad Co.; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9758, July 19, 1946 (11 F. R. 7927), Carter Coal Mines; Secretary of the Interior.

[From the Buffalo Evening News]

BALDRIDGE TELLS IVES OF SOME UNITED STATES PROBLEMS IN PLANT SEIZURES

(By Irvin D. Foos)

WASHINGTON, June 27.—Even when Government seizure of privately owned industrial facilities was legal under wartime law, many legal problems, still undecided, arose in connection with the Government's administration of seized properties.

Some of these problems were outlined today by Holmes Baldridge, Assistant Attorney General, in response to a request by Senator IRVING M. IVES, of New York.

Senator IVES felt that before again delegating seizure power to the President, as it did in the Smith-Connally Act of 1943, Congress should have a report on the Government's experience with wartime seizures.

RESPONSIBLE TO ELECTORATE

Because the Smith-Connally Act and the Selective Service Act of 1916 did not impose specific limitations, the Government generally was successful in contending that it was free to conduct the administration of seized property as it saw fit. To quote Mr. Baldridge, "the executive branch of the Government was responsible only to the electorate, in the absence of congressional limitations."

Litigation challenging congressional delegation of seizure power to the President demonstrates that Congress, in framing a new seizure law, should cover such questions as seizure of profits, fair rental for seized property, day-to-day managerial supervision, collective bargaining by the Government with employees and the Government's liability for the actions or negligence of persons working on seized property.

The Justice Department official reported that 64 seizures took place during the period that the Smith-Connolly Act was in effect from June 25, 1943, through December 31, 1946.

All but five of the seizure actions were the result of labor disputes.

DAMAGES TOTAL $8,000,000

For legal reasons, the Government "always takes the position that the seizure was not made for the purpose of ending or averting a strike," Mr. Baldridge said.

"We always assert that the seizure occurred in order to prevent interruption of necessary production or service."

In five seizure cases the Government moved in because of refusal of the company to deliver war material at fair and reasonable prices, unacceptable quality of product, inefficient management or failure to maintain production schedules for reasons other than a labor dispute.

Damages awarded by the courts to private owners of seized facilities have run up to a total of nearly $8,000,000, including interest. Most of this total represents awards to 93 motor carriers on claims that originally totaled $50,000,000. Six motor-carrier claims still are pending.

Three coal-mine seizure cases, involving claims of $290,000, still are pending in the Court of Claims.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF IMPRISONMENT OF WILLIAM N. OATIS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, exactly 1 year has elapsed since William N. Oatis, Associated Press correspondent, was sentenced by Communist rulers in Czechoslovakia.

Before the Eighty-second Congress passes into history it would seem pertinent to remind Members of the Senate that while today will bring to an end this second session of the present Congress it will mark only the beginning of a second year of imprisonment for a loyal American citizen and newsman who now is unjustly confined in a Czechoslovakian prison. Mr. Oatis was sentenced, as I am sure many here will recall, by a Czechoslovakian court on this day of last year. Charges of espionage which the whole world knows were entirely without foundation were the pretext on which he was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment.

As we prepare to disperse to homes throughout the country, let us give thought to the plight of Mr. Oatis and to his chances of emerging sound and healthy, or even alive, from his place of confinement. Every day he spends in his prison cell is but another insult added to the many which our Communist foes delight in heaping upon anyone or anything representative of the United States of America.

It seems proper, particularly, for us to consider what steps have been taken or are in process, to effect his release. One thing we do know is that whatever steps have been taken have been completely unsuccessful and that, to all intents and purposes, there would seem as little hope for speedy release of Mr. Oatis today as when he was so flagrant a victim of Communist tyranny a year ago today.

We talk of the United Nations as the one medium through which world peace can be achieved. Our experience, and our lack of success, in freeing Mr. Oatis from the effects of the injustices visited upon him gives little cause for hope as to the eventual achievement of world peace. Such incidents as the Oatis trial and sentence offer dramatic testimony of the large-scale injustices visited upon millions of unfortunate residents of the countries now under Soviet rule. If the concerted weight of free world opinion cannot effect the release of one man whose imprisonment is so palpably unjustified, what basis would there seem to be for hope that we could ever arrive at any understanding based on justice with nations and leaders who make injustice rather than justice their basic policy, and, in addition, seek out ways and means to impress their enslaved peoples with the impotence of the United States to protect its nationals against Communist violence?

As I have pointed out time and again, this country permits known subversives from enemy countries to enter and roam the Nation at will, while our people in Communist-dominated countries, if not subjected to indignities or injustices as was Oatis, are harassed and restricted in innumerable ways. I am convinced that the longer we submit to these indignities without drastic retaliatory measures, the less chance we ever will have to arrive at just and decent agreements with such lawless countries.

We have been told that we cannot take too drastic action, but that does not help at all to resolve the situation. Maybe the time has come to start doing some of the things which we are told must not be done. Perhaps we can find a way to impress upon Communist leaders that there will be redress for violence against our people. It may be possible that procedures which our State Department has not seen fit to use would be effective, where accepted diplomatic approaches have failed.

We cannot leave this session with the feeling that we have really disposed of

all the problems facing us, when we realize that our Government has failed to do anything to help Bill Oatis. His pride in his American citizenship must be at a low ebb, indeed. In a previous discussion of this important matter in the Senate on July 17, 1951, I advocated the adoption by the Senate of a resolution that would urge upon the State Department and upon other Government agencies to prevent representatives of the free Communist press from dispatching, forwarding, or gathering news and information in the United States for the governments or news agencies of the Communist countries; make suitable representation to the United Nations for consideration of the Oatis case by that body; prohibit trade between citizens of the United States and Czechoslovakia until the release of Mr. Oatis.

I am strongly of the belief that summary action should be taken so that Mr. Oatis and all freedom-loving peoplle thoughout the world may know that American principles and American rights will be upheld.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 237, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall prepare a statement showing the noncurrent and obsolete congressional publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and to submit an itemized list thereof, in duplicate, to the Joint Committee on Printing, which is hereby authorized and directed to dispose of the publications enumerated on such lists as follows:

First. A printed statement of such publications shall be submitted to each Senator, Representative, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, and officer of the Senate and House of Representatives, and any Member or officer of either House having any of such publications to his credit may dispose of the same in the usual manner at any time before September 1, 1952.

Second. Upon the expiration of the aforesaid time the Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, as promptly as practicable, a list of the publications herein referred to then remaining in the folding rooms, and thereupon such publications shall be subject to the order of any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, in the order in which they are applied for, for a period of 30 days after the day when such list shall be furnished by the Joint Committee on Printing, but no application for the transfer of these publications may be honored.

Third. The Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish a list of all such publications remaining in the folding rooms at the expiration of the last-named period to the various departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government at Washington, including the Superintendent of Documents, Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress, National Archives Establishment, Bureau of American Republics, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and such publications shall be turned over to any department, independent office, or establishment making written request therefor and shall be allocated in the order in which their application is made, and all such publications which shall remain in the folding rooms for a period of 10 days after such list shall have been furnished to the departments, independent offices, or establishments aforesaid shall be delivered to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for such disposition as he may deem to be in the best interests of the Government, and submit a report to the Joint Committee on Printing showing the tonnage so disposed of, together with the amount of money derived from such sale which shall be deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States in accordance with existing law.

Fourth. No publication which is described in the list aforesaid shall thereafter be returned to the folding rooms from any source.

Mr. HAYDEN. The suggested procedure would be very advantageous in that it would save a great deal of paper and documentation.

I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

WITHHOLDING OF STATE INCOME TAXES BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1999) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That where—

(1) the law of any State or Territory provides for the collection of a tax by imposing upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees and making returns of such sums to the authorities of such State or Territory, and

(2) such duty to withhold is imposed generally with respect to the compensation of employees who are residents of such State or Territory.

then the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the President, is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with such State or Territory within 120 days of the request for agreement from the proper official of such State or Territory. Such agreement shall provide that the head of such department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of such law in the case of employees of such agency or department who are subject to such tax and whose regular place of Federal employment is within the State or Territory with which such agreement is entered into. No such agreement shall apply with respect to compensation for service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to consent to the application of any provision of law which has the effect of imposing more burdensome requirements upon the United States than it imposes upon other employers, or which has the effect of subjecting the United States or any of its officers or employees to any penalty or liability by reason of the provisions of this act.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act relating to withholding, for State income tax purposes, on the compensation of Federal employees."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, with the recommendation of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hennings	McKellar
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Benton	Hill	Moody
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	O'Conor
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smathers
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	Magnuson	Thye
Flanders	Malone	Underwood
Frear	Martin	Watkins
George	Maybank	Welker
Gillette	McCarran	Wiley
Green	McCarthy	Williams
Hayden	McClellan	Young
Hendrickson	McFarland	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent because of official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness in their respective families.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT DUTIES ON TUNGSTEN

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, last night after I had left the Senate Chamber the majority leader, after conferring with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who had previously objected to calendar No. 1070, House bill 5248, to suspend certain import duties on tungsten, asked for the immediate consideration of the bill, and the bill was passed.

There had been a previous conversation between the chairman of the Finance Committee and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who wished to continue to insist upon his objection to the bill.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would advise the Senator that the bill has been sent to the House, and the House will have to be asked to return the papers. Then a motion to reconsider will be in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I make the appropriate motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia moves that the House be asked to return the papers to the Senate. The Senator may follow the return of the papers with a motion to reconsider.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to state my reason for my objection yesterday. Mr. Howard Robertson of the Defense Department called me and stated that we are producing in this country only 20 percent of the tungsten needed for defense purposes, and we are importing 80 percent. Certainly it seems to me that the bill should be passed. The duty on tungsten raises the cost of it to $63 a ton.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has not made a unanimous-consent request. He has made a motion.

Mr. LANGER. I understand. I want to explain why I changed my mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to be recognized?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say that when the tungsten matter came up my mind flashed to the wool situation. At the present time all over the country the warehouses are filled with domestic wool. In my State there are nearly 5,000,000 pounds in one warehouse. At the same time the Army is buying from Argentina and other South American countries, and also from Australia. Our domestic producers are not raising sheep and not producing wool because of the foreign competition.

When the tungsten matter came up I objected because it gave me an opportunity to bring to the attention of the Senate the desperate situation which confronts the wool grower in the United States.

When I was informed by the Defense Department what the situation was with respect to tungsten, I promptly withdrew my objection. I believe the bill should be passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that I did not know of the later objection. At first, objection was made by the Senator from North Dakota. He withdrew the objection. I spoke with the minority leader, but evidently he did not know about the second objection either. If I had known of the objection, I would not have asked unanimous consent to consider the bill. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] certainly would have beeen entitled to notice. Therefore, under the circumstances, I think it is no more than fair that the bill should be brought back from the House and disposed of in some other way, if it can be disposed of. Certainly it cannot be disposed of under a unanimous-consent agreement. I hope the papers will be returned from the House.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to debate the question for a minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Very well.

NECESSITY FOR ORDER IN THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the last days of the session there is a natural tendency for confusion to exist in the Chamber. In order that legislation which must be acted upon may be considered and consummated in an orderly manner, the Chair will ask all Senators to cooperate in preserving order. It is difficult to transact the business of the Senate when every Senator is talking and transacting business in his own personal capacity.

The Chair asks the occupants of the gallery to cooperate in preserving order. The Senate appreciates their interest in the proceedings, but the Chair asks their cooperation by not talking.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity, prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during the early part of this year the Committee on Agriculture and Foresty held hearings on three bills. The purpose of the first bill S. 450, was to encourage expanded production of needed nonbasic agricultural commodities. It was patterned after the so-called Steagall amendment which was adopted during World War II.

The second bill, S. 2115, sought to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic commodities by using both the old formula and the new formulas.

The third bill, S. 2996, introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], provided 100 percent of parity price supports on all major commodities, basic and nonbasic.

After holding hearings for four days the committee decided to take no action on S. 450 and S. 2996, and reported unanimously S. 2115 with an amendment.

The sole purpose of S. 2115 as amended, is to continue the present law with regard to the use of the dual parity formula in fixing parity prices for the basic commodities for a period of 2 years following December 31, 1953. While the Department of Agriculture objected to a permanent entension of the dual parity system for the basic commodities, the Department later submitted a report to the committee stating that it would be unwise to permit a sharp drop in the price support levels for the basic commodities at this time and that one way to avoid this was to continue the dual parity system through 1955.

The purpose of the pending bill, H. R. 8122 in one of its provisions, is the same as that of S. 2115, indeed, the language is identical. In addition the House bill adds another section, section 2.

The purpose of section 2 is to make the level of support prices to cooperators 90 percent of parity for the years 1953, 1954, and 1955 in the case of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas.

The committee refused to approve the second portion of the bill, with reference to making mandatory 90 percent support prices for 3 years, because of opposition in committee. Several Senators from both sides of the aisle objected to the proposal. A further reason was that the Secretary of Agriculture, under the law as it is now written, has the right and power to fix support prices at 90 percent of parity.

I now offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause of the pending House bill and to insert in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 2115. The amendment will be stated.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause of House bill 8122, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity as of any date during the 6-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, to the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I offer on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] an amendment with reference to long staple cotton, which I hope the Senate will accept. Long-staple cotton is a strategic material, and for it there is needed a better program than the one provided by the Munitions Board, and one on which the producers can rely. I hope the Senator will take the amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to will be reconsidered, in order that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], on behalf of himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], to the amendment in the nature of a substitute may be considered.

The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I can state in substance what the amendment to the amendment provides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reading of the amendment to the amendment will be dispensed with.

The amendment submitted by Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ) to Mr. ELLENDER'S amendment in the nature of a substitute, is as follows:

At the end of the bill to insert:

"SEC. —. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended as follows:

"1. Add a new subsection (f) at the end of section 101 of such act, as follows:

"'(f) The provisions of this act relating to price support for cotton shall apply severally to (1) American upland cotton, and (2) extra-long staple cotton described in subsection (a) and ginned as required by subsection (e) of section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except that the level of price support which shall be made available to cooperators for extra-long staple cotton if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas therefor shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the cost of production of extra-long staple cotton in relation to the cost of production of American upland cotton in the areas where both of these types of cotton are produced. Disapproved by producers of the quota proclaimed under such section 347 shall place into effect the provisions of section 101 (d) (3) of this act with respect to the extra-long staple cotton described in subsection (a) of such section 347. Nothing contained herein shall affect the authority of the Secretary under section 402 to make support available for extra-long staple cotton in accordance with such section 402.'

"2. Add a new section 420 to such act, reading as follows:

"'SEC. 420. Any price-support program in effect on cottonseed or any of its products shall likewise be extended to the same seed and products of the cottons defined under section 347 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.'

"SEC. —. Section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'LONG STAPLE COTTON

"'SEC. 347. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, the provisions of this part shall not apply to extra long staple cotton which is produced from pure strain varieties of the Barbadense species, or any hybrid thereof, or other similar types of extra long staple cotton designated by the Secretary having characteristics needed for various end uses for which American upland cotton is not suitable, and grown in irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States designated by the Secretary or other areas designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of such varieties or types.

"'(b) Whenever during any calendar year, not later than October 15, the Secretary determines that the total supply of cotton described in subsection (a) for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply thereof for such marketing year by more than 8 percent, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the crop of such cotton produced in the next calendar year. The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of the national marketing quota in terms of the quantity of cotton described in subsection (a) adequate to make available a normal supply of such cotton, taking into account (1) the estimated carry-over at the beginning of the marketing year which begins in the next calendar year, and (2) the estimated imports during such marketing year. The national marketing quota for cotton described in subsection (a) for any year shall not be less than the larger of 30,000 bales or a number of bales equal to 30 percent of the estimated domestic consumption plus exports of such cotton for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such quota is proclaimed.

"'(c) All provisions of this act, except section 342, subsections (h), (k), and (l) of section 344, the parenthetical provisions relating to acreages regarded as having been planted to cotton, and the provisions relating to minimum small farm allotments, shall, insofar as applicable, apply to marketing quotas and acreage allotments authorized by this section: *Provided*, that the applicable penalty rate for such cotton under section 346 shall be 50 percent of the parity price for American-Egyptian cotton as of the date specified therein.

"'(d) Unless marketing quotas are in effect under subsection (b) of this section, the penalty provisions of section 346 shall not apply to any cotton the staple of which is 1½ inches or more in length.

"'(e) The exemptions authorized by subsections (a) and (d) of this section shall not apply unless (1) the cotton is ginned on a roller-type gin or (2) the Secretary authorizes the cotton to be ginned on another type gin for experimental purposes or to prevent loss of the cotton due to frost or other adverse conditions.'"

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand its purpose, the amendment submitted to my amendment is intended to give to long staple cotton producers price support similar to that given to upland cotton producers.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct, up to 30,000 bales.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment would establish a minimum marketing quota equal to the larger of 30,000 bales or 30 percent of estimated domestic consumption and exports; is that right?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to state that the committee considered the amendment, but took no action on it because it was to be attached to a very controversial cotton bill, known as the Abernethy bill. Inasmuch as we took no action on the Abernethy bill, no action was taken on the amendment. In discussing the amendment, the committee agreed that its provisions should conform to the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. We understand that the pending amendment is practically in line with what the Department recommends and in those instances where the Department objects to the provisions of the amendment, I hope to adjust them in conference with the House.

I shall be glad to take this amendment to my amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], for himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by the Senator from Louisiana.

Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended. Without objection, the amendment as amended is agreed to.

If there is no further amendment to be submitted, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Mr. ELLENDER, explained the provisions of the bill very well. I should like, however, to make a few comments.

Commencing with the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1948, there was adopted a new parity formula known as the modernized parity formula. Until the Agricultural Act of 1948, the formula which was used to determine parity prices was the old 1909–14 base period formula.

The major basis of determining parity under the old parity formula was how many bushels of wheat would be required to buy a plow, how many pounds of cotton would be required to purchase a cotton picker, or how many bushels of corn would be required to purchase a corn planter, and so on.

The modernized parity formula used as a major basis of determining parity the average price received for farm commodities during the previous 10-year period. When first adopted the level of parity under the modernized parity formula was much lower for basics than under the old formula.

The contention of the supporters of the modernized parity formula was that as the years passed, the level of parity prices under the modernized formula would be about equal to those under the old formula for basic commodities.

There would have been considerable justification for that contention, had times been normal. However, because of the international situation and the resultant security program here in the United States, the Department of Agriculture is purposely carrying over large surpluses of the major agricultural commodities.

No three commodities are more important to the existence of man than are wheat, corn, and cotton. Because the United States Department of Agriculture is calling for increased production at a time when we are carrying over large surpluses, the surpluses we are creating by the increased production are a burden on the market, and hold down the prices to support levels or below.

Presently, the average cash price for wheat in the United States is only 84 percent of parity, while the support price is 90 percent of parity. By depressing prices in that manner, we can easily understand how the average price, as we move ahead under the modernized parity formula is lower than it would normally be.

For that reason, the spread has been widened between the old parity formula level and the level established under the modernized parity formula rather than narrowed.

Actually, we should not be carrying these wheat and other surpluses for war-emergency needs under the Commodity Credit Corporation at all. Under a different program we are stockpiling scarce war materials, such as tin, rubber, zinc, and perhaps 50 or 75 others; and they do not come into competition with prices of industrial products.

But in the case of agricultural commodities we are operating both a Commodity Credit Corporation program to support farm commodity prices and a separate program to produce increased surpluses and carry them purposely for war needs. As a result, prices have been depressed, and the modernized parity formula has not had a chance to operate as it might have otherwise.

It is for that reason that we are asking for an extension for 2 years of the use of the two parity formulas, whichever is the higher, for the basic commodities.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has agreed to study the whole parity formula system, in the hope of bringing out next year a parity formula which will be more equitable to all segments of agriculture.

Mr. President, during the period since World War II, we have appropriated approximately $30,000,000,000 for foreign assistance. The countries that are receiving this money are buying our farm commodities, in most cases at far below the cost of production.

With respect to dairy products, we have been selling our surplus at 10, 15, or probably not higher than 50 percent of parity.

Under the International Wheat Agreement, we are providing these countries with wheat at $1.80 a bushel, which probably would come within the range of 70 to 75 percent of parity.

As a result, the cost of the International Wheat Agreement has been approximately $600,000,000, as estimated by Mr. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. As he has pointed out in his telegram to all Senators, Mr. Kline, rather than defend this worth-while program, tends to condemn it in his telegram to the Members of the Senate in his opposition to the House bill we are now considering. Actually the International Wheat Agreement program ought to have been a part of the foreign-assistance program and its losses changed where it rightfully belongs—the foreign assistance program for which we are spending billions.

Mr. President, I may point out that in the foreign assistance appropriation bill which was passed just yesterday, providing economic assistance to foreign countries, there is an item of $1,282,000,000 to give foreign countries money with which to purchase industrial equipment in the United States. Some of these items are very interesting.

For instance, in the bill there is an item of $10,000,000 for the purchase of farm equipment. What price will those countries have to pay for that equipment? Not 80 percent or 90 percent of a fair price, but probably 100 percent or more.

The bill contains an item of $11,000,000 for the purchase of fertilizer—again, not at 80 percent or 90 percent of a fair price, as in the case of agricultural commodities.

The bill contains an item of $93,000,000 for the purchase of industrial machinery and equipment; $100,000,000 for iron and steel; $69,000,000 for aluminum; $68,000,000 for copper; $34,000,000 for zinc; $66,000,000 for industrial chemicals; $63,000,000 for solid fuels; $8,000,000 for lead; $13,000,000 for lumber; $14,000,000 for paper and pulp; and $23,000,000 for nonferrous ores. Foreign countries will have United States appropriations to pay full price for these huge amounts of industrial goods at the full price.

Another item is for $4,200,000,000 for military assistance. That money will be used to purchase military equipment, most of which will be purchased in the United States, not at 60 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent, or 90 percent of a fair price, but probably at 100 percent or better. Why do we have to sell our agricultural commodities at reduced prices and charge the loss to the farm program?

I am attempting to point out the difference between the farmers' end of this entire assistance program and that with respect to industry.

Those who charge that the International Wheat Agreement or other agricultural programs have been a great loss to the Department of Agriculture, ought to consider the part the farmers are playing in this international plan of security.

Actually, Mr. President, during the 18 years of operation of the farm price-support program, so far as basic farm commodities are concerned—namely, wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts—until June 30, 1951, there was a net profit to the Government of the United States of $40,000,000. The latest figure as of June 30, this year, is not available, and, I understand, will not be available for a few days.

There has been a net cost to the Government, so far as perishables and other than basic commodities, to Commodity Credit Corporation, of approximately $1,000,000,000. That is understandable, because almost half of it was due to the potato support-price program.

Again, I may point out that we have been selling our surpluses, particularly surpluses of dairy products, eggs, and other farm commodities, to meet the needs of the people of Europe, if they were to survive, at 10, 15, and 20 cents on the dollar, while we are providing billions and billions of dollars worth of industrial equipment at the price demanded for it by industry in this country.

I may say to those who condemn the program of helping the people of Europe by giving them the most essential thing in their life—which is food—and who condemn the cost of that program, ought to consider what we are doing on the industrial side.

Mr. President, I should have preferred to support the House bill known as the Cooley bill, which embodies what is in the Young-Russell bill, namely, the continuing of the use of the dual parity program for an additional 2 years. That bill contains the provisions of a bill which I introduced almost a year ago, Senate bill 450, which would extend 90 percent supports for an additional period of years. I understand—and I think it is fair to say—that there are not sufficient votes in the Senate to secure what I believe to be these desirable provisions of the Cooley bill, so our only alternative is to support the substitute offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I should first like to congratulate the Senator from North Dakota upon his excellent presentation. As a colleague of his on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I know how hard he works on farm problems, and how carefully he has studied this situation. While I associate myself completely with him in feeling that it would be much better to have the Cooley bill approved today, I, along with him, also realize that in the closing day, or next to the last day of this session, there is no possibility of overcoming the opposition which exists in this body to the Cooley bill. I simply want to emphasize the fact that while the Young-Russell bill will constitute a firm step forward, we have the further protection that in the Defense Production Act there is a guaranty of 90-percent parity for another year.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the Senator from North Dakota feel that, during that year, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry under the able, distinguished, and completely nonpartisan leadership of our friend and chairman, the Senator from Louisiana, the Senate and the House can work out a support-price program to serve as a foundation and as a continuing aid to American prosperity?

Mr. YOUNG. That is my understanding of the agreement reached in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that he and I, as well as many other members of the committee, see eye to eye as to what we should do for agriculture. The

question is, What can be enacted? I should like to say that the Cooley bill is, I think, an excellent bill. Though opposed by the Farm Bureau and the Grange, it was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Agriculture, and it received a vote of more than 2 to 1 by the Members of the House; which indicates that the Members of that body, representing the large consuming areas, and the farm areas, recognized the need of the bill, and what it could accomplish, both for the consumers and farmers of the Nation.

Mr. MUNDT. So, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, were it not for the fact that we have in the Defense Production Act precisely the same protection for a year that the Cooley bill would give us for 3 years——

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. But for that, I would now join the Senator from North Dakota and many other friends of the farmer, I am sure, in remaining here, through July and August, and even September, if necessary, in order to give my support to a suitable price support program for the farmers. However, I am certain that the position of the two Committees on Agriculture is such that during the coming session of the Congress they will arrive at a formula for continuing the price-support program.

Mr. YOUNG. I desire to point out what the emergency war program is doing to the farmers. The Agriculture Department has been asking farmers to increase their wheat production at a time when we had a surplus of wheat; it was asking the cotton farmers to go all out in production of cotton, thereby creating a tremendous surplus. Is there anyone who doubts that the creation of a surplus has the effect of beating down prices, if the surplus is sufficiently large? Certainly the farmers who are doing their part in the emergency war program are entitled to protection. Now, certainly, with the surplus which is being created by compliance on the part of the farmers with the request of the Department of Agriculture to increase production, the increased production will cause prices to drop drastically.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The application of the 90 percent of parity support program is precisely the wartime philosophy which is being applied to other segments of the American economy. We meet the labor situation by giving labor a minimum wage law. We meet the manufacturers' and industrialists' position by giving them amortization contracts, for purposes of tax relief, and by giving them cost-plus-fee contracts. Were it not for the amendment incorporated in the Defense Production Act continuing the 90 percent of parity-support prices, it would mean that the farmer alone, in the whole economy, would be expected to produce for the war situation and the emergency and to take the entire risk upon his own shoulders with respect to the income he receives instead of simply applying to the farmer the same kind of formula which is being applied to other types of economy.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the Senator is wrong in saying that the Defense Production Act guarantees net profits. I think that all it says is that the OPS Director shall not set a ceiling below 90 percent. I do not think there is any guaranty up to 90 percent, whatever. I have the bill before me now, for the first time, but if I remember correctly, it only says that the OPS Director shall not set a ceiling price below 90 percent, and has nothing to do with guaranteeing the profits.

Mr. YOUNG. My recollection is that it extends 90 percent support under the present Agricultural Act of 1949 for one additional year.

Mr. CAPEHART. I will check on that.

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

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 4 o'clock today, there be a call of the calendar of unobjected to bills placed on the calendar since the last call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reserving the right to object, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No Senator has a right to suggest the absence of a quorum in the time of another Senator, unless that Senator yields for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the absence of such yielding, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot do that at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand I do not have a right to withhold it.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator has a right to withdraw his objection. Mr. President, I discussed this matter with the Senators from New Jersey and Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point letters from the Oregon Wheat Growers' League and the National Association of Wheat Growers, supporting Senate bill 2115, the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself, and which is exactly the same as the provisions of the House bill that we are now considering.

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

THE OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
Pendleton, Oreg., June 3, 1952.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: The Oregon Wheat Growers League has requested the support of the Oregon congressional delegation for the bill which you and Senator RUSSELL introduced to extend the present method of using both the old and new parity formulas for 2 years to figure the parity price for basic crops. The enclosed brief was also brought to their attention.

We appreciate your interest in the welfare of agriculture, and will do what we can to support this bill.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD ROOT, *President.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS,
Pendleton, Oreg., June 4, 1952.

Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: We wish to inform you that the National Association of Wheat Growers has gone on record supporting the bill which you and Senator RUSSELL recently introduced into Congress to extend the present method of figuring parity for basic crops for two more years.

The enclosed letter is a copy of letters we have written to the following Senators and Representatives requesting their support for your bill: WAYNE L. MORSE, GUY CORDON, TOM CONNALLY, HUGH BUTLER, EDWARD J. THYE, FRANK CARLSON, LOWELL STOCKMAN, WILLIAM R. POAGE, WALTER E. ROGERS, CLIFFORD HOPE, HAROLD COOLEY, WALTER HORAN.

We hope that our efforts will help secure enactment of this legislation necessary to the welfare of producers of basic agriculture products, especially wheat. If you have any suggestions as to what further action we can take, please let us know.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

JENS TERJESON,
President, National Association of Wheat Growers.

Mr. YOUNG. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a telegram received by me from Allan B. Kline, President of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

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

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 1, 1952.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122. We are for a price support policy providing protection of farm prices against drastic and unreasonable price declines as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are opposed to price fixing by Government, including Government price fixing of farm prices by rigid, high-level price support programs. It is not the responsibility of Federal Government to guarantee profitable prices or returns to any economic group. Rigid high-level price-support programs are part of a trend toward centralizing more and more power and authority in Federal Government. They are a trap because if Federal Government guarantees profitable farm prices, the next logical step is for Government to impose rigid price ceilings with result that farm income is held down in years of short crops.

High, fixed price-support programs lead to an accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of CCC, the expansion of Government controls and restrictions on farmers' ability to earn good incomes by high production. Mandatory, high-level price supports can mean heavy costs to Treasury. For example, major reason international-wheat

agreement, will cost over $600,000,000 in its 4-year term, is level of price support that has been maintained. High, fixed-level price support programs prevent normal adjustments in production, unwisely stimulate production of some commodities in excess of needs, and depress production of others below needs. On behalf of 1,500,000 farm families, we recommend your opposition to H. R. 8122 as being harmful to long-run and real interests of farm people.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to say that I think it would come with better grace on the part of Mr. Kline, as president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, had he given the true facts about the international-wheat agreement and the part it plays in the international program of security against communism, rather than to discredit the agreement by not stating all of the facts.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator consider that it is hopeless to get for the farmer 100-percent parity such as industry and labor are getting?

Mr. YOUNG. I would say to my distinguished colleague, that I think it is hopeless at the present time. There are not sufficient votes to bring it about, although I agree with the Senator's program.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that when Congress convenes again, whenever that may be, a fight will be inaugurated on the part of certain Senators to get 100-percent parity?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; that is the plan.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the farmer is receiving the same miserable deal at the end of World War II that he received at the end of World War I? At the end of World War I the price of everything the farmer bought was kept up to 100 percent, while everything he sold went down almost to rock bottom.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. For example, in the case of farm machinery the index, as my distinguished colleague knows, was 101 when World War I ended, and it never receded, whereas the price of everything the farmer produced dropped steadily.

Mr. YOUNG. I may say that the price of everything the farmer has to buy has risen steadily in the period since the last war, and the price of products the farmers has to sell has declined steadily.

I may say to my distinguished colleague, who has just won a decisive victory, that received the biggest vote in areas supposed to be for sliding scale and lower supports. I think that is a tribute to him, and an expression on the part of these farmers in favor of high-level supports.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] discussed the provisions of the Production Act, let me say that after the agricultural provision was adopted, I took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture and received this information with reference to section 106 (a):

Section 106 (a) of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952 (S. 2594) would amend the fifth sentence of section 402 (d) (3) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to read as follows (the new material in brackets):

"Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or affect the provisions of either (1) the Agricultural Act of 1949 [except that under any price support program announced while this title is in effect the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent of the parity price, or such higher level as may be established under section 402 of that act for any crop of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas], or (2) the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, or to invalidate any marketing agreement, license, or order, or any provision thereof or amendment thereto, heretofore or hereafter made or issued under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended."

That is an exact quotation from the provision of the act.

I read further:

The Department advises that this provision will require the 1953 crops of the basic commodities to be supported at 90 percent of parity, assuming that title 4 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 remains in effect until April 30, 1953, as is now provided; since 1953 price support programs would normally be announced prior to April 30, 1953. Section 406 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 requires the Secretary to announce the level of price support in advance of the planting season insofar as is practicable.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was wrong in the statement I made, because the discussion we had with the conferees did not follow that line; but I am certain that all three of the able Senators are correct. It simply means that we do not really need to pass the bill, because we already have in the law the provision which is needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have it mandatory for 1953. If there is any necessity for having 90 percent of parity price supports mandatory in 1954 and 1955, we can attend to it next year.

Mr. CAPEHART. We do not need it until after the Defense Production Act expires.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, to pass this bill or to refuse to pass it means nothing.

Mr. YOUNG. But it does contain a provision which extends the use of the parity system for another 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I stated in my opening remarks, there were two provisions in the pending bill, one of which dealt with the dual-parity program——

Mr. CAPEHART. Outside of that, the Defense Production Act does for 1953 exactly what section 2 does.

Mr. ELLENDER. For 1 year. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, there is nothing to be gained either by passing or turning down this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the reason why I asked that the Senate bill, which deals merely with the dual-parity program which was introduced by my distinguished friend from North Dakota, be substituted for the House bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to say to my distinguished friend from Indiana that it would be highly desirable to pass the House bill, which would give the farmers some assurance of what is going to happen to their prices in 1954 and 1955. The provision in the Defense Production Act takes care of them for only one more year, which is a very short period.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I warmly compliment the junior Senator from North Dakota and his associate the junior Senator from Georgia. They have been the introducers and the very aggressive sponsors of this measure which is designed further to protect the farmers during this period of confusion.

In my opinion, there is real value in the immediate passage of the bill which we are now considering and of which the two Senators I mentioned are the sponsors, for the reason that in the Defense Production Act there is machinery of two or three kinds which might result in the early termination of that act. The passage of the bill now under consideration would give complete assurance that throughout the next production year the dual system would prevail. But, further than that, it would give assurance looking to the future through 1955—and there is no farmer who is not looking a little further than the immediate crop year and hoping that he will have reasonable protection during the period which covers not only that 1 year but which will last beyond that time.

This is protection of the same kind that was given under the Steagall amendment during the troublous days of World War II, by which the farmers who produced the crops covered by that amendment were assured that not only through the duration of the war, but beyond that time, they might still depend on price support at a fixed figure, which gave them some protection as against the added cost of preparing new land for increased production, and in other ways gave them the assurance which they needed.

It seems to the Senator from Florida that the measure now under consideration is like the Steagall Act in that regard, for it gives protection over more than 1 year, indeed, for three additional years to those large groups of farmers which it covers, and it will be worth a great deal generally to the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Florida for his comments. He is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and has always done an excellent job for the farmers of America.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to point out that while the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] originally raised

a question of doubt as to whether the Defense Production Act actually provided 90-percent support prices, we have his subsequent statement that from reading the legislation he is convinced that it does. Someone reading the debate might be confused.

Paragraph (a) of section 106 was read to us by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There is no doubt in the world about it, because it provides that while this title is in effect the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent. We want to be sure that some subsequent reader of the RECORD or some interpreter downtown does not get an erroneous impression.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. After reading the act itself, there is no question in my mind that the act covers 90 percent of parity.

Mr. MUNDT. I merely want to have that made clear in the RECORD.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I should like to pay my tribute to the Senator from North Dakota for advancing the proposal and for his active support of higher parity and higher price supports. I believe there are two basic reasons why we need this extension for 1 year.

The Government is calling upon the farmer to increase production. That involves a risk, and a very heavy risk. That risk is involved with a type of commodity as to which the price structure might run up and down in the open market as compared with fixed prices for nonfarmers.

Second, there are large numbers of new farmers—the younger farmer, the veteran farmer, and the nonveteran farmer who have turned to the soil, and have been called upon to buy expensive machinery, rent equipment, or buy fertilizer. Those men simply cannot have a price-support program for only next year. It is not merely next year that they will have to pay on the equipment they purchase, if they are going to be sound producers. So the extension of several additional years, up to 1955, gives them something by which they can plan. It gives them an opportunity to operate on a systematic, planned basis for the utilization of their soil and production facilities.

As the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has put it, this is a sort of Steagall amendment all over again. It worked well during the last period of emergency. I would remind the Senate that our defense program has been stretched out to 1955. That is the way we are thinking in terms of aircraft production and military preparedness. This measure would stretch out the program of 90 percent of parity supports to 1955. It fits right into the same kind of program which the mobilization officials of our country have asked us to adopt. We need agricultural mobilization as much as we need military mobilization.

I join with the Senator from North Dakota in support of this proposal and commend him for the work he has done in connection with the 90 percent of parity program, which, to my mind, is of basic importance. I do not see how farmers can get along on even 90 percent, in light of statistics which are revealing in terms of farm indebtedness and a reduction in real farm cash—not farm income, but real income.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I noticed the references by the Senator from Florida and the junior Senator from Minnesota to the similarity of this bill with the Steagall bill. I cannot see to close a resemblance between the two, because this bill—if it is the version I have in mind—covers basic commodities, whereas in the Steagall bill the basic commodities were already covered. The Steagall bill covered 12 additional commodities.

I might point out to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that this bill with support at 90 percent of parity does not cover a great deal besides wheat, so far as his State is concerned. It leaves the poultry raisers, the dairymen, and the hog raisers out of the program. The Steagall amendment was designed to cover, not the basic commodities, but the other commodities which were designated by Secretary Anderson, and there happened to be about 12 of them, including flax for oil, turkeys, of which the State of Minnesota produces a tremendous quantity——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed it does.

Mr. AIKEN. Around Buckingham, and other parts of the State.

Mr. THYE. And around Worthington.

Mr. AIKEN. It includes hogs, poultry of certain kinds, and dairy products. None of them is covered by this bill, but they were all covered by the Steagall amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. The bill pending before the Senate, as I understand, covers only the provisions of the Young-Russell bill, which provides for a continuation of dual parity. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Do I understand that the bill has been amended to include a certain type of long-staple cotton? I made inquiry of the parliamentarian, and I understand that the bill has been amended to include a certain long-staple cotton.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. What we struck out was section 2.

Mr. AIKEN. Was that stricken out on the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. What I did was simply to strike from the pending measure all after the enacting clause and to substitute the Senate bill. This is the Russell-Young bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. YOUNG. I prefer to make a statement of my own, first.

The implication was left that the only thing affecting Minnesota was with respect to wheat produced there. I should like to point out that this bill would prevent a drop in parity of more than 15 cents a bushel on corn. Minnesota also produces considerable corn.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not think that so far as the Senator from Vermont is concerned, he intended to involve Minnesota as being opposed to this bill in commenting on its probable effect. I do not wish the RECORD to show that Minnesota might be in any way involved in an argument which suggests that we are criticizing the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. We are not.

Mr. THYE. Minnesota is not criticizing the bill. I am only attempting to clarify the question, because I was not here when this measure was taken up for discussion.

I asked the Parliamentarian, "What is the legislative question we are considering?" I was informed that for House bill 8122, Senate bill 2115 had been substituted, and that a certain amendment relating to long-staple cotton had been attached to the substitute and had become a part of it.

Mr. YOUNG. That is not my fault.

Mr. THYE. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that he left the inference for anyone who reads the RECORD that the Senators representing Minnesota were finding fault with a legislative measure that was before Congress. It was for that reason that I asked to be recognized.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I wish to answer a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who did not know that the bill had been amended earlier.

Mr. THYE. May I first call one matter to the attention of the Senator from North Dakota, because I wish the situation to be entirely clear. The Senator from North Dakota left the impression, in his statement referring to Minnesota, that the contention was being made here that the only thing from which we would benefit would be in wheat. That was the reason why I rose, because I know that the farmer will read this RECORD, and he rightfully should read it.

If the Senator from North Dakota will permit me to do so, I will first state that I join with him in support of this measure. If he will permit me further to state, I may say that at no time has the actual tiller of the soil, the producer, the man who operates the farm, been squeezed any more tightly economically than he is squeezed today. Taxes are up on personal property and real estate. The cost of repairs to machinery is up. The cost of new machines is double what it was 4 years ago. The price of pork has gone down steadily in the past 3 years. The price of dairy products is not commensurate with the cost that he must invest in his dairy unit and the cost of the hired help he is compelled to employ in order to take care of his dairy production.

There is today a greater distress in the diversified agricultural area of the United States than I have seen in the past 10 years. Economically, the farmer is

squeezed today. He is squeezed more than he was at any time during World War II, both with respect to help on the farm, and with respect to other costs of operation.

Many persons believe that the farmer is exceedingly well off, because of the cost of food to the consumer. Let us examine the price of pork. Four years ago the producers received from 26 to 28 cents a pound for their pork. I will ask the consumers if they are paying more for pork at retail markets today than they did 4 years ago. They are. And yet the producer, as of today, is receiving from 18 to 19 cents a pound for his pork, whereas 4 or 5 years ago he received 28 cents. The difference between 28 cents a pound live weight for pork and a price of 18 or 19 cents is 9 or 10 cents a pound. The producer receives 9 or 10 cents a pound less today than he received for his pork 4 or 5 years ago.

That is what we are faced with. That is why I say, Mr. President, to my distinguished friend from North Dakota that I will join and support him in this legislative measure, even though I know that some of the outstanding farm organizations in the United States do not approve of this type of legislative measure as of today.

Today the producer is economically depressed. In the event that the producer's purchasing power is diminished, destroyed, or dried up, it will not be long before the factories feel the effect of the lack of purchasing power on the part of the producer.

I believe that we who serve in Congress have just as much justification for taking a look at the problems of the farmer as we have for examining the businessman's problems, or the problems of citizens of foreign countries. We endeavor to assist the citizens of foreign countries in our European recovery program and in the mutual security expenditures which we are now making abroad to build up the defenses of those countries.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am sorry if I left the wrong impression concerning the good Senators from Minnesota. Certainly the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has made his position abundantly clear. I should like to add that no Member of the Senate has been a better friend of agriculture than has the senior Senator from Minnesota.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. There is only one statement that I wish to make in connection with this legislation. We do not sufficiently safeguard the interests of the man engaged in diversified farming, the man who produces poultry, eggs, pork, and dairy products. We are not today safeguarding that kind of producer by the type of support program which would make certain that he is safeguarded against ruinously low prices, whether it be prices of eggs, pork, or other perishable products besides dairy products and eggs. I refer to such products as the citrus crop and other perishable crops.

Mr. YOUNG. I join the Senator from Minnesota in his comments. I shall be glad to join him at any time in working out a better program for other types of farming.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which has been prepared by Dr. Wilcox of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. This statement relates to the pork price question.

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

HOG SUPPLIES AND PRICES, OCTOBER 1951–SEPTEMBER 1952

An analysis of the application of alternative price-support methods.

The hog-corn feeding ratio turned unfavorable for hog producers in November 1951 and remained unfavorable until May 1952. Hog prices declined almost steadily from a United States average of $20.50 per 100 pounds in July 1951 to $16.40 in April 1952. The first part of the decline was a normal occurrence for the fall season, but prices continued to sag in midwinter when they usually rise. The hog-corn ratio, which averaged 12.6 from 1931–50, fell from 12.6 in July to 9.8 in April.

Although the Secretary of Agriculture had discretionary legislative authority to support hog prices at any level up to 90 percent of parity, no price supports were announced. Some Members of Congress and leaders of farm groups urged the Secretary to support hog prices. Others urged the Secretary to take no action, fearing that heavy losses and serious product disposal problems would be encountered, similar to those resulting from the egg and potato price support programs. After considerable urging from the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the use of section 32 funds was authorized in April to purchase pork products for distribution through the school-lunch program and to public institutions.

A review of the supply and price behavior from October to date now makes possible estimates of the size of purchase or storage operations or the amount of direct payments which would have been required if price supports had been announced and either of these two methods used to carry them out.

The change in supplies, prices and other market data as reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for the first 7 months of the 1951–52 marketing year as compared with the first 7 months of 1950–51 are shown below:

Change from first 7 months, 1950–51, to first 7 months, 1951–52

	Percent
Pork produced (pounds slaughtered commercially)	+ 8.1
Pork consumption per capita	+ 4.9
Increase in cold storage stocks	+20.3
Increase in marketing margin	+ 6.8
Decrease in retail price (pork products excluding lard)	− 3.7
Decrease in farm price of hogs	−10.8

The above data indicate there was nothing unusual about the price declines at the retail and farm levels in view of the 8 percent increase in pork slaughtered. The increase in storage stocks was to be expected and it is reported that available cold storage facilities were quite fully utilized.

Marketing margins usually widen under the impact of above-average supplies. When farmers offer more hogs for market without a compensating increase in consumer demand, processors offer lower prices at the farm which more than compensate for the mark-down in retail prices required to move the increased supplies into consumption or storage.

The United States average farm price of hogs during the period October 1951 to May 1952 compares with 90 percent of seasonally-adjusted October 1951 parity as follows:

Month	United States average farm price	90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity	Difference
1951—October	$20.20	$19.90	+$0.30
November	18.10	18.24	−.14
December	17.60	17.22	+.38
1952—January	17.40	18.14	−.74
February	17.20	18.89	−1.69
March	16.70	19.68	−2.98
April	16.40	19.26	−2.86
May	20.00	18.93	+1.07

Hog prices are expected to average above 90 percent of parity for the remainder of the marketing year. On the basis of estimates made at this time, hog prices for May through September will average high enough to pull the seasonal average up to 89 percent of parity.

In view of this it appears that, had price supports been announced at 90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity with direct payments used to make up the difference between the announced support price and the seasonal average market price, payments would have been extremely small. With approximately 18,000,000,000 pounds live weight of hogs marketed, direct payments would have been from zero to around $50,000,000, depending on the level of prices the remainder of the marketing year.

If the Government had maintained hog prices at 90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity by purchase and storage operations the marketing mechanism would have been affected in a number of places. It is doubtful if the marketing margin would have widened as it did. This widening of marketing margins amounted to $68,000,000 in the November-April period.

The volume of hog marketings also would have been smaller if prices had been supported at 90 percent of parity. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that breeding herds were reduced by 1,000,000 head of gilts sent to market because of the unfavorable hog-corn ratio. With prices supported, producers would have been more confident and less reduction would have occurred in spring farrowing, hence smaller marketings of gilts in the winter months.

Utilizing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics established relationships between supplies and prices, the removal of 278,000,000 pounds of pork, carcass weight, would have maintained hog prices at 90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity during the months from November 1951 through April 1952, assuming no change in other marketing activities.

This estimate is reduced sharply, however, by taking into account the effect of price support operations on the number of hogs marketed and on marketing margins. If half of the extra breeding gilts sent to market had been retained for spring farrowing and marketing margins had remained the same as a year earlier, hog prices might have been maintained at 90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity October 1951 to April 1952 by purchase and storage operations which removed 120,000,000 pounds from marketing channels in addition to the amount which did go into commercial storage.

Had the Government undertaken a price support operation, it probably would have been forced to make price supporting loans or purchase agreements covering almost all pork which went into commercial storage or a total in excess of 500,000,000 pounds.

Cold storage facilities might have been taxed to capacity, and special programs might have been needed to free sufficient space to care for the additional pork placed in storage.

Prices in the May to September period would be somewhat lower than otherwise if the Government had acquired additional storage stocks. Total storage stocks would not have exceeded 15 percent of the current marketings May to September, however. Although a part of the price improvement November through April would be offset by the removal of storage stocks later in the year, farmers would gain by preventing the $68,000,000 widening of the margin between farm and retail prices. Both farmers and consumers would benefit from the stabilizing effect on hog breeding plans of a price support program. At the present time it appears that spring farrowings in 1952 were reduced excessively as a result of the low hog prices in the winter months.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not rising to delay proceedings at all. I simply wish to make some explanatory statements.

As I came into the Chamber the discussion seemed to be revolving around the proposal to make mandatory a minimum of 90 percent support of the six basic commodities, for 3 years more. The Senate bill which I have on my desk has been substituted for the so-called Cooley bill from the House which I found on my desk as I entered the Chamber.

The question of continuing a minimum of 90 percent support prices for the six basic commodities does not enter into this bill at all at this time. As a matter of fact, under existing legislation the Secretary of Agriculture has very broad authority in supporting the prices of farm commodities. I sometimes think he has almost too broad authority.

With relation to the amendment offered by the Senators from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. HAYDEN] relating to long-staple cotton, I point out that I have had no opportunity to study this amendment. I did not know that it was coming up. I should like to point out that the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture is so broad that he has full authority to take care of the situation which is brought to our attention by the amendment of the two Senators from Arizona. At the present time the Secretary of Agriculture is actually supporting the price of long-staple cotton at 153 percent of parity. He is authorized to do so by the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949. I do not know that this amendment does any harm. It may do a great deal of good for the Senators from Arizona. However, I am not opposing it.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is very necessary to maintain a program upon which the farmers can depend. The only program which the long-staple cotton producers have is the program providing for the purchase of cotton by the Munitions Board. That is uncertain.

The amount of cotton involved is very small. Thirty thousand bales is a small amount of cotton. During World War II the Government called upon farmers to produce long-staple cotton. There was a time when we produced hardly enough from seed to keep the production of long-staple cotton going. If we are to maintain a minimum amount, we need this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not blame the Senators from Arizona and their cotton-growing constituents for wanting to know where they stand. As I say, the Secretary of Agriculture is now supporting the price of native long-staple cotton at $1.07, or 153 percent of parity. Nevertheless, not long ago the Government was actually buying cotton of this grade from Egypt for more than $1.40 a pound, or nearly 50 percent more than the price at which the price of our own native long-staple cotton was being supported. I do not blame the Senators from Arizona for wanting to have that situation definitely corrected.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator has just stated, it is true that the Secretary is supporting the price of long-staple cotton, but the fear is that with so much cotton being stored, the Secretary may not do so in the future. The amendment of the distinguished Senator from Arizona makes it mandatory that long-staple cotton shall be supported the same as upland cotton.

Mr. AIKEN. It is entirely possible that the Commodity Credit Corporation has bought so much long-staple cotton from abroad for the Munitions Board that the very weight of the stockpile may seriously depress the price to our western long-staple cotton producers.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what the growers of that product fear.

Mr. AIKEN. For that reason it may be just as well to have the program spelled out in the law.

As to the other part of the bill or the main part of it that is now left, which permits the dual parity formula to continue for another 2 years. It is already authorized for at least one more year. It is true that the operations of the price controllers have upset the workings of the new parity formula. Under the old parity formula the base used was the years 1909 to 1914. Under the new parity formula the base consists of the immediately preceding 10 years, which would be much better in the long run.

Changing the parity formula would not give agriculture as a whole any more money. All agricultural commodities added together amount to 100 percent of parity. The formula is devised for the purpose of keeping each agricultural commodity in the proper price relationship with all the other commodities. However, if it is changed that does not give agriculture as a whole any more money or any less money, figuratively speaking, in comparison to the other factors of our economy.

It naturally follows that if one agricultural commodity gets more than it is entitled to it takes away from some other commodity.

However, I do not have any objection to continuing the parity formula for another 2 years beyond next year. I believe we must review the entire parity situation. Producers of certain commodities feel that it is not treating them fairly. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized by law to correct such conditions when it is found, after an open hearing, that any particular commodity is discriminated against, or out of line with other commodities.

I know that if the new parity formula went into effect this year there would be a substantial drop in the price of wheat, and that situation probably would hold true for the next 3 or 4 years, or until the heavy surpluses which we have on hand at the present time were taken care of and the price went up in a free market, which we may not have for some time.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. It has been impossible for me to be on the floor during this debate because it was necessary for me to attend conferences on other bills.

Therefore, I may ask a question which has already been answered. I believe it is a fact that the leaders of some of the principal farm organizations have had rather strenuous objections to certain provisions of H. R. 8122. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if the objectionable provisions have been taken care of in the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the objections which the Senator from Nebraska refers to were particularly directed at section 2 of the Cooley bill, which would guarantee a minimum of 90-percent support for basic farm commodities through 1955. I do not believe that the farm organizations would approve entirely of what we have before us, but I doubt that they are as strenuously opposed to it as they were to the Cooley provisions, which were stricken out.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. They have been stricken out?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. As a matter of fact, the right to choose the higher of two parity formulas will continue for another year in any event. During 1953 we must review carefully the whole agricultural situation. We may find that parity is not a fair method of arriving at what farm prices should be in relation to other commodities. It may be, if we are to have price controls pop up here and there, and have other factors come into the picture, that we will have to abandon the parity concept and find some other criterion of determining fair farm prices. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota will continue dual parity for another 2 years beyond next year. In the meantime the next Congress will very likely consider the whole proposition. I do not see how any great harm can some from it at the present time. I would not agree to continue it indefinitely. But if it does not work, it will be changed anyway.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe the Senator from Vermont has been very fair. He recognizes the fact that when the Government is asking for increased production, the increased production depresses prices, as do ceiling prices, and a modernized parity formula does not have an opportunity to work, as it otherwise would.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Wheat is particularly affected by developments of the last 2 or 3 years. Normally our country uses a little more than 700,000,000 bushels of wheat. It is estimated that we will export approximately 375,000,000 bushels this year. I feel that the estimate by the Department of Agriculture may be a little high. I hope it is not. Under the law the legal carry-over is 163,000,000 bushels. The fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for such huge production of wheat, by next July we may have a carry-over of well over 500,000,000 bushels, instead of 163,000,000 bushels which normally would be expected to be adequate. I understand that the Secretary of Agriculture considers the program to be part of the preparedness program. He may be right in asking for the tremendous production of wheat. Under his emergency powers he has announced that there will be no quotas set on wheat next year. We may have another surplus of 100,000,000 bushels, and then we will have a real problem on our hands.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Would not the Senator from Vermont agree that if we carried over 163,000,000 bushels, which is deemed to be the normal carry-over under the Agricultural Act of 1948, we could expect normal prices?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. With a carry-over of 500,000,000 bushels there is not any chance of wheat prices going above the support level.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from North Dakota is correct. If we carry over only 163,000,000 bushels the price of wheat would probably be 100 percent of parity. The fact is that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for a huge production, and undoubtedly the price would collapse if it were not for price supports. The wheat grower is in a peculiar situation. For that reason I have sympathy with him. I would rather have the Secretary of Agriculture exercise the power which he possesses under the existing law to maintain the price of wheat at a reasonably good level, in view of the fact that he has himself asked for an overproduction. But if he does not choose to do so under the law he can be required to do it. Apparently the growers feel they would rather have it required directly by law.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not also true that on account of the switchover to the modernized parity formula, as of now there will be a drop in parity of about 17 cents a bushel for corn and 1 cent or 1½ cents a pound for cotton?

Mr. AIKEN. I think that would be true, but the effect on the farmers in the case of corn would not be so great, because more corn would be used, and that would increase the value of practically all protein and animal products.

When the 1948 formula was developed, it was felt that it would be wise to encourage as much use of corn as possible, by having the farmers feed corn to livestock, thus putting the corn into meat and poultry products, because in that way from 4 to 6 bushels of grain will be disposed of, as compared to 1 bushel of grain disposed of when used for cereal diet. We deliberately set out to encourage an increased use of grain in the form of animal products.

So with that addition, I see no objection to enactment of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think it is most unfortunate that each 4 years, on the eve of the presidential election, we get on the floor of the Senate an agricultural bill in connection with which the decisions are made from a political standpoint, rather than from a constructive standpoint for the American farmer. This bill proposes further extension of the artificial-high supports on certain basic commodities.

I remember that in 1948 we passed an agricultural bill providing for a flexible support program. If that program had been allowed to go into effect as scheduled, I believe the American farmer would be much better off than he is today.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] pointed out how today the American farmers are in worse shape than they were during the depression years, on the basis of the prices they are receiving for the things they produce, as compared with the prices they are paying for the implements they have to buy. That just shows how a false sense of prosperity has been created by the program under the Democratic Party. I do not believe anyone will dispute that assertion.

Likewise, I have pointed out that the agricultural program, as it is being administered today, which takes care of just a few producers of a few basic commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, rice, peanuts, tobacco—at an artificially high level, is gradually bankrupting the poultry industry and the livestock industry in the United States as well as the consumers. There is very little that the present program can do to the poultry industry that it has not done in the last 2 years, because today that industry is practically on the rocks, from the standpoint of making a profit.

If this program is continued as proposed under this bill for another 6-year period, it wil mean that in that 6-year period the parity program can be computed either under the old average or under the new average, and the result will be to continue an artificially supported high price.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to make a correction: the bill extends it for 2 years, not 4 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator said it would apply for the next 6-year period, beginning January 1, 1950. That would take it to January 1, 1956.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right; but we have already used up 3 years of that time, and it has one more year to go under present law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps so, but by 1956 the 10-year cycle following the war will have been completed; and then, when we go back to computing prices on the last 10-year average, from 1956—computing them backward—the effect will be to compute them under the prices established under the 90-percent formula. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. The dual-parity formula was begun in January 1950; and under the law as it now exists, it was to run for 4 years from January 1, 1950.

The amendment now proposed simply extends it 2 years more, or 6 years from 1950.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct; but you go back to 4 years beyond 1950, and the 90-percent provision was in effect during those 4 years. When the 6 years are added to that 4-year period, you arrive at 10 years, when computed to January 1, 1956.

I thought we might as well recognize that if this bill is enacted, and if this contract with the farmers is lived up to, the high formula will be projected for the basic commodities until 1956, while the producers of other agricultural commodities remain unprotected.

If we do not change this agricultural program, whereby the Department of Agriculture will recognize that one farmer in one section of the country, even though he is a diversified farmer or a producer of livestock, is just as important to the economy of the Nation as is a farmer who is producing wheat and other grains, the ultimate result will be to break down the entire agricultural program. The program today is splitting the farmers into two sections, one composed of the diversified farmers and livestock producers and one composed of those who favor this program because they reap substantial benefits from it.

The diversified farmers will not continue to take the blame of the high cost of living under an agricultural program which, in reality, not only gives them no benefit but actually penalizes them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In the case of cotton, if the price continues for another year at about the present price, by 1954 the parity price of cotton under the new formula will show an increase of ½ cent or possibly 1 cent a pound above the price under the old formula.

Mr. ELLENDER. At least it will equalize it.

Mr. AIKEN. It will run about ½ cent over, if it stays where it is.

However, in the case of wheat the Secretary has asked for such tremendous production that I think he is actually depressing the price, because with that production the wheat farmer cannot hope to get more than the support price.

That happened in the case of potatoes. When the potato farmers had 60 percent support on potatoes, 60 percent of parity was all those farmers could get. Yet when the support price was removed, thus stopping a considerable amount of the growing of potatoes, those who did produce potatoes last year received from 90 percent to 100 percent.

So I think the new formula will raise the price of cotton in several years' time, and will increase by over 25 percent the parity value of cottonseed.

But in the case of wheat, I am inclined to think the tremendous production which the Secretary of Agriculture has requested will depress the price a little.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would assume that the Secretary would foresee the tremendous production and accumulation and would cut down on the requested production, because if that is not done, we do not have in the Nation sufficient storage facilities to take care of all the wheat that will be produced with 2 or 3 bumper crops. The amount of storage cannot be cut down by increased purchases, because the farmers who are feeding the wheat to livestock cannot afford to buy it.

Mr. AIKEN. In 1948 Congress anticipated that the Secretary of Agriculture would comply with the act, as directed by Congress. However, he showed signs of not doing so; and in 1949 Congress took steps to require him to carry out the congressional intent, by putting in the bill certain definitions and other provisions.

However, the best bill in the world cannot do the job any better than the one who administers it will do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Vermont is correct; there is no question of that.

As the Senator from Vermont says, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, had failed to carry out the intent of Congress. I am reminded of a bulletin which the Secretary of Agriculture issued, and which I called attention to on this floor, several years ago, where he instructed his top, key officials, that in the course of their official duties, they should give more attention to getting his pet farm program enacted rather than to making the existing program work.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will yield, let me point out a case in which the law has not been used as quickly as was intended by Congress. The Senator from Delaware will recall that last winter and spring the price of hogs started going down, and dropped and dropped, until it fell below a fair price. When the price of pork started to go down, the Secretary of Agriculture did not move to support it, as he was authorized by the law to do. He could have supported it up to 90 percent of parity. However, the price went way below parity.

Before the announcement of any program to support the price of hogs, thousands and thousands of hog raisers had sold their brood sows because they felt they could not afford to keep them any longer.

Now we are faced with a probable shortage of pork, next fall as a result.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. And then the same man will then be pitying the consumers in the cities and will be advocating price controls.

Someday, Mr. President, the American people will wake up and will find that price controls or price tags emanating from a bureaucratic office in Washington do not taste very good when cooked in the pot. In order to have food, it is necessary to have something more than a bulletin from Washington. Washington does not produce food.

Mr. AIKEN. It is almost conclusive that after the price was forced so low, last spring, as to force the farmers to sell their brood sows, we can predict higher pork prices to the consumers this fall.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and the same is true in the case of potatoes. When the price support was removed from potatoes, the Department of Agriculture tried to scare the farmers to death by telling them how poorly they would fare in a free market, with the result that they cut back the acreage more than they would have done had the Government stayed out. At the same time, the threat was held over them of a price ceiling. Had the farmers been let alone, they would have gone on to produce the potatoes necessary to feed the people today. I think the Secretary of Agriculture has done more to confuse the farmers than any other organization, group, or individual in this country.

Mr. President, I shall conclude my remarks because I recognize that today we are against a losing proposition. Nevertheless, I think it is important, if we want to get a good, sound agricultural program and keep it in effect, that we someday wake up to the fact that recognize that a farmer producing diversified crops in the East and the producer of livestock are entitled to some recognition. During the past few months we have been asked by many farmers in our area why it is that dairy feed and poultry feed are so much higher than they were even during the late war. The answer to that is that we are today supporting the prices of the basic commodities which go to make up the cost of feed to the dairyman and poultryman at levels which are about 40 percent higher than the ceiling prices on those same commodities during the war. At the same time, the producers of livestock are having to sell their products at prices which are lower than the prices were during the late war. As I have said, the poultry industry has already been seriously damaged, the pork industry is following closely behind, and before many months we are likely to see the beef industry in the same situation.

Mr. President, there is not enough money in the Federal Treasury to support all perishable commodities. I think the need in this country is for a sound agricultural program, one which will not be an incentive to production, because if we continue as we are doing today, under an artificially high support price, we are inevitably going to build up a huge surplus, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, and those surpluses are going to act as ceiling prices instead of support prices. The prices on wheat and corn will not rise above the support price when there are huge backlogs waiting to be dumped on the market. The same thing is true in the case of cotton. Whether the farmers want it or not, under this administration we are inevitably moving toward a controlled agricultural economy, with ceiling prices and support prices operating at the same time, under some governmental agency in Washington. If we are to have artificially high support prices, we must give to some governmental agency the control of acreage; and the farmers are going to be told how much they can plant, when they can plant, and what they can do with the crop. That is against everything we stand for in America. Furthermore, under this procedure, the small farmers will bear the heaviest burden on acreage cut-backs.

Mr. President, I do not think the American farmers want that. The two major farm organizations of this country have gone on record unanimously as being against the provisions of the pending bill and against artificially high support prices. They recognize the danger. I shall conclude my remarks by reading a telegram which I received yesterday from the American Farm Bureau Federation, which I think speaks louder as to what should be done in the matter of the agricultural program than anything else that could be said. The telegram, dated July 1, 1952, is from Mr. Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and reads as follows:

American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122. We are for a price support policy providing protection of farm prices against drastic and unreasonable price declines as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are opposed to price fixing by Government, including Government price fixing of farm prices by rigid, high-level price support programs. It is not the responsibility of Federal Government to guarantee profitable prices or returns to any economic group. Rigid high-level price support programs are part of a trend toward centralizing more and more power and authority in Federal Government. They are a trap because if Federal Government guarantees profitable farm prices, the next logical step is for Government to impose rigid price ceilings with result that farm income is held down in years of short crops. High, fixed price support programs lead to an accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of CCC, the expansion of Government controls and restrictions on farmers ability to earn good in-

comes by high production. Mandatory, high-level price supports can mean heavy costs to Treasury. For example, major reason international wheat agreement will cost over $600,000,000 in its 4-year term is level of price support that has been maintained. High, fixed-level price support programs prevent normal adjustments in production, unwisely stimulate production of some commodities in excess of needs, and depress production of others below needs. On behalf of 1,500,000 farm families, we recommend your opposition to H. R. 8122 as being harmful to long-run and real interests of farm people.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I have received from the Delaware Farm Bureau, Inc., signed by Ralph R. Peters, executive secretary, Dover, Del.

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

DELAWARE FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Dover, Del., July 2, 1952.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I know that you have been giving a lot of thought to agricultural programs and that when the time comes to vote you will support measures that you believe best for the Nation.

H. R. 8122, providing for extension of dual parity for 3 years and mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic crops, certainly is not in the best interests of farmers from this section of the country. I get the National Farmers Union official publication and they are the chief supporters of high mandatory price supports.

High supports to farmers will certainly cause consumers to demand ceilings at support levels and soon farmers would have a completely controlled economy.

Price ceilings and high supports have been discussed at a great many meetings in Delaware and opposition was unanimous to both unless in an extreme emergency.

However, the majority are in favor of a flexible support program that will give farmers an opportunity to stay in business while they make the necessary adjustments.

I understand the high-support legislation being pushed by Farmers Union will soon be before the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH R. PETERS,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I conclude in the hope that this Congress will reject the pending bill and will return next year, 1953, to work out an agricultural program which will recognize every farmer in America as being equally as important to our economy. Let us never forget the small farmer is the backbone of American agriculture just as small business is the backbone of our free enterprise system.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel it my responsibility as representing, in part, the State of New Jersey to insert in the RECORD in connection with the pending bill two messages which have come to me on the subject involved in the bill. The first one is from Mr. H. W. Vorhees, president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau, addressed to me, which reads as follows:

Farmers of our State are opposed to H. R. 8122, which will place rigid controls on agriculture until 1956. Your help in defeating this bill is requested. This is really important.

The other message which I received, and I think the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] read it into the RECORD, is from Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill. It is addressed to me, and I read the first paragraph:

American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122.

Then follows the telegram which the Senator from Delaware read in full.

SENATOR MOODY'S REPORT ON FARM POLICY

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, during this busy session of Congress I have spent considerable time and thought on agricultural problems. In order to get directly the views of farmers in my State, I have studied the positions of the farm organizations on various aspects of farm policy. And I have also mailed a large number of questionnaires to Michigan farmers to obtain their views first-hand on specific points relating to our efforts to promote a stable and prosperous farm economy. Our purpose, of course, is to prevent any recurrence of farm depression which would bring disaster to the entire country as well as to farmers.

I should like, therefore, to take a few moments of the Senate's time this afternoon to report on some of the findings and thinking which I believe may be of interest to the Senate and also to my constituents.

A nation must eat. New cars, refrigerators, and television sets are mighty nice to have. But unless there is food in the pantry, nothing else matters.

This is the main reason why agriculture will always be our most important industry.

But agriculture's importance lies in more than this. If the farmer and his land prosper, the Nation is likely to prosper. When the farmer can buy, the manufacturer can sell; when the manufacturer can sell, there are jobs for city workers.

America has always known the value of the farmer's place in the scheme of things. But not everyone has recognized that the Nation's dependence on the farm is matched by the farmer's dependence on the rest of the Nation. What we do about inflation, military strength, unemployment, monopoly, taxation and foreign policy can make or break the farmer.

We know what can happen when these decisions are mishandled by men whose thinking has lagged behind reality.

Mr. President, I agree with some of the things which my friend from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] said a few moments ago. I differ, however, with his remarks regarding false prosperity. I wonder if he believes the farmers were prosperous before the Government put into effect its program.

Farmers will long remember the collapse of farm prices in 1921, and the lengthening shadows of the later twenties, warning of the gathering storm ahead. They will never forget the brief, tragic period when 233,000 farmers lost their homes and their land to the men holding the mortgages. They have vivid memories of milk holidays, bank failures, two-bit wheat, 15-cent corn, 2½-cent beef, and food rotting in the fields while city children lacked bread.

Farmers can recall when the parity ratio stood at 55 percent and the farmer cleared $290 per year—$290 per year on which to raise a family. That kind of poverty does not build character. It builds only despair and a burning sense of injustice.

In the last couple of decades, however, the American farmer has come up from the black pit of desperation, foreclosures, crashing farm prices, and staggering piles of unwanted crops. He has had behind him the assurance that the bottom would not be allowed to drop out of farm prices—as it does not drop out of the manufacturers' prices. He has had an opportunity to electrify his farm at a reasonable cost, bringing greater efficiency.

A realistic system of farm credit has helped him expand production and survive the lean years. An ever-normal granary has stabilized his supply of livestock feed, as well as safeguarded the Nation against food shortages. The Government has promoted the growth of farm cooperatives, brought about tremendous progress in soil conservation, and stimulated modern farming practices.

Given a fair break, the farmer has forged ahead as never before.

It is important now, as we ponder what Government policies will be most helpful to farmers and the Nation, to compare agricultural conditions today with those of 20 years ago.

Seventy-five percent of our farmers own their own farms, compared to 58 percent in 1932.

Farm mortgage debt is down from more than $9,000,000,000 to less than $6,000,000,000.

Net farm income is up from $1,900,000,000 to $14,600,000,000 a year.

In 1932, only 9 percent of the Nation's farms had electricity. REA, plus enlightened policy of private utilities in some States, have raised this to 92 percent.

The State of Michigan leads the Nation in this field. Over 97 percent of Michigan farms are electrified today, compared with 14 percent in 1930.

Eighty percent of the Nation's farms are included in the 2,450 soil-conservation districts created since 1937.

But this is not all. Equally remarkable is the farmer's record of increasing man-hour output 70 percent in the last 20

years. Backed up by outstanding research in the Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations, he has increased his efficiency in the past 10 years three times faster than the rate for industry. This is an astounding performance.

In Michigan, for example, the potato farmer is producing three times as many potatoes as in 1930, and on half the acreage. Bean growers harvest 50 percent more beans on only three-fifths the 1930 acreage. Total sugar beet production has doubled on only a third larger acreage.

The farmer has a right to be proud of this achievement. The Nation can also take pride and satisfaction in what has been done. Everyone in our country has profited, directly or indirectly, by the progress which the farmers have shown they can make if fair opportunities are given to them.

We have made a lot of progress—but we have not come to the end of the road. The world changes, and agriculture changes with it. Policies which are sound at one time are out of date at another. The farm program must be continually reexamined in the light of the changing picture of today and the prospects of tomorrow. If we are satisfied to pat ourselves on the back, if we forget to profit by the mistakes of the past, if we fail to look and plan ahead, we may lose what has been won.

What are the main questions farmers are asking themselves these days? It is important to face them squarely.

First, what Government policies will help the farmer meet the Nation's food requirements in the years ahead?

This is a crucial problem. We have already brought into production about all the farm land the Nation has. In some areas, in fact, we have plowed up land which better would have been left in sod. Yet, in 1975, it is estimated there will be five plates to fill, where now there are four. Every 24 hours 7,000 more persons look to the farmer for bread.

This presents a major challenge to the farmer, and a problem of utmost concern to the Nation. It is imperative that we follow the most modern practices, conserve our soil prudently, and insure that Government policy is geared to stimulate, rather than to stifle, production.

Of this we may be sure: The farmer likes to produce. Nothing suits him better than an opportunity to turn out bumper crops—at prices which net him a reasonable profit.

What governmental policies will help the farmer do the job?

Farmers do not ask for prices that make it tough on the low-income consumer. They do want and are entitled to a fair return on their labor and their investment. They do not want the taxpayer to carry them on his back. They do not want their freedom eroded. They are willing, however, to accept such intelligent rules as are necessary to their welfare and the welfare of the Nation.

To those sincerely seekingly a farm program of maximum usefulness, a number of other questions press forward.

Is it fair to give price protection to some farmers and deny it to others? Since the question answers itself, how do we go about correcting the unequal situation that exists today?

What can and should be done to help the 1,200,000 farmers who produce less than $2,000 worth of commodities every year? We have thousands of them in Michigan.

These farmers, many of whom got off to a bad start through no real fault of their own, are not enjoying the living standards America can offer. Whatever can be done to help them work out a satisfactory, self-sustaining income should be done.

These farmers do not want charity—and should not get it. But if we can help them get a new start, under conditions which bring out the best that is in them because they see the prospects of better things ahead, they can make important contributions to their communities which will be of advantage to all of us.

What amount and what kind of food reserves should the Nation have?

This is an exceptionally important question, because of the current threat to peace inherent in the ominous international conspiracy known as communism. Some hard thinking needs to be done in this area—now.

Finally, what should be our policy on the exporting and importing of farm products?

Farmers and farm organizations have already done a lot of spadework on most of these problems. So have Members of Congress. It is important that we get the right answers.

Here are a few suggestions. They are not put forward in any sense as final conclusions, or as the only answers. They are simply recommendations—recommendations which others will undoubtedly be able to improve upon. But I hope they will provoke thought and discussion, and help contribute something toward the development of sound agricultural policies for our time.

Basic to the problem of protecting agriculture against depression and stimulating abundant and confident production, is the system of price supports. Price supports are essential to protect the Nation from a collapse of farm income which, in 1930 and at other times, has touched off major national depressions. Only war would be a greater disaster than another depression on the scale of the early thirties.

Our policy should be directed toward creating the economic climate in which farmers will produce to the maximum the foods we need, and receive for their products prices as close to parity as possible. This provides the best guaranty of adequate supply and therefore the best break for the consumer as well. After all, is not parity, by definition, the price at which the farmer can receive in the market place a return which will enable him to buy the things he needs on a fair basis? Farmers should not be forced to sell cheap and buy dear.

Of course, if price guaranties should bring about persistent surpluses of certain crops, or excessive costs to the taxpayer, or if to avoid these evils the Government should be tempted to impose too many controls, supports should be adjusted accordingly. The farmer must never be penalized for producing abundantly the things we need; on the contrary, he must be encouraged to do so. But if production of a particular commodity goes beyond abundance and into waste, he would want sensible adjustments to protect both the farmer and the national economy. Some flexibility in the price-support system strengthens our capacity to deal with special situations.

A serious weakness in the present farm program is its failure to protect specialty crops adequately. Producers of fruits and vegetables have little price protection compared to other producers. Obviously, there can be no real justification for helping one group of farmers far more than others.

The regular price-support system does not seem to provide the answer for most perishable commodities. In order to maintain price-support guaranties in this area, the Government undoubtedly would have to resort to mass purchases from time to time. This frequently would be followed by the rotting or destruction of food, something none of us wants to see happen.

One alternative to price supports I have been studying, Mr. President, is a system of mutual price insurance. This idea should be thoroughly explored, for it may be the answer we are looking for.

In the field of fruits and vegetables, prices fluctuate sharply from year to year. Good prices one year may be followed by unprofitable prices the next. It may be possible to work out a voluntary, self-financing insurance plan to level out the losses suffered during bad years. If farmers were to contribute to the insurance fund during favorable years, and receive payments from the insurance pool during poor years—in proportion to their marketings—we might go a long way toward solving the problem.

The Government's part should be limited if possible, to administering the plan, and paying the administrative costs. It would be hoped that no direct Government contribution would be necessary to persuade farmers to join the system in sufficient numbers to make it workable.

A plan of this nature would of course present difficulties. But if farmers put their best efforts into working out a sound insurance plan, these would not be insuperable.

Only in a major depression should it be necessary to supplement the insurance fund in order to give these producers the protection they unquestionably deserve.

The dilemma of low-income farmers, of course, presents a special problem requiring special treatment.

The Farmers Home Administration, if its activities were expanded, could do a

lot more towards putting many low-income farmers on their feet. Wherever individual farmers want and need to enlarge their acreage, modernize their farms, or convert from a low-cost type of farming to a more costly type—such as livestock farming—the FHA should help them do the job if loans from private sources are not available. At the present time 96 percent of FHA loans are being paid on or before schedule. By carefully selecting enterprising farmers in unfortunate circumstances, thousands of farmers can be helped to get a new lease on life.

Another problem of national as well as individual importance is that of adequate food reserves.

Our present ever-normal granary program builds up reserves of a few storables to take care of normal ups and downs of national yields. But this does not provide a reserve for great national emergencies. We know from our experiences in World War II and in the Korean conflict, how indispensable our food reserves can be.

When we are spending scores of billions on military defense and stockpiling critical metals for an hour of emergency, it is a tragic mistake not to stockpile food reserves for war. We need to store several hundred million bushels more of both corn and wheat, substantial amounts of fats and oils, dried beans and peas, canned milk, dried fruits, and such other items as are storable and necessary to a sound diet. In the event of an atomic world war, these reserves could mean the difference between our survival and the loss of all our liberties. Certainly we should not overlook the compelling need for a national food policy which recognizes the tremendous dangers involved in a world in which freedom and communism are locked in a gigantic struggle for the future of the human race.

In dealing with certain controversial aspects of agricultural policy, it is essential to be guided by the facts, and not be deceived by misconceptions of our national position, even if widely held.

There is a good deal of discussion about the advisability of allowing foreign farm produce to compete, to some extent, with our own. Many fail to realize that, if we adopted a policy of isolation and exclusion, we would be damaging not only the Nation but also our farmers.

Our total farm exports in 1951 were valued at over $4,000,000,000. This represented about one-ninth of the total value of farm produce sold during the year.

We imported only about $2,300,000,000 of farm products which competed with our own. The balance of our imports consisted of noncompetitive items such as bananas, cocoa, coffee, and so forth.

During the first 4 months of 1952, to take a specific example, we exported far more dairy products than we imported.

After excluding the small amount of dairy exports which were subsidized by our Government, our dairy exports were almost three times as great as our imports.

Our overseas sales can drain off surpluses which would otherwise depress the domestic price, or increase the cost of maintaining the support level. And here is the point to remember: Foreign nations have repeatedly threatened to raise barriers against American agricultural exports if we deny them the right to sell to us. We must make sure this does not happen. The loss of our foreign trade would be a major blow to the American farmer.

This, all too briefly, capsules part of the farm picture and points out some of the jobs that lie ahead. It is my earnest hope that the ideas touched on here will stimulate farmers to renewed efforts to strengthen the farm program to meet their needs and the needs of our people.

A prosperous agriculture goes far toward building the character of the Nation. It contributes stability. It nourishes the solid virtues of diligence, frugality, and self-reliance. It replenishes the Nation's human stock with those who have lived close to nature and to God.

The welfare of agriculture lies at the core of a sound economy. None of us can afford to permit the farmer once again to become America's forgotten man.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished and able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] with reference to the farm bill.

I am also fully aware of the position taken by the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as well as the position taken by the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I realize, of course, that in the closing days of this session—and it may well be in the closing hours of the session—the Senate is unable to consider all angles of farm parity legislation. The Senator from Vermont has pointed out most vividly and clearly the position in which we find ourselves and the protection which the farmers of the country should have.

I realize that there is some objection to the Cooley bill. Many persons in my State and some of the great farm organizations have emphasized to me the objections they have to that measure, but I sincerely feel that because of the shortness of time it would be wise for the Senate to take into consideration and pass the amended form of House bill 8122 which, of course, is incorporated in Senate bill 2115.

I fully agree with some of my colleagues who feel that during the next year we shall be in a position thoroughly to investigate and consider all avenues of legislative approach to this most important problem. Farmers are a vital segment of the economy of this Nation. I feel that the action the Senate is taking today with reference to the amended section of this measure is most important and is a practical way to handle the situation.

Mr. MARTIN subsequently said: Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, relating to House bill 8122. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 1, 1952.*

Senator EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122. We are for a price-support policy providing protection of farm prices against drastic and unreasonable price declines as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are opposed to price fixing by Government, including Government price fixing of farm prices by rigid, high-level price-support programs. It is not the responsibility of Federal Government to guarantee profitable prices or returns to any economic group. Rigid high-level price-support programs are part of a trend toward centralizing more and more power and authority in Federal Government. They are a trap because if Federal Government guarantees profitable farm prices, the next logical step is for Government to impose rigid price ceilings with result that farm income is held down in years of short crops. High, fixed price-support programs lead to an accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of CCC, the expansion of Government controls and restrictions on farmers ability to earn good incomes by high production. Mandatory, high-level price supports can mean heavy costs to Treasury. For example, major reason international wheat agreement will cost over $600,000,000 in its 4-year term, is level of price support that has been maintained. High, fixed-level price-support programs prevent normal adjustments in production, unwisely stimulate production of some commodities in excess of needs, and depress production of others below needs. On behalf of 1,500,000 farm families, we recommend your opposition to H. R. 8122 as being harmful to long-run and real interests of farm people.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. CAPEHART subsequently said: Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a few remarks, and then I shall request that a chart which I shall present be placed before the vote taken on the parity bill.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a

chart showing the exact dollars spent for food in the United States from 1929 through 1951, and the exact amount of national income each year from 1929 through 1951, together with the percentage of the national income spent for food by all the people of the United States.

An interesting fact shown by the statistics in the chart is, for example, that in 1929 the percentage of the national income spent for food by all our people was 22½ percent and that the percentage of the national income spent for food by all our people in 1951 was about 21⅓ percent.

Another interesting fact shown by the chart is that the highest percentage of national income spent by our people for food was in 1932, when there was a depression. At that time our people spent 27½ percent of the national income for food. That was at a time when farm prices in the United States were very, very low. They were certainly terribly depressed. Yet the consumer in the United States spent for food in 1932, when the farmer was getting the lowest prices for his products, 27½ percent of the national income, whereas in 1951 the consumers of America spent for food only 21⅓ percent of the national income.

Those figures certainly prove that the consumer does not necessarily spend for food less percentagewise because farm products are low. If prosperity is maintained on the farms, there will be prosperity in the cities. There can be no question at all in my mind about that.

The chart is very enlightening, and it ought to put a stop to much of the uncalled for propaganda and unwarranted attacks which are made upon the American farmer to the effect that he is getting more than his share of income today because of high food prices. The American public are paying less today, based upon national income, than they paid in 1932, in the midst of the so-called depression.

Mr. President, I ask that the chart be printed as a part of my remarks.

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

Percentage of national income spent for food in the United States

Year	Food expenditures (millions)	National income (billions)	Percent of national income for food
1929	$19,674	$87.4	22.5
1930	18,065	75.0	24.0
1931	14,779	58.9	25.0
1932	11,394	41.7	27.3
1933	10,876	39.6	27.4
1934	12,256	48.6	25.2
1935	13,690	56.8	24.1
1936	15,295	64.7	23.6
1937	16,465	73.6	22.3
1938	15,669	67.4	23.2
1939	15,849	72.5	21.8
1940	17,085	81.3	20.9
1941	20,148	103.8	19.4
1942	25,254	137.1	18.4
1943	29,324	169.7	17.2
1944	31,879	183.8	17.4
1945	35,229	182.7	19.2
1946	41,615	180.3	23.1
1947	47,239	198.7	24.0
1948	51,587	223.5	23.0
1949	$50,674	$216.7	23.0
1950	52,838	239.0	22.1
1951	58,880	276.0	21.3

Note that the percentage of national income for food remains quite constant. This proves that the real cost of living cannot be reduced on a national basis through the medium of lower farm prices. The real cost of living can be reduced only through an increase in per man output. This is also true of the over-all standard of living.

1942–45 period of food subsidies under OPA.

PARITY FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that 90 percent of parity for agricultural products is included in the National Defense Act for the period for which the act was recently extended, most of the debate on the agricultural bill, H. R. 8122, appears to be more or less academic.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point telegrams received from the Nevada State Farm Bureau, the National Farm Bureau, and others, in the order of their date.

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

WELLS, NEV., *June 23, 1952.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I would urge your opposition to amendment to Agricultural Act of 1949 for rigid high-price supports. Ranchers believe all forms of support confusing and unnecessary at this time. Best regards.

RUSSEL WEEKS.

RENO, NEV., *June 23, 1952.*

Senator MALONE,
Senate Office Building:

Resolutions of 1,406 Farm Bureau families in Nevada oppose amendment to Agriculture Act of 1949 calling for high-priced support. We are convinced this not in the long range interest of farmers. Looking to you to call a halt to these unsound proposals.

BILL HOWARD,
Nevada State Farm Bureau.

ELKO, NEV., *June 24, 1952.*

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly urge you to oppose amendment to Agricultural Act of 1949 for rigid high-price support. This looks like a trap for the ranchers and farmers.

NORMAN D. GLASER.
HALLECK, NEV.

RENO, NEV., *June 24, 1952.*

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Members of the Washoe County Farm Bureau urge your effort to defeat proposal to amend Agricultural Act of 1949 for high-price support. This is not the way to the hearts of Nevada farmers and ranchers.

ANGELO ROSSI,
President.
PIT MELINDY,
CAESAR GASPERI,
ANDY HANSON,
Board of Directors.

FALLON, NEV., *June 25, 1952.*

Hon. GEO. W. MALONE,
United States Senator from Nevada,
Washington, D. C.:

Nevada State Farm Bureau, representing over 60 percent of Nevada farmers and ranchers, is on record as opposed to urgent price support system. Price supports encourage overproduction at the expense of overloaded taxpayers to the chagrin of participating taxpaying farmers. Production of agricultural commodities should be discouraged as production goes over 100 percent of normal. Flexible system needed. Have you forgotten Government meddling in the potato deal? We oppose amendments to Agricultural Act of 1949 for rigid price supports. Government-manipulated guaranteed profits not analogous to free enterprise. We urge your support.

GEORGE FREY,
Legislative Director and Second Vice President, Nevada State Farm Bureau.

MINDEN, NEV., *June 25, 1952.*

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We rigidly oppose the amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949 for high price supports. We feel that it has caused shortages and overproduction.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. WHITE,
President, Douglas County Farm Bureau.

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 1, 1952.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building:

American Farm Bureau Federation Board of Directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122. We are for a price support policy providing protection of farm prices against drastic and unreasonable price declines as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are opposed to price fixing by Government, including Government price fixing of farm prices by rigid high-level price support programs. It is not the responsibility of Federal Government to guarantee profitable prices or returns to any economic group. Rigid high level price support programs are part of a trend toward centralizing more and more power and authority in Federal Government. They are a trap because if Federal Government guarantees profitable farm prices, the next logical step is for Government to impose rigid price ceilings with result that farm income is held down in years of short crops. High, fixed prices support programs lead to an accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of CCC, the expansion of Government controls and restrictions on farmers' ability to earn good incomes by high production. Mandatory, high-level price supports can mean heavy costs to Treasury. For example, major reason international wheat agreement will cost over $600,000,000 in its 4-year term is level of price support that has been maintained. High, fixed level price support programs prevent normal adjustments in production, unwisely stimulate production of some commodities in excess of needs, and depress production of others below needs. On behalf of 1,500,000 farm families, we recommend your opposition to H. R. 8122 as being harmful to long run and real interests of farm people.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

RENO, NEV., *July 2, 1952.*

Senator MALONE,

Senate Office Building:

Again we urge your effort to vote down H. R. 8122 with which short-sighted Congressmen are mistakenly trying to buy votes. This bill is for the wartime support levels. This is not wartime. Such support levels will create surpluses for which Congress will take the blame. We observe this as another wedge for the Brannan plan. Will some of these Congressmen never see the light?

BILL HOWARD,
Nevada State Farm Bureau.

Mr. MALONE. Ninety percent of parity is included in the National Defense Act. Therefore, this bill, H. R. 8122, simply affirms something that has already become law.

The junior Senator from Nevada suggests that the entire system be reviewed by Congress in 1953, the Eighty-third Congress, and a feasible, workable method be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2115 is indefinitely postponed.

CHIEF JOSEPH DAM IRRIGATION WORKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, yesterday during the call of the calendar the Senate passed Calendar No. 1975, Senate bill 2320. I wish my colleague would listen to what I am saying, because it involves a matter in which we are both interested.

This bill deals with the irrigation works in connection with the Chief Joseph Dam. Later in the proceedings the Chair noted that there was on the desk a measure passed by the House, House bill 6163, dealing with the same subject. From a casual reading of the two bills it appeared they were identical, hence the Chair, in an effort to expedite matters, obtained unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate bill was originally passed be reconsidered, and the House bill substituted for the Senate bill, and that Senate bill 2320 be indefinitely postponed.

Unfortunately, the two bills are not identical. Section 1 of the House bill contains ambiguities which were clarified by the Senate committee. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] suggested the changes. The text of the Senate bill therefore should be enacted.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which House bill 6163 was passed be reconsidered, and I further ask unanimous consent that the House bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the language of Senate bill 2320. That would mean that the Senate would send to the House the bill the Senate first passed yesterday, and I understand the House is in complete agreement with the changes. The Chair was endeavoring to be helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which House bill 6163 was passed yesterday? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

The Senator from Washington now moves that all after the enacting clause of House bill 6163 be stricken out, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 2320. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to proceed in relation to the Chief Joseph Dam project on the Columbia River, Wash., initially authorized by section 1 of the act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 637), in accordance with the provisions of this act to make a study and report to Congress on means of providing financial and other assistance in the reclamation of arid lands in the general vicinity of the project. In making such study and report the Secretary shall be guided by the provisions of applicable laws.

SEC. 2. The report of the Secretary of the Interior shall state among other things, the construction cost of the proposed works, including said authorized project and proposed reclamation units; the portions of said cost allocable to various functions; the operation and maintenance costs of all functions (of the project); the amount of the construction cost allocable to irrigation which the irrigators may reasonably be expected to repay, together with the proposed charges for water service and proposed repayment period upon the irrigation allocation; the amount of the cost allocable to irrigation in excess of that which the irrigators can repay, which the Secretary proposes shall be recovered from power revenues; the proposed charges for power, and proposed repayment period on the amount allocable to power; the proposed interest rate on the power investment, and the disposition which the Secretary proposes to make of the interest component and other components of the power revenues; the unrecovered cost to the Federal Treasury of the works proposed, in connection with the means of financing recommended by the Secretary; the ratio of net costs to net benefits; the ratio of net benefits per acre to irrigators' repayment per acre; and a complete financial analysis of repayment program together with all other data reasonably required to enable the Congress to pass upon the economic feasibility of the proposed works.

SEC. 3. Any such reclamation works proposed to be constructed under the study authorized by this act may be undertaken only after the Secretary of the Interior has submitted a report and findings thereon under section 2 of this act and section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), and only if the works so reported on are thereafter specifically authorized by act of Congress.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall modify in any way the requirements and provisions of existing laws with respect to the availability of funds for construction and operation and maintenance of the Chief Joseph Dam and power plant.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill (H. R. 6163) was read the third time and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE WILLIAM P. COLE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the appointment of Judge William P. Cole to be associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals gives untold gratification to me, as I have consistently urged his elevation, based upon his proven capabilities and sound judgment.

Judge Cole's record has reflected distinct credit upon our State of Maryland, and his promotion gives assurance that the important duties entrusted to him will be discharged conscientiously and efficiently.

As I personally stated to the President of the United States, in a call at the White House in urging this appointment, Judge Cole's lengthy experience in the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government, combined with his professional skill and mental qualities, constitute him as an ideal appointee to this important tribunal.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of pleasure and pride that I learned that my friend and fellow Marylander, Hon. for which he has now been nominated, by the President of the United States to be associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. Judge Cole is an outstanding lawyer and jurist. He is at present a member of the court of customs sitting in the city of New York. His elevation to the appellate court is but a well-merited recognition of his integrity, learning, and judicial qualifications.

When I first learned that Judge Cole was being considered by the President of the United States for the position for which he has now been nominated, though I am of the opposite political faith I immediately transmitted to the President my endorsement and wholehearted support of this truly great son of my native State. Maryland is and can well be proud of this recognition of one of its learned sons. I hope the nomination of Judge Cole will be speedily confirmed.

THE COST OF AID TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, aid to foreign countries by the United States from July 1, 1945, to date amounts to the staggering total of $61,461,000,000. This includes $6,400,000,000 recently authorized by the Congress. The figures are official. They come from the Legislative Service of the Library of Congress.

This sum of $64,461,000,000 is $408 for every man, woman, and child in the United States on the basis of the last official census. It is $1,428 for the average American family.

Let us look at the cost of foreign aid to the average man. I have here a table showing, with reference to each county and many towns and cities in Missouri, the per capita cost of foreign aid since July 1, 1945, to the residents of these

counties, towns, and cities. I ask unanimous consent to have this table incorporated as a part of my remarks at this point.

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

Foreign-aid costs to the people of Missouri by individual, city, and county for the period July 1, 1945–June 30, 1952

County and city	Population	Cost of foreign aid to the counties and cities of Missouri	Annual tax receipts [1]
Adair	19,689	$8,033,112	$466,820
Kirksville	11,110	4,532,880	
Novinger	734	299,472	
Andrew	11,727	4,784,616	434,934
Savannah	2,332	951,456	
Atchison	11,127	4,539,816	560,438
Fairfax	806	328,848	
Rockport	1,511	616,488	
Tarkio	2,221	906,168	
Watson	199	81,192	
Audrain	23,829	9,722,232	703,176
Laddonia	599	244,392	
Martinsburg	296	120,768	
Mexico	11,623	4,742,184	
Vandalia	2,624	1,070,592	
Barry	21,755	8,876,040	374,289
Cassville	1,441	587,928	
Monett	4,031	1,644,648	
Wheaton	394	160,752	
Barton	12,678	5,172,624	309,588
Golden City	839	342,312	
Lamar	3,233	1,319,064	
Liberal	739	301,512	
Bates	17,534	7,153,872	477,479
Adrian	804	328,032	
Amsterdam	160	65,280	
Butler	3,333	1,359,864	
Hume	474	193,392	
Rich Hill	1,820	742,560	
Rockville	372	151,776	
Benton	9,080	3,704,640	214,540
Warsaw	936	381,888	
Bollinger	11,019	4,495,752	142,392
Marble Hill	454	185,232	
Boone	48,432	19,760,256	$20,461
Centralia	2,460	1,003,680	
Columbia	31,969	13,043,352	
Hartsburg	171	69,768	
Sturgeon	544	221,952	
Buchanan	96,826	39,505,008	2,209,928
Rushville	319	130,152	
St. Joseph	78,588	32,063,904	
Butler	37,707	15,384,456	669,343
Poplar Bluff	15,064	6,146,112	
Caldwell	9,929	4,051,032	358,113
Breckenridge	617	251,736	
Braymer	955	389,640	(1)
Hamilton	1,728	705,024	
Kidder	726	296,208	
Kingston	338	137,904	
Polo	549	223,992	
Callaway	23,316	9,512,928	433,512
Auxvasse	993	405,144	
Fulton	10,052	4,101,216	
Mokane	477	194,616	
*New Bloomfield	500	204,000	
Camden	7,861	3,207,288	199,215
Camdenton	1,142	465,936	
Cape Girardeau	38,397	15,665,976	602,125
Cape Girardeau	21,578	8,803,824	
Jackson	3,707	1,512,456	
Carroll	15,589	6,360,312	663,836
Bosworth	503	205,224	
Carrollton	705	287,640	
Hale	452	184,416	
Norborne	1,114	454,512	
De Witt	254	103,632	
Carter	4,777	1,949,016	78,676
Van Buren	708	288,864	
Cass	19,325	7,884,600	664,504
Belton	1,233	503,064	
Creighton	269	109,752	
Drexel	456	186,048	
Garden City	149	60,792	
Harrisonville	2,530	1,032,240	
Pleasant Hill	2,200	897,600	
Cedar	10,663	4,350,504	204,753
El Dorado Springs	2,618	1,068,144	
Stockton	811	330,888	
Chariton	14,944	6,097,152	624,540
Brunswick	1,653	674,424	
Keytesville	733	299,064	
Mendon	349	142,392	
Salisbury	1,676	683,808	

[1] State of Missouri, Annual Report of the Director of the Department of Revenue for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, Jefferson City, Mo., Mid-State Printing Co., 1950. Tax figures are for 1949 calendar year, latest figures available.

Foreign-aid costs to the people of Missouri by individual, city, and county for the period July 1, 1945–June 30, 1952—Continued

County and city	Population	Cost of foreign aid to the counties and cities of Missouri	Annual tax receipts
Christian	12,412	$5,064,096	$255,029
Billings	597	243,576	
Ozark	1,087	443,496	
Clark	9,003	3,673,224	295,943
Kahoka	1,847	753,576	
Clay	45,221	18,450,168	1,249,354
Excelsior Springs	5,805	2,368,440	
Kearney	570	232,560	
Liberty	4,709	1,921,272	
North Kansas City	3,886	1,585,488	
Smithville	947	386,376	
Clinton	11,726	4,784,208	490,924
Cameron	3,446	1,405,968	
Lathrop	888	362,304	
Plattsburg	1,655	675,240	
Cole	35,464	14,469,312	700,655
Jefferson City	25,099	10,240,392	
Cooper	16,608	6,776,064	459,561
Boonville	6,686	2,727,888	
Pilot Grove	635	259,080	
Crawford	11,615	4,738,920	$198,765
Bourbon	543	221,544	
Cuba	1,301	530,808	
Steelville	1,157	472,056	
Dade	9,324	3,804,192	215,064
Everton	306	124,848	
Greenfield	1,213	494,904	
Lockwood	791	322,728	
Dallas	10,392	4,239,936	157,919
Buffalo	904	368,832	
Daviess	11,180	4,561,440	335,897
Altamont	178	72,624	
Gallatin	1,634	666,672	
Jamesport	720	293,760	
Pattonsburg	883	360,264	
De Kalb	8,047	3,283,176	314,195
Maysville	973	396,984	
Osborn	237	96,696	
Stewartsville	414	168,912	
Union Star	373	152,184	
Dent	10,936	4,461,888	148,433
Salem	3,611	1,473,288	
Douglas	12,638	5,156,304	121,617
Ava	1,611	657,288	
Dunklin	45,329	18,494,232	945,355
Campbell	1,931	787,848	
Kennett	8,685	3,543,480	
Malden	3,396	1,385,568	
Franklin	36,046	14,706,768	769,713
Gerald	429	175,032	
New Haven	1,009	411,672	
Pacific	1,964	801,312	
St. Clair	1,779	725,832	
Sullivan	2,638	1,076,304	
Union	2,917	1,190,136	
Washington	6,850	2,794,800	
Gasconade	12,342	5,035,536	240,162
Bland	596	243,168	
Hermann	2,523	1,029,384	
Owensville	1,945	793,968	
Gentry	11,036	4,502,688	325,510
Albany	1,850	754,800	
King City	1,031	420,648	
Stanberry	1,651	673,608	
Greene	104,823	42,767,784	2,273,812
Ash Grove	970	395,760	
Republic	965	393,720	
Springfield	36,016	14,694,528	
Grundy	13,220	5,393,760	352,778
Trenton	6,157	2,512,056	
Harrison	14,107	5,755,656	477,336
Bethany	2,714	1,107,312	
Cainsville	618	252,144	
Gilman City	450	183,600	
Henry	20,043	8,177,544	497,475
Clinton	6,052	2,469,216	
Urich	400	163,200	
Windsor	2,429	991,032	
Hickory	5,387	2,197,896	110,313
Hermitage	204	83,232	
Holt	9,833	4,011,864	428,578
Forest City	484	197,472	
Maitland	456	186,048	
Mound City	1,412	576,096	
Oregon	870	354,960	
Howard	11,857	4,837,656	329,973
Armstrong	424	172,992	
Fayette	3,144	1,282,752	
Glasgow	1,440	587,520	
New Franklin	1,060	432,480	
Howell	22,725	9,271,800	332,629
Mountain View	892	363,936	
West Plains	4,918	2,006,544	
Willow Springs	1,914	780,912	
Iron	9,458	3,858,864	145,342
Ironton	1,148	468,384	
Jackson	541,035	220,742,280	15,798,160
Blue Springs	1,068	435,744	
Buckner	639	260,712	
*Fairmount	4,200	1,713,600	
Grandview	1,556	634,848	

Foreign-aid costs to the people of Missouri by individual, city, and county for the period July 1, 1945–June 30, 1952—Continued

County and city	Population	Cost of foreign aid to the counties and cities of Missouri	Annual tax receipts
Jackson—Con.			
Independence	36,963	$15,080,904	
Lee's Summit	2,554	1,042,032	
Oak Grove	761	310,488	
*Raytown	880	359,040	
Sugar Creek	1,858	758,064	
Kansas City	442,825	180,672,600	
Jasper	79,106	32,275,248	$1,818,913
Carl Junction	1,006	410,448	
Carthage	11,034	4,501,872	
Jasper	776	316,608	
Joplin	35,498	14,483,184	
Sarcoxie	1,042	425,136	
Webb City	6,919	2,822,952	
Jefferson	38,007	15,506,856	1,025,822
Crystal City	3,499	1,427,592	
De Soto	5,357	2,185,656	
Festus	5,199	2,121,192	
Herculaneum	1,603	654,024	
Hillsboro	390	159,120	
Johnson	20,716	8,452,128	636,603
Holden	1,765	720,120	
Knob Noster	585	238,680	
Warrensburg	6,857	2,797,656	
Knox	7,617	3,107,736	262,182
Edina	1,607	655,656	
Hurdland	268	109,344	
Knox City	362	147,696	
Laclede	19,010	7,756,080	297,734
Conway	514	209,712	
Lebanon	6,808	2,777,664	
Lafayette	25,272	10,310,976	807,647
Concordia	1,218	496,944	
Corder	541	209,712	
Higginsville	3,428	1,398,624	
Lexington	5,074	2,070,192	
Odessa	1,969	803,352	
Waverly	809	330,072	
Lawrence	23,420	9,555,360	523,295
Aurora	4,153	1,694,424	
Marionville	1,167	476,136	
Miller	615	250,920	
Mount Vernon	2,057	839,256	
Pierce City	1,156	471,648	
Lewis	10,733	4,379,064	294,294
Canton	2,490	1,015,920	
La Belle	840	342,720	
La Grange	1,106	451,248	
Lewistown	415	169,320	
Lincoln	13,478	5,499,024	355,360
Elsberry	1,565	638,520	
Troy	1,738	709,104	
Linn	18,865	7,696,920	559,473
Brookfield	5,810	2,370,480	
Browning	373	152,184	
Bucklin	783	319,464	
Linneus	513	209,304	
Marceline	3,172	1,294,176	
Meadville	446	181,968	
Livingston	16,532	6,745,056	337,709
Chillicothe	8,694	3,547,152	
McDonald	14,144	5,770,752	222,659
Anderson	1,073	437,784	
Noel	685	279,480	
Pineville	464	189,312	
South West City	595	242,760	
Macon	18,332	7,479,456	525,237
Atlanta	438	178,704	
La Plata	1,331	543,048	
Macon	4,152	1,694,016	
New Cambria	295	120,360	
Madison	10,380	4,235,040	182,391
Fredericktown	3,696	1,507,968	
Maries	7,423	3,028,584	130,226
Belle	906	369,648	
Vienna	471	192,168	
Marion	29,765	12,144,120	661,634
Hannibal	20,386	8,317,488	
Palmyra	2,295	936,360	
Mercer	7,235	2,951,880	230,754
Princeton	1,506	614,448	
Miller	13,734	5,603,472	332,323
Eldon	2,766	1,128,528	
Iberia	595	242,760	
Tuscumbia	221	90,168	
Mississippi	22,551	9,200,808	305,967
Charleston	5,501	2,244,408	
East Prairie	3,033	1,237,464	
Moniteau	10,840	4,422,720	253,517
California	2,627	1,071,816	
Tipton	1,234	503,472	
Monroe	11,314	4,616,112	291,881
Madison	571	232,968	
Monroe City	1,896	773,568	
Paris	1,407	574,056	
Montgomery	11,555	4,714,440	297,286
Middletown	240	97,920	
Montgomery City	1,679	685,032	
New Florence	522	212,976	
Rhineland	198	80,784	
Wellsville	1,519	619,752	

Foreign-aid costs to the people of Missouri by individual, city, and county for the period July 1, 1945–June 30, 1952—Continued

County and city	Population	Cost of foreign aid to the counties and cities of Missouri	Annual tax receipts
Morgan	10,207	$4,164,456	$256,912
Stover	693	282,744	
Versailles	1,929	787,032	
New Madrid	39,444	16,093,152	720,054
Gideon	1,754	715,632	
Lilbourn	1,361	555,288	
New Madrid	2,726	1,112,208	
Parma	1,163	474,504	
Portageville	2,662	1,086,096	
Risco	495	201,960	
Newton	28,240	11,521,920	535,014
Diamond	405	165,240	
Granby	1,670	681,360	
Neosho	5,790	2,362,320	
Seneca	1,195	487,560	
Nodaway	24,033	9,805,464	1,645,707
Clearmont	283	115,464	
Elmo	258	105,264	
Hopkins	825	336,600	
Maryville	6,834	2,788,272	
Ravenwood	319	130,152	
Skidmore	485	197,880	
Oregon	11,978	4,887,024	154,080
Alton	571	232,968	
Koshkonong	333	153,864	
Thayer	1,639	668,712	
Osage	11,301	4,610,808	211,304
Chamois	621	253,368	
Linn	758	309,264	
Meta	353	144,024	
Ozark	8,856	3,613,248	97,277
*Bakersfield	177	72,216	
Gainsville	309	126,072	
Pemiscot	45,624	18,614,592	893,357
Caruthersville	8,614	3,514,512	
Hayti	3,302	1,347,216	
Steele	2,360	962,880	
Perry	14,890	6,075,120	255,161
Perryville	4,591	1,873,128	
Pettis	31,577	12,883,416	845,180
Green Ridge	335	136,680	
La Monte	502	204,816	
Sedalia	20,354	8,304,432	
Smithton	339	138,312	
Phelps	21,504	8,773,632	379,523
Newburg	949	387,192	
Rolla	9,354	3,816,432	
St. James	1,811	738,888	
Pike	16,844	6,872,352	365,046
Bowling Green	2,396	977,568	
Clarksville	702	286,416	
Louisiana	4,389	1,790,712	
Platte	14,973	6,108,984	553,584
Dearborn	391	159,528	
Parkville	1,186	483,888	
Platte City	742	302,736	
Weston	1,067	435,336	
Polk	16,062	6,553,296	343,152
Bolivar	3,482	1,420,656	
Humansville	803	327,624	
Pulaski	10,392	4,239,936	145,532
Crocker	712	290,496	
Dixon	988	403,104	
Richland	1,133	462,264	
Waynesville	1,010	412,080	
Putnam	9,166	3,739,728	223,467
Unionville	2,050	836,400	
Ralls	8,686	3,543,888	291,526
Center	415	169,320	
Perry	813	331,704	
Randolph	22,918	9,350,544	613,726
Clifton Hill	262	106,896	
Higbee	674	274,992	
Huntsville	1,520	620,160	
Moberly	13,115	5,350,920	
Ray	15,932	6,500,256	557,698
Hardin	747	304,776	
Lawson	486	198,288	
Orrick	675	275,400	
Richmond	4,299	1,753,992	
Reynolds	6,918	2,822,544	174,451
*Centerville	250	102,000	
Ellington	777	317,016	
Ripley	11,414	4,656,912	151,167
Doniphan	1,611	657,288	
St. Charles	29,834	12,172,272	610,269
Wentzville	1,227	500,616	
St. Charles	14,314	5,840,112	
St. Clair	10,482	4,276,656	213,052
Appleton City	1,150	469,200	
Osceola	1,082	441,456	
St. Francois	35,276	14,392,608	1,130,738
Bismarck	1,244	507,552	
Bonne Terre	3,533	1,441,464	
Farmington	4,490	1,831,920	
Flat River	5,308	2,165,664	
Ste. Genevieve	11,237	4,548,696	196,734
Ste. Genevieve	3,992	1,628,736	
St. Louis	406,349	165,790,392	14,527,298
*Ballwin	450	183,600	
Clayton	16,035	6,542,280	
Ferguson	11,573	4,721,784	
Kirkwood	18,640	7,650,120	
St. Louis—Con.			
Maplewood	13,416	$5,473,728	
Lemay	47,773	19,475,064	
Overland	11,566	4,718,928	
Normandy	2,306	940,848	
Pinelawn	6,425	2,621,400	
University City	39,892	16,275,936	
Webster Groves	23,390	9,543,120	
Wellston	9,396	3,833,568	
St. Louis City	856,796	349,572,768	$36,535,403
Saline	26,694	10,891,152	792,625
Marshall	8,850	3,610,800	
Slater	2,836	1,157,088	
Sweet Springs	1,439	587,112	
Schuyler	5,760	2,350,080	143,583
Downing	453	184,824	
Greentop	281	114,648	
Lancaster	856	349,248	
Queen City	554	226,032	
Scotland	7,332	2,991,456	290,568
Gorin	2,035	830,280	
Memphis	303	123,624	
Scott	32,842	13,399,536	500,619
Benton	546	222,768	
Chaffee	3,134	1,278,672	
Illmo	1,247	508,776	
Sikeston	11,640	4,749,120	
Shannon	8,377	3,417,816	132,245
Birch Tree	409	166,872	
Eminence	527	215,016	
Winona	473	192,984	
Shelby	9,730	3,969,840	283,610
Clarence	1,123	458,184	
Hunnewell	293	119,544	
Shelbina	2,113	862,104	
Shelbyville	635	259,080	
Stoddard	33,463	13,652,904	539,788
Bloomfield	1,382	563,856	
Bernie	1,308	533,664	
Dexter	4,624	1,886,592	
Puxico	749	305,592	
Stone	9,748	3,977,184	169,210
Crane	939	383,112	
Galena	439	179,112	
Sullivan	11,299	4,609,992	293,511
Green City	673	274,584	
Milan	1,972	804,576	
Taney	9,863	4,024,104	159,214
Branson	1,314	536,112	
Forsyth	354	144,432	
Texas	18,992	7,748,736	364,226
Cabool	1,245	507,960	
Houston	1,277	521,016	
Licking	733	299,064	
Vernon	22,685	9,255,480	554,602
Bronaugh	214	87,312	
Nevada	8,009	3,267,672	
Sheldon	427	174,216	
Warren	7,666	3,127,728	185,904
Marthasville	347	141,576	
Warrenton	1,584	646,272	
Washington	14,689	5,993,112	226,893
Potosi	2,359	962,472	
Wayne	10,514	4,289,712	142,320
Greenville	270	110,160	
Piedmont	1,548	631,584	
Webster	15,072	6,149,376	261,197
Marshfield	1,925	785,400	
Seymour	1,015	414,120	
Worth	5,120	2,008,960	195,203
Grant City	1,184	483,072	
Wright	15,834	6,460,272	214,823
Hartville	526	214,608	
Mansfield	963	392,904	
Mountain Grove	3,106	1,267,248	
Norwood	345	140,760	
State total	3,954,653	1,613,498,424	116,881,857

*Unincorporated towns with estimated population figures for 1952, Rand McNally Commercial Atlas and Marketing Guide, 83d ed., 1952. (All cities and towns in Missouri are not included in this tabulation.)

NOTE.—Where population was given in part for some cities, the parts were totaled to get the full population of the city. In cases where the city was not specified the population of a whole township was taken.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1950 United States Census of Population, Missouri. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 16, 1948. A Synopsis of Foreign Aid, 1940-52. H. Ficker, Legislative Reference Service, May 1, 1952.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it will be observed from this table that the residents of my native county of Macon, a typical northeast Missouri county, have, since July 1, 1945, paid on a per capita basis, a total of $7,479,456 for foreign aid. This is more than 10 times the annual tax bill of the people of Macon County, for county, including school, purposes. The sum could be used to pretty good advantage in Macon County, Mo.

Foreign aid has cost the people of St. Louis $349,572,768. We may well contemplate the slums this would clear, the hospitals, homes, schools, and streets this would build, the playgrounds, parks, airports, and other improvements it would provide.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, this is only the first cost of foreign aid. An additional cost is found on the price tag of every essential product. The high cost of giving is a major cause of the high cost of living in this country today.

Mr. President, I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but the record will show that I have been more successful in prophecy than in persuasion.

In 1948, when the Marshall plan first came before the Senate, I said:

> Every dollar sent to Europe weakens by that much our own national economy. We are distributing our wealth and resources around the world without the benefit that comes from ordinary foreign trade. Every such expenditure not only retards retirement of our national debt and the burden of taxation, but causes shortages of scarce goods in our own country. This process raises prices, promotes inflation, and intensifies our own difficulties. The ultimate result will be inevitably to reduce our own national economy to the level of the countries we want to help and to make us as vulnerable as they are to communism. Instead of setting an example to lead Europe out of her economic and political chaos we may be forced to adopt the same economic planning and controls that we find plaguing Europe today, with such tragic results.

The American housewife is striving to stretch her husband's pay checks to cover the present inflated cost of groceries and clothing. She feels the effect every day of the hardships brought about in large part by over-generous handouts.

Too little attention has been devoted to needs of our own people—old people for example, trying to eke out a living on a meager pension. I am interested in the welfare of the natives of Africa, Asia, and the South Sea islands, but I am a lot more interested in the welfare of needy folks right here at home. We have plenty of them requiring our attention now.

State Department planners have learned from long experience in doling out the money of the American people to governments abroad that at frequent intervals it is necessary and desirable to change the label on the hand-out program.

Since the end of World War II, we have had a continuous flow of dollars abroad. Each year our Uncle Sam has doled out dollars in increasingly large amounts. We have had a whole series of programs—UNRRA, Bretton Woods, the British loan, the Marshall plan, point 4, and now the so-called Mutual Security program.

They all have sounded fine; they have taken a lot of money; but none of them has accomplished the job that we were told it would do.

Great Britain, who has profited more than any other country from our gifts, is again in dire need of further assistance.

Every time an effort is made in Congress to reduce the hand-out program, European countries raise their familiar cry: "If you cut your aid we will go communistic." It is a familiar cry of "Wolf! Wolf!"

Hundreds of millions of dollars of foreign-aid funds have been used to reduce the debts of European governments.

Yet in terms of national debt, the average debt upon every man, woman, and child in the United States is six times as heavy as the per capita debt upon the individual European.

Our lavish gifts abroad have led one on-the-spot observer to state that "the American taxpayer in the guise of Santa Claus strides through Europe dispensing presents in a fashion never achieved by the old gentleman from the North Pole."

From the English Channel to the Danube there are new buildings with inset placques stating that they were built with ECA funds. There are privately owned hotels in Nuremburg, old headquarters of the Nazi movement. Gigantic plants have been built to create electricity. Massive hydroelectric dams, docks, and factories have been raised with American tax dollars.

Paris is swarming with United States Government employees, some press agents turning out endless copy telling of more money to be spent.

The Greeks demand more. The Iranians have high hopes. Politicians from Asia, Europe, and Africa swarm over Washington, D. C., with proposals to help rich Uncle Sam divest himself of his uncomfortable wealth so that he may retire at his ease in some convenient poorhouse.

There is a definite relationship between the vast expenditures for foreign aid during the last 6 years and increasingly heavy domestic spending.

The scooping of the assets of the United States abroad has been accompanied by a visible letting down of efforts on the part of both Congress and the executive branch of the Government to economize at home.

As I said in 1948 during Senate debate on the Marshall plan:

> We cannot have at one and the same time economy and frugality at home and profligacy and extravagance abroad. If we open the sluice gates of public spending abroad, who among us will undertake to keep them closed at home?

Every Member of Congress must have received letters from people at home saying in effect: If we can afford to spend billions abroad for flood-control projects and a million other purposes, why cannot we have funds for projects of the same kind right here at home? I have had my share of such letters from my fellow Missourians.

Leading economists have warned that our own economy has about reached the breaking point—that our commitments at home and abroad far exceed our capacity to deliver. This plagues us now and will plague us in the future more than we like to think.

Production in the United States is currently high. There are a lot of dollars in circulation, but our economy is sick. The disappointing thing about the present kind of prosperity is that it is based upon extravagant Government spending, ill-considered hand-outs to foreign nations, and war, and threats of war.

This type of prosperity is as deceiving as the rosy cheeks on a patient with a fatal fever.

Our national debt has long since exceeded wise limits.

The value of the dollar is now 53 cents. This fact alone has profoundly altered our economy for the worse. No bureaucratic argument for a cheap dollar will relieve the difficulties of the hard-pressed housewife, the young married couple longing to buy a home, parents striving to educate their children, or the teacher compelled to live on a fixed income.

Somehow, we must reverse the present trend. Instead of more spending there must be less spending. Instead of bigger Government deficits, we must reduce the national debt. And instead of doling out bigger and bigger handouts to foreign nations, we must encourage those countries to make their way on their own. The hour is late—it is later than many of us realize.

In March 1948, when the Marshall plan first came before the Senate, I urged the Congress to adopt a three-point program. Here is the program I presented at that time:

First. Let us stop meddling in the internal governmental affairs of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Second. Let us drive the Communists and fellow travelers from all employment under the Government of the United States.

Third. While we still have strong resources, let us spend as much as needed to build a national defense so strong that neither Russia nor any other aggressor nation will dare attack us.

I do not hesitate to say that if these proposals had been put into effect when they were made in 1948, the United States would be in far better position than now to meet the threat of communism.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I do not know that the Senate of the United States has ever met on the Fourth of July to transact a full day's business. So far as I know, the Senate last met on the 4th of July 17 years ago to perform some perfunctory business before recessing.

Without further comment, but, I think, to the satisfaction, certainly, of the junior Senator from Washington, and of a great many other Americans as well, I want to consume a few minutes of the precious time of the Senate in reading that declaration of faith known as the Declaration of Independence, which was made available to the citizens of this Nation on July 4, 1776.

Mr. President, in the opinion of all of us, the words in the Declaration of Independence are completely timeless. They have been worth while since 1776, and will continue to be so in perpetuity.

The Senator from Washington is privileged to speak these words about the greatest Republic the world has ever known. Our collective hope and effort is to maintain its strength and fidelity.

I shall now read the Declaration of Independence.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE—IN CONGRESS JULY 4, 1776

THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION OF THE THIRTEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places, unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large for their exercise; the state remaining in the meantime exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

He has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies without the consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation.

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us.

For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States.

For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world.

For imposing taxes on us without our consent.

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury.

For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses.

For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies.

For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our governments.

For suspending our own legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated government here, by declaring us out of his protection and waging war against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow citizens taken captive on the high seas to bear arms against their country, to become the executioners of their friends and brethren, or to fall themselves by their hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions.

In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have we been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind. Enemies in war, in peace friends.

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these united Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; and they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

(The foregoing declaration was, by order of Congress, engrossed, and signed by the following members:)

JOHN HANCOCK.

New Hampshire: Josiah Bartlett, Wm. Whipple, Matthew Thornton.

Massachusetts Bay: Saml. Adams, John Adams, Robt. Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry.

Rhode Island, etc.: Step. Hopkins, William Ellery.

Connecticut: Roger Sherman, Sam'el Huntington, Wm. Williams, Oliver Wolcott.

New York: Wm. Floyd, Phil. Livingston, Frans. Lewis, Lewis Morris.

New Jersey: Richd. Stockton, Jno. Witherspoon, Fras. Hopkinson, John Hart, Abra Clark.

Pennsylvania: Robt. Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benja. Franklin, John Morton, Geo. Clymer, Jas. Smith, Geo. Taylor, James Wilson, Geo. Ross.

Delaware: Caesar Rodney, Geo. Read, Tho M'Kean.

Maryland: Samuel Chase, Wm. Paca, Thos. Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton.

Virginia: George Wythe, Richard Henry Lee, Th Jefferson, Benja. Harrison, Thos. Nelson, jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, Carter Braxton.

North Carolina: Wm. Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn.

South Carolina: Edward Rutledge, Thos. Heyward, junr., Thomas Lynch, junr., Arthur Middleton.

Georgia: Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, Geo. Walton.

Resolved, That copies of the Declaration be sent to the several assemblies, conventions, and committees or councils of safety, and to the several commanding officers of the continental troops; that it be proclaimed in each of the United States, and at the head of the Army.—(Jour. Cong., vol. 1, p. 396.)

AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. MUNDT obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me for about 2 minutes, so that I may ask the Senate to act on a bill which was discussed here yesterday?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, I yield for that purpose, provided it is understood that I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may yield for that purpose, without losing any right he has to the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly, Mr. President.

I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 8271, calendar 1765, on page 12 of the calendar, a bill to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask what the calendar number is.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is calendar No. 1765.

Mr. McCARRAN. Has the bill been amended?

Mr. McKELLAR. Several amendments to it were agreed to yesterday.

Mr. President, my information is that the Senator who objected yesterday no longer objects. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered and passed, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Finance Committee with two amendments. One offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the other by myself. Objection was made to them at that time, but those objections have been withdrawn.

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

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does the Senator recall who objected to consideration of the bill on the call of the calendar yesterday?

Mr. McKELLAR. The objection was made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May I inquire whether the bill was reported unanimously by the Finance Committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. The chairman, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], is present, and I shall refer the question to him.

Mr. GEORGE. It was unanimously reported, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has indicated he will not insist upon his objection today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments were agreed to yesterday.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it may be necessary to amend the title to this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the title be amended to conform to the text that has been approved.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 457 and section 459 of the Internal Revenue Code."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent was given to the Senator from South Dakota to yield for the purpose of having this bill considered, without his losing the right to the floor. Does the Senator from South Dakota now yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MUNDT. For what purpose?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation. We are trying to expedite the consideration of several important treaties now on the calendar. I have been requested by the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from Wisconsin to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, in order that, following the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota, the Senate may proceed expeditiously to the consideration of the treaties.

Mr. MUNDT. My remarks will be brief.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

A NEW ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at this time in this country a number of exchange-of-persons programs are being advanced by our Government. We are going to put several millions of dollars into these programs. One of the main objectives of the programs is to develop better understanding among men and nations, and particularly to develop better understanding of our America in foreign lands. I have supported such programs, because I believe the best way to impart to the nations now being wooed by the Communists an adequate idea of what America really is would be by having the people in other countries learn to know our America and our democratic way of life first hand.

When the Senate was considering the appropriation bill, I joined with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in securing a slight increase of funds for the exchange-of-persons program which is operating under the so-called Fulbright Act and the Smith-Mundt Act. This exchange-of-persons program is also operating as a part of the mutual security aid program.

It seems to me that this particular type of public-information program is uniquely American, because it is one strategy, it is one device, and it is one tactic which the Communists dare not employ. We are proud to invite foreigners to come to our country, so that they may understand, know, and see the real America. The Communists are afraid to have people from outside the iron curtain visit their sequestered areas, because of the impact made by communism upon people who are antagonistic toward seeing and visiting and living in a police state. So, under the mutual security program and similar projects, thousands of foreigners are being brought to America from month to month and from year to year. They are taken usually in large groups from big city to big city on a tour of America, with most of the concentration being made upon the coastal areas of America, especially the areas in the East.

My concern lies in the fact that many of the foreigners who are brought here so that they may know America never really get to know the heart of America. The heart of America is in the American family and the American home, and on the American farm; in the pioneer spirit which braved the wilderness and the desert and developed this country; in the America we see typified in communities of less than 250,000 people, and in what we are happy to call rural America. That spirit which built America still dominates great areas of this country. I am sure it dominates the wide-open spaces of the West.

It is for this reason that I am eager to have our get-to-know-America guests brought to the West, and into the heart of America. I shall continue to confer with the officials of the Mutual Security Administration and in the State Department, concerning the arrangement of these programs. I have done so in the past, and I shall do so in the future, because many Members of the Senate have told me they share with me the desire to see a more concentrated effort made to take the foreign guests who come here under these programs into the interior portions of the United States.

Mr. President, I have in mind a plan for orientation and reception of these guests from afar, which will change their status here from sightseers to personal guests of Americans living in typical American centers.

I mention this proposal today on the Senate floor because I am sure there are other Senators who, like me, want to help these people know our America as it is outside the large metropolitan areas, to help these foregin visitors know the people, the families, the aims of this country, and in the small towns, on large farms, in the factories, in typically small cities, which are all a part of America, to gain an insight into the true America of which we are so proud, the America which was originated and born out of the Declaration of Independence which was recently read to the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Washington.

It is my theory that we should get these foreign visitors "oriented" in our western colleges and universities and in our wide-open spaces, as well as in crammed places of metropolitan centers, for it takes all of this to make our America.

It seems to me that we should have several orientation centers established for visitors outside the large metropolitan centers. I think at least some of these should be in the West and in the Midwest. I have conferred with a number of educators and farm leaders and labor leaders in this connection, and I know that they are desirous of cooperating in the establishment of orientation centers of this type. I know, Mr. President, that the University of South Dakota, at Vermillion, and the State college, at Brookings, as well as other colleges in the West, would afford visitors from afar this opportunity to see America, which is entirely different from anything in Europe, the wide-open spaces and the type of free men and women that America has produced, the tremendous natural resources of our country in many fields, both those being worked and those still undeveloped and untouched.

Under such programs of orientation, these foreign visitors could study American farming methods on large and small farms in the vicinity of our smaller American urban communities; they could study mining and metallurgy in their many aspects as they are being developed throughout this country. Under a program of this kind, cattle raising and marketing, forestry, and other activities such as are developed in the United States could be studied, and knowledge of the progress we have made carried back to the foreign countries from which these visitors come.

Mr. President, after such orientation courses, when these visitors first reached this country, they could then be sent out in small groups to visit not only in the large cities of America, but with the peoples of these cities, and with the people of the smaller communities of the South and in the Middle West.

At present, relatively large groups—sometimes as many as 25—are taken from one city to another, on conducted tours, without having the opportunity to come to know the real American by having a chance to meet him in his home, in his church, in his place of business, and in his place of recreation. Usually there has been altogether too little preparation from the standpoint of the reception and education of these guests, and usually little preparation has been made for their education before they arrive. They have not been oriented. They have not been briefed. They have not been given a preview of what to expect as they come to visit America. I think we are failing to take advantage of vast potentialities of development through our failure to provide the proper kind of

orientation centers and the proper kind of reception treatment for these visitors who come here yearning to know what it is that actually makes America tick.

So, Mr. President, I suggest a program through which hospitality and continuing education could be provided under the Know Your America Program and the program to encourage the exchange of persons. These visitors should have private contacts with the little people and big people of America, the urban and the rural people of this country.

State and local receptionists can be employed at a nominal fee, perhaps $5 to $10 a day, on an average of 3 days a week. The receptionist would fully plan the programs of those who are to come before they arrive.

A well-trained, alert housewife in any city who wishes to work at home—and that is the type of work which appeals to many women—would be told not less than 2 or 3 weeks before the arrival of the visitors that they are coming. She would be given a thumbnail sketch by the chairman of the reception group. The local chairman would then arrange for study visits where the visiting students would want to go and arrange to have them called for if necessary. Arrangements could be made for visits in the simple, good American homes that we want our guests to know. Arrangements could be made for a dinner here or a cup of coffee there or for a trip to the country. Hostess teams could be set up in many communities composed of volunteer local representatives of member organizations joining with many others like Rotary Clubs, Lions Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs, or other service clubs which are eager to help on such projects.

Talks could be arranged to put our visitors before many such groups under this hostess plan. They can tell us the type of country in which they live and, at the same time, learn from us more about the country which it is their privilege to visit.

I am proud of South Dakota, and I want to let the world know what we have in our State. I am sure other Senators from other States are equally interested in helping foreign visitors to our shores learn to know the real forces and virtues which make America great and they are equally proud of the vast potentialities and the vast possibilities of their areas.

I am sure it is the intention of the Senate that in this exchange-of-persons program, whether it be under the Fulbright Act, the Smith-Mundt Act, or any other act, foreign visitors should have an opportunity to see the soul and heart of this country of ours.

By following some such program as has been suggested, I am confident that what the Senate and the Congress have in mind could be better implemented and better satisfied than by the somewhat careless and cursory manner in which visitors now come to this country and spend the major portion of their time in a few of the great metropolitan cities of this country.

I am interested in effecting a part of this exchange program through the Mutual Security Administration. I like the word "mutual" in this program. I think that any program must be mutually cooperative to make it work.

A program which helps effect functional cooperation, and I repeat, functional cooperation, between the people of other democracies and our own, is the kind of activity I believe in and the kind which we Americans want. If, at the same time, such a program will help bring the people of other lands closer to the people of our country, then I am sure that this is the kind of project we need and want. I feel confident the Mutual Security Administration aims to have such a program, and I sincerely believe the suggestions I have made this afternoon move in the direction of developing a program of this type.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO RECORDING AND PERFORMING RIGHTS IN LITERARY WORKS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

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

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
WILLIS SMITH,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
ROBERT L. RAMSAY,
SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief statement on the conference report which has just been agreed to.

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

H. R. 3589 is a copyright bill which passed the Senate on June 21, 1952, with three amendments. The amendments consisted of inserting the word "pecuniary" in two places and the third amendment consisted of making the effective date of the act January 1, 1953.

The conferees agreed that the word "pecuniary" was not necessary in the bill and the conferees agreed to recede from those two amendments. The more important amendment, making the effective date of this act January 1, 1953, was discussed and the conferees agreed that the House should recede from its disagreement to that amendment.

I ask the adoption of the conference report on H. R. 3589.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals vice Joseph R. Jackson, retired; and

James Augustine Walsh, of Arizona, to be United States district judge for the district of Arizona, vice Howard C. Speakman, deceased.

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

William B. Savchuck and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

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

Paul Moss, of Texas, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, vice J. H. Allen, deceased; and

Thirty-six postmasters.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I dislike to proceed out of order, but I have to attend a committee in a very few minutes. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive K, a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield so that

we may take up nominations on the Executive Calendar of judges, district attorneys, and others?

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond Ross Paty, of Georgia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 18, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the name of James William Johnson, Jr., of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the name of James T. Hill, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Air Force will be confirmed en bloc.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps will be confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS OF CERTAIN JUDGES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, two nominations were filed this afternoon by the Judiciary Committee, a judge for the district of Arizona, and a judge of the Tax Court of Appeals in Maryland. They were both approved by the Senators from their respective States, by the bar associations of their respective districts, and by the Judiciary Committee. I ask unanimous consent that those nominations may be considered out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the nominations?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if I may ask the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee to let those two nominations go to the calendar so that they may be passed on tomorrow. I have heard rumors that someone would like to read the reports and find out more about the nominees. I am asking that of my friend in all sincerity, not because I have any wish to delay the proceedings.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will go to the Executive Calendar to be considered tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in confirming nominations passed upon today be reported immediately to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

Mr. GEORGE. Last year the Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of 14 conventions and protocols designed to afford tax relief to individuals and corporations subject to taxation by two or more jurisdictions because of their place of residence or the nature of their operations.

The pending conventions, one with Switzerland on estate taxes and two with Finland on estate and income taxes, carry forward this program to prevent double taxation. The conventions have been examined by the Committee on Foreign Relations and by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. They have been found consistent with other conventions we have approved.

The committee has received no evidence of opposition to these conventions. On the contrary, it has received a number of requests that they be approved.

The committee therefore recommends that the Senate give its advice and consent to the ratification of these conventions.

Mr. President, in conclusion, all the questionable provisions which have heretofore given rise to some controversy in connection with the tax conventions have been omitted in the treaties under consideration and they are wholly unobjectionable.

Executive L and Executive P are separate conventions, but they are precisely as I have described them. They both relate to the double taxation of individuals and corporations having a dual residence, or whose business in its nature leads to double taxation by differing jurisdictions.

CONVENTION WITH FINLAND RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION ON ESTATES AND INHERITANCES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive K (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND THE PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON ESTATES AND INHERITANCES

The President of the United States of America and the President of the Republic of Finland, desiring to conclude a Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The President of the Republic of Finland:

Johan A. Nykopp, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Finland to the United States of America,

who, having communicated to one another their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes referred to in this Convention are the following taxes asserted upon death:

(a) In the case of the United States of America: The Federal estate tax, and

(b) In the case of the Republic of Finland: The inheritance tax, the communal tax on inheritances, bequests, or devices, and the "poors percentage."

(2) The present Convention shall also apply to any other taxes of a substantially similar character imposed by either contracting State subsequently to the date of signature of the present Convention.

ARTICLE II

(1) As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense includes only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Finland" means the Republic of Finland.

(c) The term "tax" means the Federal estate tax imposed in the United States, or the inheritance tax, the communal tax on inheritances, bequests or devises, or the "poors percentage," imposed in Finland, as the context requires.

(d) The term "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, and in the case of Finland, the Taxation Department of the Ministry of Finance.

(2) In the application of the provisions of the present Convention by one of the contracting States, any term not otherwise defined shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning which such term has under the tax laws of that State.

ARTICLE III

(1) For the purposes of the present Convention, the question whether a decedent was at the time of his death domiciled in or a citizen of the United States, or whether the decedent or the beneficiary of a deceased person's estate was a resident in Finland at the time of the decedent's death, shall be

determined in accordance with the laws in force in the United States or Finland, respectively.

(2) In the case of a decedent who at the time of death was a citizen of or domiciled in the United States, or in the case of a decedent who at the time of death was a resident of Finland, or in the case of a beneficiary of a deceased person's estate who at the time of the death of such person was a resident of Finland, the situs of any of the following property or property rights shall, for the purposes of the imposition of the tax where the tax is imposed on the basis of the situs of property, and for the purposes of credit, be determined exclusively in accordance with the following rules:

(a) Immovable property shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the land involved is located. The question whether any property or right in property constitutes immovable property shall be determined in accordance with the law of the place where the land involved is located.

(b) Tangible movable property (other than such property for which specific provision is hereinafter made) and bank or currency notes and other forms of currency recognized as legal tender in the place of issue, shall be deemed to be situated at the place where such property or currency are located at the time of death, or, if in transitu, at the place of destination.

(c) Debts (including bonds, promissory notes, bills of exchange, and insurance) shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the debtor resides, or if the debtor is a corporation, at the place in or under the laws of which such corporation was created or organized.

(d) Shares or stock in a corporation (including shares or stock held by a nominee where the beneficial ownership is evidenced by scrip certificates or otherwise) shall be deemed to be situated at the place in or under the laws of which such corporation was created or organized.

(e) Ships and aircraft and shares thereof shall be deemed to be situated at the place of registration or documentation of the ship or aircraft.

(f) Goodwill as a trade, business, or professional asset shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the trade, business, or profession to which it pertains is carried on.

(g) Patents, trade-marks, and designs shall be deemed to be situated at the place where they are registered or used.

(h) Copyrights, franchises, rights to artistic and scientific works, and rights or licenses to use any copyrighted material, artistic and scientific works, patents, trade-marks, or designs shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the rights arising therefrom are exercisable.

(i) All property other than hereinbefore mentioned shall be deemed to be situated in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax on the basis of situs of property within such State, but if neither of the contracting States impose the tax on the basis of situs of property therein, then all such other property shall be deemed to be situated where the decreased person was domiciled at the time of his death.

ARTICLE IV

(1) In the case of a decedent (other than a citizen or domiciliary of the United States) who at the time of his death was a resident of Finland, the United States, in imposing the tax:

(a) shall allow a specific exemption, which would be allowable under its law if the decedent had been domiciled in the United States, in an amount not less than the proportion thereof which the value of the property subjected to its tax bears to the value of the property which would have been subjected to its tax if such decedent had been domiciled in the United States; and

(b) shall (except for the purpose of subparagraph (a) of this paragraph and for the purpose of any other proportionate allowance otherwise provided) take no account of property situated according to Article III outside the United States in determining the amount or rate of tax.

(2) In the case of a decedent (other than a resident of Finland) who at the time of his death was a citizen of or domiciled in the United States, or in the case of a beneficiary of a deceased person's estate (other than a beneficiary who at the time of the decedent's death was a resident of Finland), and such deceased person was at time of death a citizen of or domiciled in the United States, the taxation authority in Finland, in imposing the tax:

(a) shall allow a specific exemption, which would be allowable under its law if the decedent or beneficiary, as the case may be, had been resident in Finland, in an amount not less than the proportion thereof which the value of the property subjected to its tax bears to the value of the property which would have been subjected to its tax if such decedent or beneficiary had been resident in Finland; and

(b) shall (except for the purpose of subparagraph (a) of this paragraph and for the purpose of any other proportionate allowance otherwise provided) take no account of property situated according to Article III outside Finland in determining the amount or rate of tax.

ARTICLE V

(1) If the decedent was at the time of his death domciled in or a citizen of the United States, the United States shall allow against its tax (computed without application of this Article) a credit for the amount of the tax imposed in Finland with respect to property situated in Finland and included for tax purposes in both contracting States, but the amount of the credit shall not exceed the portion of the tax imposed by the United States which is attributable to such property. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any property referred to in paragraph (3) of this Article.

(2) If the decedent was at the time of his death a resident of Finland, or if the beneficiary of the deceased person's estate was at the time of the death of such person a resident of Finland, the taxation authority in Finland shall allow against its tax (computed without application of this Article) a credit for the amount of the tax imposed by the United States with respect to property situated in the United States and included for tax purposes in both contracting States, but the amount of the credit shall not exceed the portion of the tax imposed in Finland which is attributable to such property. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any property referred to in paragraph (3) of this Article.

(3) If in a particular case taxes are imposed in one of the contracting States by reason of the decedent's domicile or citizenship thereof and in the other contracting State by reason of the decedent's or beneficiary's residence therein, the taxation authorities in each contracting State shall allow against their taxes (computed without application of this Article) a credit for the part of the taxes imposed in the other contracting State with respect to property included for tax in both States and situated or deemed to be situated—

(a) in both contracting States, or

(b) outside of both States.

The total of the credits authorized by this paragraph shall be equal to the amount of the taxes imposed with respect to such property in the contracting State imposing the smaller amount of taxes, and shall be divided between the two States in proportion to the amount of taxes imposed in each of the two States with respect to such property.

(4) For the purpose of this Article, the amount of the tax in each contracting State attributable to any designated property shall be ascertained after taking into account any applicable diminution or credit otherwise provided, except any credit authorized by this Article.

ARTICLE VI

(1) Any claim for credit or for a refund of tax founded on the provisions of the present Convention shall be made within six years from the date of death of the decedent.

(2) Any refund shall be made without payment of interest on the amount so refunded.

ARTICLE VII

The competent authorities of the contracting States shall exchange such information (being information available under the respective taxation laws of the contracting States) as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present Convention or for the prevention of fraud or the administration of statutory provisions against tax avoidance in relation to the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any person other than those concerned with the assessment and collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. No information shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade secret or trade process.

ARTICLE VIII

Each of the contracting States may collect taxes, which are the subject of this Convention, imposed by the other contracting State (as though such tax were a tax imposed by the former State) as will ensure that the credit or any other benefit granted under the present Convention shall not be enjoyed by persons not entitled to such benefits.

ARTICLE IX

The State to which application is made for information or assistance shall comply as soon as possible with the request addressed to it except that such State may refuse to comply with the request for reasons of public policy or if compliance would involve violation of a trade, business, industrial or professional secret or trade process.

ARTICLE X

Where the representative of the estate of a decedent or beneficiary of such estate shows proof that the action of the revenue authorities of one of the contracting States has resulted or will result in double taxation contrary to the provisions of the present Convention, such representative or beneficiary shall be entitled to present the facts to the contracting State of which the decedent was a citizen at the time of death or of which the beneficiary is a citizen, or if the decedent was not a citizen of either of the contracting States at the time of death or if the beneficiary is not a citizen of either of the contracting States, such facts may be presented to the contracting State in which the decedent was domiciled or resident at time of death or in which the beneficiary is domiciled or resident. The competent authority of the State to which the facts are so presented shall undertake to come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other contracting State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE XI

(1) The provisions of this Convention shall not be construed to deny or affect in any manner the right of diplomatic and consular officers to other or additional exemptions now enjoyed or which may hereafter be granted to such officers.

(2) The provisions of this Convention shall in no case increase the tax liability in either contracting State.

(3) Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention or its relationship to Conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE XII

(1) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may prescribe regulations necessary to carry into effect the present Convention within the respective States. With respect to the provisions of this Convention relating to exchange of information and mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, such authorities may, by common agreement, prescribe rules concerning matters of procedure, forms of application and replies thereto, conversion of currency, disposition of amounts collected, costs of collection, minimum amounts subject to collection and related matters.

(2) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of this Convention.

ARTICLE XIII

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Helsinki as soon as possible.

(2) The present Convention shall become effective on the day of the exchange of instruments of ratification and shall be applicable to estates or inheritances in the case of persons who die on or after that date. It shall continue effective for a period of five years beginning with that date and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of that five-year period or at any time thereafter, provided that at least six months' prior notice of termination has been given, the termination to become effective on the first day of January following the expiration of the six-month period.

DONE at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Finnish languages, the two texts having equal authenticity, this third day of March, 1952.

For the President of the United States of America:

DEAN ACHESON [SEAL]

For the President of the Republic of Finland:

JOHAN A. NYKOPP [SEAL]

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have but a very brief statement to make on this treaty or convention, and it is equally applicable to Executive L which appears on page 2 of the Executive Calendar, and Executive P; Executive L being a convention between the United States and the Republic of Finland for the avoidance of double taxation, and Executive P being a convention between the United States and Switzerland for the avoidance of double taxation. What I shall say relates to all three of the conventions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive K, Eighty-second Congress, second session, the convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

CONVENTION WITH FINLAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON INCOME

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive L (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, which read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND THE PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON INCOME

The President of the United States of America and the President of the Republic of Finland, desiring to conclude a Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The President of the Republic of Finland:

Johan A. Nykopp, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Finland to the United States of America,

who, having communicated to one another their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes referred to in this Convention are:

(a) In the case of the United States of America: The Federal income tax, including surtaxes and excess profits taxes.

(b) In the case of Finland: The State (National) income tax.

(2) The present Convention shall also apply to any other taxes of a substantially similar character imposed by either contracting State subsequently to the date of signature of the present Convention.

ARTICLE II

(1) As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense includes only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Finland" means the Republic of Finland.

(c) The term "permanent establishment" means a branch office, factory, warehouse or other fixed place of business, but does not include the casual and temporary use of merely storage facilities, nor does it include an agency unless the agent has and exercises a general authority to negotiate and conclude contracts on behalf of an enterprise or has a stock of merchandise from which he regularly fills orders on its behalf. An enterprise of one of the contracting States shall not be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the other State merely because it carries on business dealings in such other State through a bona fide commission agent, broker or custodian acting in the ordinary course of his business as such. The fact that an enterprise of one of the contracting States maintains in the other State a fixed place of business exclusively for the purchase of goods or merchandise shall not of itself constitute such fixed place of business a permanent establishment of such enterprise. The fact that a corporation of one contracting State has a subsidiary corporation which is a corporation of the other State or which is engaged in trade or business in the other State shall not of itself constitute that subsidiary corporation a permanent establishment of its parent corporation.

(d) The term "enterprise" includes every form of undertaking whether carried on by an individual, partnership, corporation, or any other entity.

(e) The term "enterprise of one of the contracting States" means, as the case may be, United States enterprise" or "Finnish enterprise".

(f) The term "United States enterprise" means an enterprise carried on in the United States by a resident or partnership of the United States or by a United States corporation or other entity; the term "United States corporation or other entity" means a corporation or other entity created or organized in the United States or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory of the United States.

(g) The term "Finnish enterprise" means an enterprise carried on in Finland by a resident or partnership of Finland or by a Finnish corporation or other entity; the term "Finnish corporation or other entity" means a corporation or other entity created or organized in Finland or under Finnish law.

(h) The term "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury; and in the case of Finland, the Taxation Department of the Ministry of Finance.

(2) In the application of the provisions of the present Convention by one of the contracting States any term not otherwise defined shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning which such term has under the tax laws of that State.

ARTICLE III

(1) An enterprise of one of the contracting States shall not be subject to taxation in the other contracting State in respect of its industrial and commercial profits unless it is engaged in trade or business in such other State through a permanent establishment situated therein. If it is so engaged such other State may impose its tax upon the entire income of such enterprise from sources within such other State.

(2) In determining the industrial or commercial profits from sources within the territory of one of the contracting States of an enterprise of the other contracting State, no profits shall be deemed to arise from the mere purchase of goods or merchandise within the territory of the former contracting State by such enterprise. In the determination of the net industrial and commercial

profits of the permanent establishment there shall be allowed as deductions all expenses, wherever incurred, reasonably allocable to the permanent establishment, including executive and general administrative expenses so allocable.

(3) Where an enterprise of one of the contracting States is engaged in trade or business in the territory of the other contracting States through a permanent establishment situated therein, there shall be attributed to such permanent establishment the industrial or commercial profits which it might be expected to derive if it were an independent enterprise engaged in the same or similar activities under the same or similar conditions and dealing at arm's length with the enterprise of which it is a permanent establishment and the profits so attributed shall, subject to the law of such other contracting State, be deemed to be income from sources within the territory of such other contracting State.

(4) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may lay down rules by agreement for the apportionment of industrial and commercial profits.

ARTICLE IV

Where an enterprise of one of the contracting States, by reason of its participation in the management or the financial structure of an enterprise of the other contracting State, makes with or imposes on the latter, in their commercial or financial relations, conditions different from those which would be made with an independent enterprise, any profits which would normally have accrued to one of the enterprises but by reason of those conditions have not so accrued, may be included in the profits of that enterprise and taxed accordingly.

ARTICLE V

(1) Income which an enterprise of one of the contracting States derives from the operation of ships or aircraft registered in that State shall be exempt from taxation in the other contracting State.

(2) The present Convention shall be deemed to have superseded, as of the effective date of this Convention, the arrangement between the United States and Finland providing for relief from double income taxation on shipping profits, effected by exchange of notes dated June 6, 1946 and January 7, 1947.

ARTICLE VI

(1) The rate of United States tax on dividends derived from a United States corporation by a resident or corporation or other entity of Finland, not engaged in trade or business in the United States through a permanent establishment therein, shall not exceed 15 percent: provided that such rate of tax shall not exceed 5 percent if such Finnish corporation controls, directly or indirectly, at least 95 percent of the entire voting power in the corporation paying the dividend, and not more than 25 percent of the gross income of such paying corporation is derived from interest and dividends, other than interest and dividends from its own subsidiary corporation. Such reduction of the rate to 5 percent shall not apply if the relationship of the two corporations has been arranged or is maintained primarily with the intention of securing such reduced rate.

(2) The rate of Finnish tax on dividends derived from a Finnish corporation by a resident or corporation or other entity of the United States, not engaged in trade or business in Finland through a permanent establishment therein, shall not exceed 15 percent; provided that such rate of tax shall not exceed 5 percent if such United States corporation controls, directly or indirectly, at least 95 percent of the entire voting power in the corporation paying the dividend, and not more than 25 percent of the gross income of such paying corporation is derived from interest and dividends, other than interest and dividends from its own subsidiary corporation. Such reduction of the rate to 5 percent shall not apply if the relationship of the two corporations has been arranged or is maintained primarily with the intention of securing such reduced rate. For the purposes of this paragraph the combined Finnish tax on such dividends and the Finnish property tax on the capital stock of a Finnish corporation owned by such resident or corporation of other entity shall not exceed an amount computed at such rates as applied to dividends, if any, so derived.

ARTICLE VII

(1) Interest on bonds, securities, notes, debentures, or on any other form of indebtedness derived from sources within one of the contracting States by a resident or corporation or other entity of the other contracting State, not having a permanent establishment in the former State, shall be exempt from tax by such former State.

(2) Bonds, bank deposits and trade balances beneficially owned by a resident or corporation or other entity of the United States shall be exempt from the Finnish property tax.

ARTICLE VIII

Royalties for the right to use copyrights or in respect of the right to produce or reproduce any literary, dramatic, musical, or artistic work (but not inclusive of rents or royalties in respect of motion picture films) derived from sources within one of the contracting States by a resident or corporation or other entity of the other contracting State, not engaged in trade or business in the former State through a permanent establishment therein, shall be exempt from tax imposed by such former State.

ARTICLE IX

(1) Income from real property (not including interest derived from mortgages and bonds secured by real property) and royalties in respect of the operation of mines, quarries, or other natural resources, shall be taxable only in the contracting State in which such property, mines, quarries, or other natural resources are situated.

(2) A resident or corporation or other entity of one of the contracting States deriving any such income from sources within the other contracting State may, for any taxable year, elect to be subject to the tax of such other contracting State as if such resident or corporation or other entity were engaged in trade or business within such other contracting State through a permanent establishment therein during such taxable year.

ARTICLE X

(1) (a) Wages, salaries and similar compensation and pensions, paid by the United States or by the political subdivisions or territories thereof to an individual (other than a Finnish citizen who is not also a citizen of the United States) shall be exempt from Finnish tax.

(b) Wages, salaries and similar compensation and pensions, paid either directly, or from funds or institutions created, by Finland or by the political subdivisions or communities thereof, to an individual (other than a United States citizen who is not also a citizen of Finland) shall be exempt from United States tax. The term "funds or institutions" shall not be deemed to include a corporation even if such corporation is owned, in whole or in part, by the Government of Finland.

(2) Private pensions and life annuities derived from within one of the contracting States and paid to individuals residing in the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State.

(3) The term "pensions", as used in this Article, means periodic payments made in consideration for services rendered or by way of compensation for injuries received.

(4) The term "life annuities" as used in this Article means a stated sum payable periodically at stated times during life, or during a specified number of years, under an obligation to make the payments in return for adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth.

ARTICLE XI

(1) A resident of Finland shall be exempt from United States tax upon compensation for labor or personal services (including the practice of the liberal and artistic professions) if he is temporarily present in the United States for a period or periods not exceeding a total of 183 days during the taxable year and either of the following conditions is met:

(a) his compensation is received for labor or personal services performed as an employee of, or under contract with, a resident, or corporation or other entity of Finland, or

(b) his compensation received for labor or personal services does not exceed $10,000.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) of this Article shall apply, mutatis mutandis, to a resident of the United States with respect to compensation for such labor or personal services performed in Finland.

(3) The provisions of this Article shall have no application to the income to which Article X (1) relates.

ARTICLE XII

(1) Dividends and interest paid by a Finnish corporation shall be exempt from United States tax except where the recipient is a citizen, resident or corporation or other entity of the United States.

(2) Dividends and interest paid by a United States corporation shall be exempt from Finnish tax except where the recipient is a resident or corporation or other entity of Finland.

ARTICLE XIII

A professor or teacher, a resident of one of the contracting States, who temporarily visits the territory of the other contracting States for the purpose of teaching for a period not exceeding two years at a university, college, school or other educational institution in the other contracting State, shall be exempted in such other contracting State from tax on his remuneration for such teaching for such period.

ARTICLE XIV

A student or apprentice, a resident of one of the contracting States, who temporarily visits the other contracting State exclusively for the purposes of study or for acquiring business or technical experience shall not be taxable in the latter State in respect or remittances received by him from abroad for the purpose of his maintenance or studies.

ARTICLE XV

(1) It is agreed that double taxation shall be avoided in the following manner:

(a) The United States in determining its taxes specified in Article I of this Convention in the case of its citizens, residents or corporations may, regardless of any other provision of this Convention, include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed all items of income taxable under the revenue laws of the United States as if this Convention had not come into effect. The United States shall, however, subject to the provisions of section 131, Internal Revenue Code, as in effect on the date of the entry into force of this Convention, deduct from its taxes the amount of Finnish taxes specified in Article I of this Convention.

(b) Finland in determining its taxes specified in Article I of this Convention in the case of its residents or corporations or other

entities may, regardless of any other provision of this Convention, include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed all items of income taxable under the revenue laws of Finland as if this Convention has not come into effect. Finland shall, however, deduct from the taxes so calculated that portion of such tax liability which the taxpayer's income from sources in the United States (not exempt from United States tax under this Convention) bears to the taxpayer's entire income but not in excess of the income tax paid to the United States and to the political subdivisions thereof on or with respect to the income so taxable in the United States.

(2) The provisions of this Article shall not be construed to deny the exemptions from United States tax or Finnish tax, as the case may be, granted by Article X (1) of this Convention.

ARTICLE XVI

The citizens of one of the contracting States shall not, while resident in the other contracting State, be subjected therein to other or more burdensome taxes than are the citizens of such other contracting State residing in its territory. As used in this paragraph,

(a) the term "citizens" includes all legal persons, partnerships, and associations created or organized under the laws in the respective contracting States, and

(b) the term "taxes" means taxes of every kind or description whether national, Federal, State, communal or municipal.

ARTICLE XVII

The competent authorities of the contracting States shall exchange such information (being information available under the respective taxation laws of the contracting States) as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present Convention or for the prevention of fraud or the administration of statutory provisions against tax avoidance in relation to the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any person other than those concerned with the assessment and collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. No information shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade secret or trade process.

ARTICLE XVIII

Each of the contracting States may collect taxes, which are the subject of this Convention, imposed by the other contracting State (as though such tax were a tax imposed by the former State) as will ensure that the exemption or reduced rate of tax granted under the present Convention by such other State shall not be enjoyed by persons not entitled to such benefits.

ARTICLE XIX

The State to which application is made for information or assistance shall comply as soon as possible with the request addressed to it except that such State may refuse to comply with the request for reasons of public policy or if compliance would involve violation of a trade, business, industrial, or professional secret or trade process.

ARTICLE XX

Where a taxpayer shows proof that the action of the revenue authorities of the contracting States has resulted in double taxation in his case in respect to any of the taxes to which the present Convention relates, he shall be entitled to lodge a claim with the State of which he is a citizen, or if he is not a citizen of either of the contracting States, with the State of which he is a resident, or, if the taxpayer is a corporation or other entity, with the State in which it is created or organized. Should the claim be upheld, the competent authority of such State may come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE XXI

(1) The provisions of this Convention shall not be construed to deny or affect in any manner the right of diplomatic and consular officers to other or additional exemptions now enjoyed or which may hereafter be granted to such officers.

(2) The provisions of the present Convention shall not be construed to restict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit or other allowance accorded by the laws of one of the contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

(3) Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, or its relationship to Conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE XXII

(1) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may prescribe regulations necessary to interpret and carry out the provisions of this Convention. With respect to the provisions of this Convention relating to exchange of information and mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, such authorities may, by common agreement, prescribe rules concerning matters of procedure, forms of application and replies thereto, conversion of currency, disposition of amounts collected, minimum amounts subject to collection and related matters.

(2) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of this Convention.

ARTICLE XXIII

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Helsinki as soon as possible. It shall have effect for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January of the year in which such exchange takes place.

(2) The present Convention shall continue effective for a period of five years and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of the five-year period, or at any time thereafter, provided that at least six months' prior notice of termination has been given, and, in such event, the present Convention shall cease to be effective for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January next following the expiration of the six-month period.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Finnish languages, the two texts having equal authenticity, this third day of March, 1952.

For the President of the United States of America:

DEAN ACHESON [SEAL]

For the President of the Republic of Finland:

JOHAN A. NYKOPP [SEAL]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive L, Eighty-second Congress, second session, the convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

CONVENTION WITH SWITZERLAND REGARDING THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON ESTATES AND INHERITANCES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention Executive P (82d Cong., 1st sess), a convention between the United States of America and Switzerland, signed at Washington on July 9, 1951, for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, which was read as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE SWISS CONFEDERATION FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON ESTATES AND INHERITANCES

The President of the United States of America and the Swiss Federal Council, desiring to conclude a Convention for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The Swiss Federal Council:

Charles Bruggmann, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Swiss Confederation in Washington, who, having communicated to one another their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes referred to in this Convention are the following taxes asserted upon death:

(a) In the case of the United States of America: The Federal estate tax, and

(b) In the case of The Swiss Confederation: Estate and inheritance taxes imposed by the cantons and any political subdivision thereof.

(2) The present Convention shall also apply to any other estate or inheritance taxes of a substantially similar character imposed by the United States or the Swiss cantons or any political subdivision thereof subsequently to the date of signature of the present Convention.

ARTICLE II

(1) As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense means the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Switzerland" means The Swiss Confederation.

(c) The term "tax" means the Federal estate tax imposed by the United States, or the inheritance or estate taxes imposed in Switzerland, as the context requires.

(d) The term "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury; and in the case of Switzerland, the Director of the Federal Tax Administration as authorized by the Federal Department of Finances and Customs.

(2) In the application of the provisions of the present Convention by one of the contracting States any term not otherwise defined shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning which such term has under its own laws.

(3) For the purposes of the present Convention, each contracting State may determine whether the decedent was at the time of death domiciled therein or a citizen thereof.

ARTICLE III

In imposing the tax in the case of a decedent who at the time of death was not a citizen of the United States and was not domiciled therein, but who was at the time of his death a citizen of or domiciled in Switzerland, the United States shall allow a specific exemption which would be allowable under its law if the decedent had been domiciled in the United States in an amount not less than the proportion thereof which the value of the total property (both movable and immovable) subjected to its tax bears to the value of the total property (both movable and immovable) which would have been subjected to its tax if the decedent had been domiciled in the United States. If a tax is imposed in Switzerland by reason of movable property being situated within the territorial jurisdiction of the tax authority (and not by reason of the decedent's domicile therein or by reason of the decedent's Swiss citizenship) in the case of an estate of a decedent who at the time of his death was a citizen of or domiciled in the United States, the tax authority in Switzerland shall allow a specific exemption which would be allowable under its law if the decedent had been domiciled within its territorial jurisdiction in an amount not less than the proportion thereof which the value of the total property (both movable and immovable) subjected to its tax bears to the value of the total property (both movable and immovable) which would have been subjected to its tax if the decedent had been domiciled within its territorial jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IV

(1) If the tax authority in the United States determines that the decedent was a citizen of or domiciled in the United States at the time of his death, and the tax authority in Switzerland determines that the decedent was a citizen of or domiciled in Switzerland at the time of his death, the tax authority in each contracting State shall allow against its tax (computed without application of this Article) a credit for the tax imposed in the other contracting State with respect to the following property included for tax by both States (but the amount of the credit shall not exceed the portion of the tax imposed in the crediting State which is attributable to such property):

(a) Shares or stock in a corporation (including shares or stock held by a nominee where the beneficial ownership is evidenced by scrip certificates or otherwise) created or organized under the laws of such other contracting State or a political subdivision thereof.

(b) Debts (including bonds, promissory notes, bills of exchange, and insurance) if the debtor resides in such other State, or if the debtor is a corporation created or organized under the laws of such other State or a political subdivision thereof.

(c) Corporal movable property (including bank or currency notes and other forms of currency recognized as legal tender in the place of issue) physically located in such other State at the time of death of the decedent, and

(d) Any other property which the competent authorities of both contracting States agree upon as constituting property situated in such other State.

(2) For the purpose of this Article, the amount of the tax of each contracting State attributable to any particular property shall be ascertained after taking into account any applicable diminution or credit as provided by its law other than any credit authorized by this Article.

(3) The credit provided by this Article shall be allowed only upon condition that the tax for which credit may be authorized has been fully paid; and the competent authority of the contracting State in which such tax is imposed shall certify to the competent authority of the contracting State in which credit may be allowed such information pertaining thereto as is necessary to carry out the provisions of this Article.

ARTICLE V

(1) Any claim for a credit or refund of tax founded on the provisions of the present Convention shall be made within five years from the date of death of the decedent.

(2) Any refund or credit shall be made without payment of interest on the amount so refunded.

ARTICLE VI

Where the representative of the estate of a decedent or a beneficiary of such estate can show proof that the action of the tax authorities of one of the contracting States has resulted or will result in double taxation contrary to the provisions of the present Convention, such representative or beneficiary shall be entitled to present the facts to the contracting State of which the decedent was a citizen at a time of death or of which the beneficiary is a citizen, or if the decedent was not a citizen of either of the contracting States at the time of death or if the beneficiary is not a citizen of either of the contracting States, such facts may be presented to the contracting State in which the decedent was domiciled at time of death or in which the beneficiary is domiciled. The competent authority of the State to which the facts are presented shall undertake to come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other contracting State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE VII

(1) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry into effect the present Convention within the respective States.

(2) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of this Convention. Any information so received shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any persons other than those concerned with the assessment and collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention.

(3) Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention or its relationship to conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE VIII

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Berne as soon as possible.

(2) The present Convention shall become effective on the day of the exchange of instruments of ratification and shall be applicable to estates or inheritances in the case of persons who die on or after that date. It shall continue effective for a period of five years beginning with that date and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of that five-year period or at any time thereafter, provided that at least six months' prior notice of termination has been given, the termination to become effective with respect to estates or inheritances in the cases of persons who die on or after the first day of January following the expiration of the six-month period.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and German languages, the two texts having equal authenticity, this 9th day of July, 1951.

For the President of the United States of America:

[SEAL] DEAN ACHESON

For the Swiss Federal Council:

[SEAL] CHARLES BRUGGMANN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive P, Eighty-second Congress, first session, the convention between the United States of America and Switzerland, signed at Washington, on July 9, 1951, for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

PROTOCOLS REGARDING REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to have taken up now Executive I and Executive O.

These protocols extend the international sugar agreement of 1937 until August 31, 1952, as follows: Executive I for 1 year after August 31, 1950, and Executive O for 1 year after August 31, 1951. Their only purpose is to continue alive the administrative framework provided for in the agreement until a revision of the agreement can be negotiated and to make possible a further study of the world sugar situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the protocol Executive I.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocol, Executive I (82d Cong., 1st sess.), a protocol dated in London, August 31, 1950, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1950, the international agreement, regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937, which was read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL FOR THE PROLONGATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR SIGNED IN LONDON ON 6TH MAY, 1937

Whereas an International Agreement regarding the Regulation of the Production and Marketing of Sugar (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement") was signed in London on 6th May, 1937;

And whereas by a Protocol signed in London on 22nd July, 1942, the Agreement was regarded as having come into force on 1st September, 1937, in respect of the Governments signatory of the Protocol;

And whereas it was provided in the said Protocol that the Agreement should continue in force between the said Governments for a period of two years after 31st August 1942;

And whereas by further Protocols signed in London on 31st August, 1944, 31st August, 1945, 30th August, 1946, 29th August, 1947, 31st August, 1948, and 31st August, 1949, it was agreed that, subject to the provisions of Article 2 of the said Protocols, the Agreement should continue in force between the Governments signatory thereof for periods of one year terminating on 31st August, 1945, 31st August, 1946, 31st August, 1947, 31st August, 1948, 31st August, 1949, and 31st August, 1950, respectively:

Now, therefore, the Governments signatory of the present Protocol, considering that it is expedient that the Agreement should be prolonged for a further term as between themselves, subject, in view of the present situation, to the conditions stated below, have agreed as follows:—

ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of Article 2 hereof, the Agreement shall continue in force between the Governments signatory of this Protocol for a period of one year after 31st August, 1950.

ARTICLE 2

During the period specified in Article 1 above the provisions of Chapters III, IV and V of the Agreement and those provisions of Article 31 thereof which limit the number of members of each delegation and the number of advisers accompanying each delegation shall be inoperative.

ARTICLE 3

1. The Governments signatory of the present Protocol recognise that revision of the Agreement is necessary and should be undertaken as soon as the time appears opportune. Discussion of any such revision should take the existing Agreement as the starting-point.

2. In the event of an agreement based on such revision coming into force before 31st August, 1951, the present Protocol shall thereupon terminate.

3. For the purposes of such revision due account shall be taken of any general principles of commodity policy embodied in any agreements which may be concluded under the auspices of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 4

Before the conclusion of the period of one year specified in Article 1, the contracting Governments, if the steps contemplated in Article 3 have not been taken, will discuss the question of a further renewal of the Agreement.

ARTICLE 5

The present Protocol shall bear the date 31st August, 1950, and shall remain open for signature until 30th September, 1950, provided, however, that any signatures appended after 31st August, 1950, shall be deemed to have effect as from that date.

It witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorised thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Protocol.

Done in London on the 31st day of August, 1950, in a single copy which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and of which certified copies shall be furnished to the signatory Governments.

For the Government of the Union of South Africa:
A. L. GEYER.
For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:
E. J. HARRISON.
For the Government of Belgium:
OBERT DE THIEUSIES.
For the Government of Brazil:
MONIZ DE ARAGÃO.
For the Government of Cuba:
Subject to a reservation that the Republic of Cuba will have the right to withdraw from the Agreement at any time, giving notice to the Government of the United Kingdom, as depository of the Protocol, of the intention to withdraw ninety days in advance.
ROBERTO G. DE MENDOZA.
For the Government of Czechoslovakia:
Dr. RUDOLF BYSTRICKY.
For the Government of the Dominican Republic:
J. G. BATLLE.
For the Government of the French Republic:
F. ANDRÉ-HESSE.
For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
ERNEST BEVIN.
For the Government of Hayti:
HUGUES BOURJOLLY.
For the Government of the Republic of Indonesia:
SUBANDRIO.
For the Government of the Netherlands:
W. J. G. GEVERS.
For the Government of Peru:
RICARD RIVERA SCHREIBER.
For the Government of the Republic of the Philippines:
J. E. ROMERO.
For the Government of Poland:
JÚRKIEWICZ.
For the Government of Portugal:
MIGUEL DE ALMEIDA PILE.
For the Government of the United States of America:
J. C. HOLMES
(subject to ratification).
For the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia:
ZLATARIC.

Certified a true copy.

FOREIGN OFFICE
LONDON
6 Nov 1950

S. H. GELLATLY
Deputy Librarian and Keeper of the Papers for the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The protocol is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive I, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a protocol dated in London August 31, 1950, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1950, the international agreement, regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the protocol.

PROTOCOL PROLONGING THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocol, Executive O (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a protocol dated in London August 31, 1951, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1951, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937, which was read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL FOR THE PROLONGATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR SIGNED IN LONDON ON 6TH MAY, 1937

Whereas an International Agreement regarding the Regulation of the Production and Marketing of Sugar (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement") was signed in London on 6th May, 1937;

And whereas by a Protocol signed in London on 22nd July, 1942, the Agreement was regarded as having come into force on 1st September, 1937, in respect of the Governments signatory of the Protocol;

And whereas it was provided in the said Protocol that the Agreement should continue in force between the said Governments for a period of two years after 31st August, 1942;

And whereas by further Protocols signed in London on 31st August, 1944, 31st August, 1945, 30th August, 1946, 29th August, 1947, 31st August, 1948, 31st August, 1949 and 31st August, 1950, it was agreed that, subject to the provisions of Article 2 of the said Protocols, the Agreement should continue in force between the Governments signatory thereof for periods of one year terminating on 31st August, 1945, 31st August, 1946, 31st August, 1947, 31st August, 1948, 31st August, 1949, 31st August, 1950 and 31st August, 1951, respectively:

Now, therefore, the Governments signatory of the present Protocol, considering that it is expedient that the Agreement should be prolonged for a further term as between themselves, subject, in view of the present situation, to the conditions stated below, have agreed as follows:—

ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of Article 2 hereof, the Agreement shall continue in force

between the Governments signatory of this Protocol for a period of one year after 31st August, 1951.

ARTICLE 2

During the period specified in Article 1 above the provisions of Chapters III, IV, and V of the Agreement and those provisions of Article 31 thereof which limit the number of members of each delegation and the number of advisers accompanying each delegation shall be inoperative.

ARTICLE 3

1. The Governments signatory of the present Protocol recognise that revision of the Agreement is necessary and should be undertaken as soon as the time appears opportune. Discussion of any such revision should take the existing Agreement as the starting-point.

2. In the event of an agreement based on such revision coming into force before 31st August, 1952, the present Protocol shall thereupon terminate.

3. For the purposes of such revision due account shall be taken of any general principles of commodity policy embodied in any agreements which may be concluded under the auspices of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 4

Before the conclusion of the period of one year specified in Article 1, the contracting Governments, if the steps contemplated in Article 3 have not been taken, will discuss the question of a further renewal of the Agreement.

ARTICLE 5

The present Protocol shall bear the date 31st August, 1951, and shall remain open for signature until 30th September, 1951, provided, however, that any signatures appended after 31st August, 1951, shall be deemed to have effect as from that date.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorised thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Protocol.

Done in London on the 31st day of August, 1951, in a single copy which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and of which certified copies shall be furnished to the signatory Governments.

For the Government of the Union of South Africa:

A. L. GEYER.

For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:

T. W. WHITE.

For the Government of Belgium:

OBERT DE THIEUSIES.

For the Government of Brazil:

MONIZ DE ARAGÃO.

For the Government of Cuba:

Subject to a reservation that the Republic of Cuba will have the right to withdraw from the Agreement at any time, giving notice to the Government of the United Kingdom, as the Depository of the Protocol, of the intention to withdraw ninety days in advance.

ROBERTO G. DE MENDOZA.

For the Government of Czechoslovakia:

J. ULLRICH.

For the Government of the Dominican Republic:

J. V. BATLLE.

For the Government of the French Republic:

R. MASSIGLI.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

WILLIAM STRANG.

For the Government of Hayti:

LOVE O. LEGER.

For the Government of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia:

SUBANDRIO.

For the Government of Mexico:

F. JIMÉNEZ O'F.

For the Government of the Netherlands:

W. J. G. GEVERS.

For the Government of Peru:

RICARDO RIVERA SCHREIBER.

For the Government of the Republic of the Philippines:

J. E. ROMERO.

For the Government of Poland:

JERZY MICHALOWSKI.

For the Government of Portugal:

LUIZ LEOTTE DO REGO.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WALTER S. GIFFORD.

Subject to ratification.

For the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia:

ZLATARIC.

Certified a true copy.

FOREIGN OFFICE
LONDON
25 Oct 1951

E. J. PASSANT,
Librarian and Keeper of the Papers for the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The protocol is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive O, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a protocol dated in London August 31, 1951, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1951, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. (Putting the question.) Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the protocol.

HIGHWAY CONVENTION WITH THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to call up next Executive W, the highway convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, signed at Panama on September 14, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays the convention before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the Convention, Executive W (81st Cong., 2d sess.), a highway convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, signed at Panama on September 14, 1950, which was read the second time, as follows:

HIGHWAY CONVENTION

The United States of America and the Republic of Panamá,

Having in mind their interest in the maintenance of highways essential to the security and defense of the Panama Canal, have decided to conclude a Highway Convention, and to this end have designated as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

The Honorable Monnett B. Davis, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Panamá; and

The President of the Republic of Panamá:

His Excellency Dr. Carlos N. Brin, Minister of Foreign Relations of the Republic of Panama;

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, which have been found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following:

ARTICLE I

In consideration of the obligations assumed by the Republic of Panamá in the present Convention, the United States of America assumes the responsibility for maintenance, at its expense, of that portion of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway which begins at the southeast pavement edge of Randolph Road, near Coco Solito, Latitude N 9°20' +2715.5 feet, Longitude W 79°52'+5991.72 feet, and which ends at the intersection of the highway with the Tumba Muerto Road, Latitude N 8°59'+2383.0 feet, Longitude W 79°32'+784.0 feet. The above limits and the course of the highway are shown on the map which accompanies this Convention and is marked Exhibit A.

ARTICLE II

The Republic of Panama agrees to prevent any encroachments which might interfere in any way with the safe use or proper maintenance of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway within the limits prescribed in Article I of the present Convention.

ARTICLE III

The Republic of Panama agrees to assume any and all liability which may accrue on account of damage to or loss of property, or on account of personal injury or death arising out of or in connection with or resulting from maintenance, within the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama of the portion of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway referred to in Article I of the present Convention; but this Article shall not apply to any liability accruing on account of damage to or loss of property utilized by the United States of America in the maintenance of such portion of the highway, or on account of the personal injury or death of any employee of the United States of America engaged in the maintenance of such portion of the highway.

ARTICLE IV

The Republic of Panama agrees to furnish free of charge in natural deposits, all stone, gravel, sand, earth or other natural products desired by the United States of America for the performance of the maintenance responsibility assumed in Article I of the present Convention, where such deposits occur on the public domain, so long as such materials cannot be easily obtained in the Canal Zone, and also to arrange for any easements that may be necessary to gain access to such deposits so long as the arrangements for these easements do not entail unreasonable expenses to the Republic of Panamá.

ARTICLE V

The Republic of Panama agrees that there shall not be imposed any import duties or taxes of any kind upon any property, equipment or materials utilized by the United States of America in the maintenance, within the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panamá, of the portion of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway referred to in Article I of the present Convention; and that there shall not be imposed contributions or charges of a personal character of any kind upon employees of the United States of America engaged in

the maintenance of such portion of the highway.

ARTICLE VI

The Republic of Panamá agrees to provide without cost to the United States of America throughout the life of this Convention a right-of-way which shall be 100 feet in width from each side of the center line of the portion of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway described in Article I of the present Convention: Provided, however, that in areas where it is unnecessary or impracticable in the opinion of either government to provide a right-of-way of the full width hereinbefore prescribed, and in areas where it is necessary and practicable in the opinion of either Government to provide a right-of-way of greater width than that hereinbefore prescribed, the width of the right-of-way shall be as agreed upon between representatives to be designated by the two Governments: And provided further that this paragraph shall not apply to the corridors referred to in Articles III and IV of the Convention regarding the Colón Corridor signed May 24, 1950.

ARTICLE VII

In consideration of the obligations assumed by the United States of America in the present Convention, the Republic of Panamá accords to the United States of America the free and unimpeded use without cost of all public roads within the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panamá, and of the Ancón Cove Dock, Taboga Island, and the roads leading therefrom, including the road to El Vigia Reservation, subject to the laws and regulations relating to vehicular traffic in force in the Republic of Panamá.

ARTICLE VIII

The Governments of the United States of America and the Republic of Panamá shall maintain in a suitable condition at all times those surfaced roads which are essential for the protection and security of the Republic of Panamá and the Panama Canal and for the maintenance of which they are respectively responsible. Whenever either Government is unable to perform its maintenance obligations, as undertaken in this Article, the other Government will cooperate in the making of such repairs as are determined by the Board constituted by Article IX of the present Convention to be essential to the road or roads involved. The cost of such repairs shall be borne by the Government originally responsible for maintenance under the terms of the present Convention.

ARTICLE IX

There is hereby constituted a Board, to be known as the Joint Highway Board, consisting of two qualified representatives appointed by each of the High Contracting Parties. It shall be the responsibility of the Board to advise the two Governments relative to matters and problems arising in connection with the execution of the provisions of the present Convention.

ARTICLE X

The provisions of the present Convention shall not affect the rights and obligations of either of the two High Contracting Parties under the treaties or other international agreements now in force between the two countries, nor be considered as a limitation, definition, restriction or restrictive interpretation of such rights and obligations, but without prejudice to the full force and effect of any provisions of the present Convention which constitute addition to, modification or abrogation of, or substitution for the provisions of previous treaties or other international agreements.

ARTICLE XI

1. The present Convention shall be ratified in accordance with the constitutional methods of the High Contracting Parties and shall enter into force immediately on the exchange of instruments of ratification which shall take place in Panamá.

2. The present Convention shall remain in force for twenty years and thereafter unless terminated in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 of this Article.

3. Either High Contracting Party may, by giving one year's written notice to the other High Contracting Party, terminate the present Convention at the end of the initial twenty-year period or at any time thereafter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention in duplicate in the English and Spanish languages, both texts being authentic, and have hereunto affixed their seals.

DONE at the city of Panamá the 14th day of September 1950.

For the United States of America:
[SEAL] MONNETT B. DAVIS
For the Republic of Panamá:
[SEAL] CARLOS N. BRIN

No. 408.

PANAMÁ, September 14, 1950

His Excellency Dr. CARLOS N. BRIN,
Minister for Foreign Affairs.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the Highway Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panamá which has been signed today at Panamá by the Plenipotentiaries of the two countries.

In accordance with the understanding reached by the Governments of the two countries in the course of the negotiation of the Highway Convention that, upon the signing of the Convention, the provisions of Point V of the General Relations Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Panamá, effected by exchange of notes dated May 18, 1942, should cease to be effective, the Government of the United States of America proposes that it be mutually agreed that Point V of that Agreement is terminated as of this date.

In order to safeguard the common interest of the two countries in the proper maintenance of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway, the Government of the United States of America further proposes that, by way of modus vivendi, pending the entry into force of the Highway Convention above-mentioned, it be mutually agreed by and between the Governments of the two countries as follows:

(a) The United States of America assumes the responsibility for maintenance, at its expense, of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway as defined in article I of the convention, it being understood that the Republic of Panamá, in order to make possible such maintenance, will cooperate in the manner specified in articles II to VI, inclusive, of the convention.

(b) The Republic of Panamá grants to the United States of America the free and unimpeded use without cost of all public roads within the Republic of Panamá and of the Ancón Cove Dock, Taboga Island, and the roads leading therefrom, including the road to El Vigia Reservation, subject to the laws and regulations relating to vehicular traffic in force in the Republic of Panamá.

In the event that, at the expiration of 3 years from the date o. this exchange of notes, the exchange of ratifications of the Highway Convention above-mentioned shall not have been accomplished, the provisions of this exchange of notes will be automatically terminated and will be the subject of further discussions between the two Governments.

The Government of the United States of America will consider this note and your reply note indicating the concurrence of your Government in the proposals set forth above as constituting an agreement between the two Governments with respect thereto, effective as of this date.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

MONNETT B. DAVIS.

[Translation]

[SEAL] D. P. No. 1443

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Panama, September 14, 1950.

His Excellency MONNETT B. DAVIS,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, City.

Mr. AMBASSADOR: I have the honor to refer to Your Excellency's courteous note No. 408, of this date, which reads as follows:

[Here follows a Spanish translation of the complete text of the American Ambassador's note, except the complimentary closing paragraph.]

In reply, I have the honor to state that the Government of the Republic of Panama considers the proposals set forth in Your Excellency's note to be acceptable, and that these two communications constitute an Agreement between the two Governments with respect thereto, effective as of this date.

I avail myself of the opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest and most distinguished consideration.

CARLOS N. BRIN,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the highway convention with Panama provides that the United States shall assume responsibility for the maintenance of the strategic Boyd-Roosevelt Trans-Isthmian Highway in the Republic of Panama. In return the United States is granted the free and unimpeded use without cost of all public roads within the jurisdiction of Panama and of the Ancon Cove Dock, Taboga Island and connecting roads.

The present convention was signed on September 14, 1950. At the same time a modus vivendi was entered into which embodies the main principles of the convention, terminates the highway provisions of the 1942 agreement on general relations between the United States and Panama, and will expire after 3 years unless the convention is ratified in the meantime.

The Trans-Isthmian Highway was built by the United States in Panamanian territory parallel to the Canal by agreement with Panama. After the completion of the highway, it was maintained by the United States until 1949 under another agreement discussed below. The total cost to the United States for construction and maintenance over these years was $9,000,000. The obligations and rights of both countries with relation to the public roads in Panama were set forth in two agreements between United States and Panama signed May 18, 1942, the first dealing with general relations and the second with defense sites.

The terms covering public roads in Panama in both agreements were identical. They provided that the United States should complete the Trans-Isthmian Highway and maintain it until the highway was stabilized. They also provided that the United States should pay one-third of the maintenance cost of all Panamanian roads used "periodically and frequently" by the United

States Armed Forces. In return for this commitment, the United States was granted the right of transit for the routine movement of its Armed Forces and other personnel and equipment engaged in the defense of the Panama Canal.

The new convention is very much needed. The highway provisions in the 1942 agreement served a wartime need, but they are no longer satisfactory. Accordingly they are terminated. The words "periodically or frequently," which proved contentious in that they were capable of many meanings, are omitted from the new convention. Differences also developed under this commitment over the amount properly chargeable by Panama to the United States. The Trans-Isthmian Highway during the period in which Panama was responsible for maintenance deteriorated, making a new agreement desirable. Finally, the critical world situation, which has caused the United States to strengthen its defenses generally, makes it urgently necessary for our Armed Forces to have the right to use the Panamanian roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive W, Eighty-first Congress, second session, the highway convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, signed at Panama on September 14, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA FOR PROMOTION OF SAFETY ON THE GREAT LAKES BY MEANS OF RADIO

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the agreement, Executive M (82d Cong., 2d sess.), an agreement between the United States of America and Canada signed at Ottawa on February 21, 1952, for promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio, which was read the second time, as follows:

AGREEMENT FOR THE PROMOTION OF SAFETY ON THE GREAT LAKES BY MEANS OF RADIO

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, being desirous of promoting safety of life and property on the Great Lakes of North America by means of radio, and believing that this purpose will be served by making provision in common agreement for radiotelephone communication for safety purposes, including radiotelephone communication as an aid to and instrument of navigation, and considering that this objective may best be achieved and maintained by the conclusion of an Agreement between the two Governments, have designated for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the United States of America:

Stanley Woodward,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America at Ottawa;
E. M. Webster,
Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission.

The Government of Canada:

Lionel Chevrier,
Minister of Transport.

who, having communicated to each other their respective Full Powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. The Contracting Governments undertake, by their respective constitutional procedures, to give effect to the provisions of this Agreement, for the purpose of promoting safety of life and property on the Great Lakes, and to take all steps which may be necessary to give this Agreement full and complete effect.

2. This Agreement shall apply to vessels of all countries, as provided in Article 3 of this Agreement.

3. The Regulations annexed to this Agreement are an integral part thereof, and every reference to this Agreement implies at the same time a reference to the Regulations unless the language or context of the reference clearly excludes the Regulations. The Regulations may be amended, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Agreement, by agreement between the two Governments.

4. Each Contracting Government agrees that any vessel which is not subject to this Agreement, and which is permitted by such Government to use any frequency designated by this Agreement, shall be required, while on the Great Lakes, to use such frequency in the same manner as a vessel subject to this Agreement.

5. No provision of this Agreement shall prevent the use by a vessel or survival craft in distresss of any means at its disposal to attract attention, make known its position, and obtain help.

ARTICLE 2—DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this Agreement, unless expressly provided otherwise:

1. "Approved" or "Approval" means, in relation to compliance with the terms of this Agreement by vessels of Canada and of the United States, approval by Canada and the United States, respectively, and in relation to vessels of other countries, approval by either Canada or the United States.

2. "Vessel" includes every description of watercraft or other artificial contrivance, except aircraft, used or capable of being used as a means of transportation on water, whether or not it is actually afloat.

3. "Passenger carrying vessel" means any vessel transporting persons for hire.

4. "Port" means any place to which vessels may resort for shelter or to load or unload passengers or goods or to obtain fuel, water, or supplies. This term shall apply to such places whether proclaimed public or not and whether natural or artificial.

5. "Great Lakes" means all of the Great Lakes, their connecting and tributary waters, and the River St. Lawrence as far east as the lower exist of the Lachine Canal and the Victoria Bridge at Montreal, but shall not include tributary rivers which are not also connecting rivers, and shall not include the Niagara River (including the Black Rock Canal).

6. "Mile" means a statute mile of 5,280 feet or 1,609 meters.

7. "Safety Convention" means the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (1929) and the Regulations annexed thereto, and the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (1948) and the Regulations annexed thereto as from the date the latter Convention and its annexed Regulations are brought into force in supersession of the former, and any other safety of life at sea convention and the regulations annexed thereto which may be brought into force between the Contracting Governments in supercession of the 1948 Convention and its annexed Regulations.

8. "Safety Radiotelephony Certificate", "Safety Radiotelegraphy Certificate", and "Safety Certificate" as referred to in paragraph 3 or Article 3 of this Agreement, mean certificates bearing those titles provided for by the Safety Convention.

9. "International Radio Regulations" means the Radio Regulations in force (General Radio Regulations, Cairo, 1938, and Radio Regulations, Atlantic City, 1947) annexed to the International Telecommunication Convention in force (Madrid, 1932, and Atlantic City, 1947) or any regulations which have been, or which from time to time in the future may be, substituted for such regulations.

10. "Regulations" means the regulations in force referred to in paragraph 3 of Article 1 of this Agreement.

11. "Radiotelephone installation" means a radio station (including the source of power necessary to energize the apparatus) capable of being used for the effective transmission and reception of speech for the purpose of quickly establishing and effectively carrying on radiotelephone communication in time of emergency or distress.

12. "Distress frequency" means the distress frequency designated for radiotelephony in the maritime mobile service by the International Radio Regulations or any frequency applicable to all stations of the maritime mobile service on the Great Lakes substituted therefor in the Regulations.

13. "Alarm signal" means the automatic alarm signal, if any, prescribed by the International Radio Regulations for radiotelephony, or any such signal substituted therefor in the Regulations.

14. "Auto Alarm" means a warning device which is capable of being actuated automatically by the alarm signal, and which complies with the Regulations.

ARTICLE 3

1. Except as provided in paragraph 2 of this Article, a vessel to which this Agreement applies generally, as stated in paragraph 2 of Article 1 of this Agreement, and which falls in any of the following specific categories, shall be subject to the requirements of this Agreement while being navigated on the Great Lakes outside of a port, or while being navigated on the St. Mary's River, the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, the Detroit River, the Welland Ship Canal, the River St. Lawrence as far east as the lower exit of the Lachine Canal and the Victoria Bridge at Montreal, and other restricted waters of the Great Lakes as may be specified in the Regulations

(a) Every vessel of 500 gross tons or over.

(b) Every passenger carrying vessel over 65 feet in length (measured from end to end over the deck exclusive of sheer).

(c) Every vessel under 500 gross tons engaged in towing another vessel of 500 gross tons or over or engaged in towing any other floating object having a dimension in any direction of 150 feet or more, unless the vessel so towed complies with the requirements of this Agreement.

2. A vessel which would otherwise be subject to the requirements of this Agreement as provided in paragraph 1 of this Article, shall nevertheless not be subject thereto if such vessel falls in any of the following specific categories:

(a) Ships of war and troop ships.

(b) Vessels in tow.

(c) Vessels not self-propelled by mechanical means.

(d) Vessels owned and operated by any Government and not engaged in trade.

(e) Any vessel engaged in towing another vessel in or out of a single port when such towage is not in excess of 30 miles outside such port.

(f) Any vessel towing another vessel engaged in the movement of material between a port and a dumping ground authorized by either Contracting Government when the dumping ground is not more than 30 miles outside such port.

(g) Any vessel navigated in connection with river or harbor improvement work or any marine construction when such navigation is within an area whose radius from the site of such river or harbor improvement work or marine construction is not greater than 30 miles.

3. In order to provide a means whereby a country, whether or not a party to this Agreement, may facilitate compliance with this Agreement on behalf of vessels belonging to it, for not more than two voyages on the Great Lakes in any calendar year, any such vessel which enters the Great Lakes from Montreal or below and proceeds above the lower exit of the Lachine Canal or the Victoria Bridge at Montreal for the sole purpose of engaging in a voyage between (a) one or more ports outside the Great Lakes and (b) one or more ports on the Great Lakes, shall be deemed to be in compliance with the technical radiotelephone requirements of this Agreement if such vessel has on board a radiotelephone installation which—

(i) meets the radio frequency requirements of this Agreement and the technical requirements of either this Agreement or the Safety Convention for radiotelephony, and

(ii) is carrying a Safety Radiotelephony Certificate issued to the vessel by the country to which it belongs, or a certificate issued by either of the countries party to this Agreement endorsed for operation on the Great Lakes.

The Safety Radiotelephony Certificate or the endorsed certificate tendered under these terms will be satisfactory for the purpose of this paragraph, even though the same vessel also carries a valid Safety Certificate or a valid Safety Radiotelegraphy Certificate.

ARTICLE 4—CASES OF FORCE MAJEURE

A vessel which is not subject to the provisions of this Agreement shall not become subject thereto due to stress of weather or any other cause of *force majeure*.

ARTICLE 5—COAST STATION LISTENING WATCH

Each Contracting Government undertakes to ensure that necessary arrangements are made for a listening watch by coast stations on the distress frequency.

ARTICLE 6—EXEMPTIONS

1. Each Contracting Government, if it considers that the conditions of the voyage or voyages affecting safety, including but not necessarily limited to the regularity or frequency of the voyages, the route or routes, the maximum distance of the vessel from shore, the length of voyage or voyages, and the absence of general navigation hazards, or other circumstances, are such as to render the full application of Articles 7, 8, and 9, or any of them, of this Agreement unreasonable or unnecessary, may exempt partially, conditionally, or completely from the provisions of Articles 7, 8, and 9, or any of them, any individual vessel for one or more voyages or for any period of time not exceeding one year from the date of exemption. Each Contracting Government shall promptly notify the other of each exemption that is granted and of the significant terms thereof.

2. Since the waters to which this Agreement applies are under the jurisdiction of Canada or the United States, the exemptions referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article may be granted only by the Contracting Governments, each for vessels of its own country and either for the vessels of other countries.

ARTICLE 7—OPERATORS AND LISTENING

1. While a vessel is subject to the requirements of this Agreement, as stated in Article 3 of this Agreement:

(a) There shall be on board, as an officer or member of the crew of vessel, at least one person whose qualifications for radiotelephone operation for safety purposes on the Great Lakes have been certified by the Contracting Governments, each for citizens of its own country for employment on vessels of that country, and either for persons for employment on vessels of other countries, as meeting the qualifications set forth in the Regulations.

(b) From among those certified persons, the master shall designate one or more who shall operate the radiotelephone installation. The duties of the persons so designated need not be restricted to duties in connection with the radiotelephone installation but may include any and all duties assigned them by the master.

(c) Except when the radiotelephone installation is being used to transmit or receive on frequencies authorized for the Maritime Mobile Service, there shall be continuous effective listening on the distress frequency by aural means by at least one officer or member of the crew of the vessel who has been designated by the master to perform such listening. The person so designated by the master may simultaneously perform other duties relating to the operation or navigation of the vessel, provided that such other duties do not interfere with the effectiveness of the listening.

(d) If the vessel is deprived of the services of the certified persons referred to in subparagraph (a) of this Article without fault or collusion of the master, the vessel may, as a matter of temporary expediency, proceed on her voyage, provided:

(i) The master shall exercise due diligence in an effort to obtain a qualified replacement before sailing and failing that shall exercise due diligence to obtain a qualified replacement as soon as practicable,

(ii) The qualified replacement is made at the destination of the vessel before proceeding on another voyage, and

(iii) In addition to the foregoing, the master shall within 12 hours after the time of arrival of the vessel at her destination, explain, in writing, the full particulars in the matter to the Contracting Government of the country to which such vessel belongs. If the vessel does not belong to the country of either Contracting Government, the master's written explanation shall be made to the Contracting Government of the country where the vessel's destination is located or to the Contracting Government in which the vessel's last port of call on the Great Lakes is located.

2. If and when a system, consisting of an alarm signal and an auto alarm apparatus actuated by such signal transmitted on the distress frequency, is adopted by both Canada and the United States for use on the Great Lakes, an approved auto alarm in operation may be substituted for the continuous, aural listening prescribed in paragraph 1 of this Article. Adoption of such system by both Canada and the United States for use on the Great Lakes, as well as the conditions under which it may be used, shall be accomplished by appropriate amendment of the Regulations.

ARTICLE 8—RADIOTELEPHONE INSTALLATION

1. Each vessel, while subject to the requirements of this Agreement, as stated in Article 3, shall, except as it may be exempted under Article 6, or except as may be otherwise provided by paragraph 3 of Article 3, be fitted with a radiotelephone installation in effective operating condition and approved as meeting the requirements set forth in the Regulations.

2. If while a vessel is subject to the requirements of this Agreement, as stated in Article 3, the vessel's radiotelephone installation ceases to be in effective operating condition, the master shall forthwith exercise due diligence to restore the radiotelephone installation to effective operating condition at the earliest practicable moment and, in any event, the effective operating condition of the radiotelephone installation shall be restored at the destination of the vessel before the vessel proceeds on another voyage. In addition to the foregoing, the master shall within 12 hours after the time of arrival of the vessel at her destination, explain, in writing, the full particulars in the matter to the Contracting Government of the country to which such vessel belongs. If the vessel does not belong to the country of either Contracting Government, the master's written explanation shall be made to the Contracting Government of the country where the vessel's destination is located or to the Contracting Government in which the vessel's last port of call on the Great Lakes is located.

ARTICLE 9—VESSEL RECORD

Each vessel, while subject to the requirements of this Agreement, as stated in Article 3 of the Agreement, shall, except as it may be exempted under Article 6, maintain such records of the use of the radiotelephone installation for safety purposes as may be required by the Regulations.

ARTICLE 10—AUTHORITY OF THE MASTER

The radiotelephone installation, its operation and all persons connected therewith, and the performance of the act of listening shall be under the supreme control of the master. The person holding this authority must comply with applicable law and international agreements and with rules and regulations made pursuant thereto.

ARTICLE 11—INSPECTIONS AND SURVEYS

1. So far as concerns the enforcement of this Agreement, the radiotelephone installations of all vessels subject to the provisions of this Agreement shall be subject to inspection from time to time. In addition, vessels subject to the provisions of this Agreement belonging to the countries of the Contracting Governments shall be subjected to a periodical survey of the radiotelephone installation not less than once every twelve months. This survey shall be made while the vessel is in active service or within not more than one month before the date on which it is placed in such service.

2. The inspection and survey of radiotelephone installations shall be carried out by officers of the Contracting Governments for their respective vessels. With respect to any vessel which belongs to any other country, such inspection shall be carried out by officers of the Contracting Government within whose jurisdiction such vessel first enters and thereafter by the Contracting Government having jurisdiction as determined by the location of the vessel at the time of any inspection deemed necessary by such Government.

3. Each Contracting Government may entrust the inspection and survey of the radio-

telephone installations either to surveyors nominated for this purpose or to organizations recognized by it. In every case the Contracting Government concerned fully guarantees the completeness and efficiency of the inspection and survey.

ARTICLE 12—CERTIFICATION AND PRIVILEGES

1. If, after appropriate inspection or survey made in accordance with Article 11, the Contracting Government responsible for the inspection or survey is satisfied that all relevant provisions of this Agreement have been complied with, including any exemption or conditions of exemption approved in accordance with Article 6, that fact shall be certified immediately after each such inspection or survey either on the vessel's radiotelephone station license or by means of another document as determined by the Contracting Government.

2. The certification prescribed by paragraph 1 of this Article shall be kept on board the vessel while the vessel is subject to the provisions of this Agreement and shall be available for inspection by the officers authorized by the Contracting Governments to make such inspections. Certifications issued under the authority of a Contracting Government shall be accepted by the other Contracting Government for all purposes covered by this Agreement.

ARTICLE 13—ISSUE OF CERTIFICATE ON REQUEST OF RESPONSIBLE ADMINISTRATION

Each of the Contracting Governments may, at the request of the other, cause a vessel for the survey of which the requesting Government is primarily responsible to be surveyed, and, if satisfied that the requirements of this Agreement are complied with, issue certificates to the vessel in accordance with the terms of this Agreement. Any certificate so issued must contain a statement to the effect that it has been issued at the request of the Government which made the request, and it shall have the same force and receive the same recognition as a certificate issued under Article 12 of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 14—CONTROL

1. Over and above the application of this Agreement as set forth in the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article 3 of this Agreement every vessel required by this Agreement to have a certificate issued by one Contracting Government in accordance with Article 12 or Article 13 is subject in the ports of the other Contracting Government to control by officers duly authorized by such Government insofar as this control is directed towards verifying that (a) there is on board a valid certification, (b) that the conditions of the radiotelephone apparatus correspond substantially with the particulars of that certification, and (c) that there are on board the necessary certificated personnel required by Article 7 of this Agreement.

2. In the event of this control giving rise to intervention of any kind, the authorities carrying out the control shall forthwith inform the appropriate authorities of the country to which the vessel belongs of all the circumstances in which intervention is deemed to be necessary.

ARTICLE 15—VESSELS OF COUNTRIES OTHER THAN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

To the extent permitted by their respective constitutional procedures, the Governments of Canada and the United States will undertake to assist the vessels of countries other than Canada and the United States in meeting the requirements of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 16—LAWS, REGULATIONS, REPORTS

The Contracting Governments undertake to communicate to each other:

(a) a sufficient number of specimens of their certifications under Article 12 and Article 13 for the information of their officers;

(b) the texts of laws, decrees, and regulations which shall have been promulgated on the various matters within the scope of this Agreement; and

(c) all available official reports or official summaries of reports insofar as they show the results of the provisions of this Agreement, provided always that such reports or summaries are not of a confidential nature.

ARTICLE 17—ENTRY INTO FORCE

This Agreement shall be ratified and instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Washington, D. C., as soon as possible. This Agreement shall come into force two years after the data on which the instruments of ratification are exchanged.

ARTICLE 18—DURATION AND TERMINATION

1. This Agreement may be terminated by either Contracting Government at any time after the expiration of five years from the date on which the Agreement comes into force. Termination shall be effected by a notification in writing from either Contracting Government to the other Contracting Government.

2. Termination of this Agreement shall take effect twelve months after the date on which notification thereof is received by the Contracting Government to which such notification is addressed.

In witness whereof, the above-named Plenipotentiaries have signed this Agreement and affixed thereto their respective seals.

Done in duplicate at Ottawa this 21st day of February, 1952.

For the Government of the United States of America:

STANLEY WOODWARD
E M WEBSTER

[SEAL]

For the Government of Canada:

LIONEL CHEVRIER

[SEAL]

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the purpose of the agreement, and its attached technical regulations, is to promote safety on the Great Lakes by requiring that authorized radio telephone equipment be installed on all Great Lakes shipping of 500 gross tons and over and on all passenger-carrying vessels over 65 feet in length in those waters; and to require that all such vessels and shore stations maintain constant listening watch on the distress-calling frequency—2,182 kilocycles. The agreement is effective on the Great Lakes and their navigable connecting tributary waters as far east as Montreal.

The committee recommends that the Senate give its advice and consent to the ratification of the agreement. Only the intervention of World War II prevented an agreement for that purpose from being drawn up and entered into long before this. As noted above, in 1937 the congressional committees expressed the hope and expectation that the United States in agreement with Canada would soon prescribe the use of radio equipment for safety purposes for ships on the Great Lakes. And now that such an agreement is submitted for Senate advice and consent to ratification, the committee knows of no opposition to favorable Senate action.

The convention prescribes safety provisions for the Great Lakes comparable to those now applicable to the high seas. In effect the convention here under consideration complements the provisions of the recent agreements governing the safety of life at sea to which the Senate has agreed that the United States should become a party. This agreement is in the interests of the United States and the safety of its people and therefore the committee recommends favorable action by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the agreement will be reported to the Senate.

The agreement was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive M, Eighty-second Congress, second session, an agreement between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa on February 21, 1952, for the promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the agreement.

CONVENTIONS RELATING TO WORKING CONDITIONS ON SEAGOING VESSELS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to call up four conventions, Calendar Nos. 16, 17, 18, and 19, being Executive R, Executive S, Executive Y, and Executive Z.

These conventions all relates to working standards on seagoing vessels. They were recommended by the International Labor Convention, of which this country has been a member since 1938. Some of them have already been adopted by as many as eight foreign nations. We should not hesitate to join, inasmuch as they do not affect the working conditions on our ships, because our standards are higher than those elsewhere. Our interest is in raising the standards on foreign competing vessels. The conventions serve to bring about that result in the different categories.

In order to avoid misunderstanding, let me say that we do not recommend any amendments or any reservations; but we do recommend certain understandings, so that it may be clear that the conventions do not relate either to inland waters such as the Great Lakes or to coastwise vessels. We consider it sufficient to state the understandings in the form in which they are stated. The understandings have been drafted and attached to certain of the four covenants where they belong.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION (NO. 68) CONCERNING FOOD AND CATERING FOR CREWS ON BOARD SHIP

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive R (80th Cong., 1st sess.), an international convention concerning food and catering for crews on board ship, adopted on June 27, 1946,

which was read the second time, as follows:

EXECUTIVE R. (EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION)

CONVENTION (NO. 68) CONCERNING FOOD AND CATERING FOR CREWS ON BOARD SHIP

The General Conference of the International Labor Organization—

Having been convened at Seattle by the Governing Body of the International Labor Office, and having met in its Twenty-eighth Session on June 6, 1946, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to food and catering for crews on board ship, which is the fourth item on the agenda of the Session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of an International Convention,

adopts this twenty-seventh day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-six the following Convention which may be cited as the Food and Catering (Ships' Crews) Convention, 1946:

Article 1

1. Every Member of the International Labor Organization for which this Convention is in force is responsible for the promotion of a proper standard of food supply and catering service for the crews of its sea-going vessels, whether publicly or privately owned, which are engaged in the transport of cargo or passengers for the purpose of trade and registered in a territory for which this Convention is in force.

2. National laws or regulations or, in the absence of such laws or regulations, collective agreements between employers and workers, shall determine the vessels or classes of vessels which are to be regarded as seagoing vessels for the purpose of this Convention.

Article 2

The following functions shall be discharged by the competent authority, except insofar as these function are adequately discharged in virtue of collective agreements:

(*a*) the framing and enforcement of regulations concerning food and water supplies, catering, and the construction, location, ventilation, heating, lighting, water system and equipment of galleys and other catering department spaces on board ship, including store rooms and refrigerated chambers;

(*b*) the inspection of food and water supplies and of the accommodation, arrangements and equipment on board ship for the storage, handling and preparation of food;

(*c*) the certification of such members of the catering department staff as are required to possess prescribed qualifications;

(*d*) research into, and educational and propaganda work concerning, methods of ensuring proper food supply and catering service.

Article 3

1. The competent authority shall work in close co-operation with the organisations of shipowners and seafarers and with national or local authorities concerned with questions of food and health, and may where necessary utilise the services of such authorities.

2. The activities of the various authorities shall be duly coordinated so as to avoid overlapping or uncertainty of jurisdiction.

Article 4

The competent authority shall have a permanent staff of qualified persons, including inspectors.

Article 5

1. Each Member shall maintain in force laws or regulations concerning food supply and catering arrangements designed to secure the health and well-being of the crews of the vessels mentioned in Article 1.

2. These laws or regulations shall require—

(*a*) the provision of food and water supplies which, having regard to the size of the crew and the duration and nature of the voyage, are suitable in respect of quantity, nutritive value, quality and variety;

(*b*) the arrangement and equipment of the catering department in every vessel in such a manner as to permit of the service of proper meals to the members of the crew.

Article 6

National laws or regulations shall provide for a system of inspection by the competent authority of—

(*a*) supplies of food and water;

(*b*) all spaces and equipment used for the storage and handling of food and water;

(*c*) galley and other equipment for the preparation and service of meals; and

(*d*) the qualification of such members of the catering department of the crew as are required by such laws or regulations to possess prescribed qualifications.

Article 7

1. National laws or regulations or, in the absence of such laws or regulations, collective agreements between employers and workers shall provide for inspection at sea at prescribed intervals by the master, or an officer specially deputed for the purpose by him, together with a responsible member of the catering department of—

(*a*) supplies of food and water;

(*b*) all spaces and equipment used for the storage and handling of food and water, and galley and other equipment for the preparation and service of meals.

2. The results of each inspection shall be recorded.

Article 8

A special inspection shall be made by the representatives of the competent authority of the territory of registration on written complaint made by a number or proportion of the crew prescribed by national laws or regulations or on behalf of a recognised organisation of shipowners or seafarers. In order to avoid delay in sailing, such complaints should be submitted as soon as possible and at least twenty-four hours before the scheduled time of departure from port.

Article 9

1. Inspectors shall have authority to make recommendations to the owner of a ship, or to the master or other person responsible, with a view to the improvement of the standard of catering.

2. National laws or regulations shall prescribe penalties for—

(*a*) failure by an owner, master, member of the crew, or other person responsible to comply with the requirements of the national laws or regulations in force; and

(*b*) any attempt to obstruct an inspector in the discharge of his duties.

3. Inspectors shall submit regularly to the competent authority reports framed on uniform lines dealing with their work and its results.

Article 10

1. The component authority shall prepare an annual report.

2. The annual report shall be issued as soon as practicable after the end of the year to which it relates and shall be made readily available to all bodies and persons concerned.

3. Copies of the annual report shall be transmitted to the International Labour Office.

Article 11

1. Courses of training for employment in the catering department of sea-going ships shall be organised either in approved schools or by means of other arrangements acceptable to both shipowners' and seafarers organisations.

2. Facilities shall be provided for refresher courses to enable persons already trained to bring their knowledge and skill up to date.

Article 12

1. The competent authority shall collect up-to-date information on nutrition and on methods of purchasing, storing, preserving, cooking and serving food, with special reference to the requirements of catering on board ship.

2. This information shall be made available, free of charge or at reasonable cost, to manufacturers of and traders in ships' food supplies and equipment, ships' masters, stewards and cooks, and shipowners and seafarers and their organisations generally; appropriate forms of publicity, such as manuals, brochures, posters, charts or advertisements in trade journals shall be used for this purpose.

3. The competent authority shall issue recommendations to avoid wastage of food, facilitate the maintenance of a proper standard of cleanliness, and ensure the maximum practicable convenience in working.

Article 13

Any of the functions of the competent authority in respect of the certification of catering department staff and the collection and distribution of information may be discharged by delegating the work, or part of it, to a central organisation or authority exercising similar functions in respect of seafarers generally.

Article 14

The formal ratifications of this Convention shall be communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration.

Article 15

1. This Convention shall be binding only upon those Members of the International Labour Organisation whose ratifications have been registered with the Director.

2. It shall come into force six months after the date on which there have been registered ratifications by nine of the following countries: United States of America, Argentine Republic, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, Finland, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece, India, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey and Yugoslavia, including at least five countries each of which has at least one million gross register tons of shipping. This provision is included for the purpose of facilitating and encouraging early ratification of the Convention by Member States.

3. Thereafter, this Convention shall come into force for any Member six months after the date on which its ratification has been registered.

Article 16

1. A Member which has ratified this Convention may denounce it after the expiration of ten years from the date on which the Convention comes into force, by an act communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration. Such denunciation shall not take effect until one year after the date on which it is registered.

2. Each Member which has ratified this Convention and which does not, within the year following the expiration of the period of ten years mentioned in the preceding paragraph, exercise the right of denunciation provided for in this Article, will be bound for another period of ten years and, thereafter, may denounce this Convention at the expiration of each period of ten years under the terms provided for in this Article.

Article 17

1. The Director of the International Labour Office shall notify all the Members of the International Labor Organisation of the

registration of all ratifications and denunciations communicated to him by the Members of the Organisation.

2. When notifying the Members of the Organisation of the registration of the last of the ratifications required to bring the Convention into force, the Director shall draw the attention of the Members of the Organisation to the date upon which the Convention will come into force.

Article 18

The Director of the International Labour Office shall communicate to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations full particulars of all ratifications and acts of denunciation registered by him in accordance with the provisions of the preceding Articles.

Article 19

At the expiration of each period of ten years after the coming into force of this Convention, the Governing Body of the International Labour Office shall present to the General Conference a report on the working of this Convention and shall consider the desirability of placing on the agenda of the Conference the question of its revision in whole or in part.

Article 20

1. Should the Conference adopt a new Convention revising this Convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new Convention otherwise provides—

(*a*) the ratification by a Member of the new revising Convention shall *ipso jure* involve the immediate denunciation of this Convention, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 16 above, if and when the new revising Convention shall have come into force;

(*b*) as from the date when the new revising Convention comes into force this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members.

2. This Convention shall in any case remain in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

Article 21

The English and French versions of the text of this Convention are equally authoritative.

The foregoing is the authentic text of the Convention duly adopted by the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation during its Twenty-eighth Session which was held at Seattle and declared closed the twenty-ninth day of June 1946.

In faith whereof we have appended our signatures this thirtieth day of August 1946.

The President of the Conference,
HENRY M. JACKSON
The Acting Director of the International Labour Office,
EDWARD J. PHELAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification with the understanding will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive R, Eightieth Congress, first session, Convention (No. 68) concerning food and catering for crews on board ship, with the following understanding:

It is the understanding of the Government of the United States of America that the words "seagoing vessel" appearing in this Convention, shall mean a merchant vessel which in the usual course of her employment proceeds outside the line dividing the inland waters from the high seas as defined under section 2 of the Act of February 19, 1895, 28 Stat. 672, as amended (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 151).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the understanding to the resolution of ratification.

The understanding was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution with the understanding. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution, with the understanding, is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION (NO. 69) CONCERNING THE CERTIFICATION OF SHIPS' COOKS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive S (80th Cong., 1st sess.) an international convention concerning the certification of ships' cooks, adopted on June 27, 1946, which was read the second time, as follows:

EXECUTIVE S (EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION)

CONVENTION (NO. 69) CONCERNING THE CERTIFICATION OF SHIPS' COOKS

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

Having been convened at Seattle by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Twenty-eighth Session on 6 June 1946, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to the certification of ships' cooks, which is included in the fourth item on the agenda of the Session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of an International Convention,

adopts this twenty-seventh day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-six the following Convention which may be cited as the Certification of Ships' Cooks Convention, 1946:

Article 1

1. This Convention applies to sea-going vessels, whether publicly or privately owned, which are engaged, in the transport of cargo or passengers for the purpose of trade and registered in a territory for which this Convention is in force.

2. National laws or regulations or, in the absence of such laws or regulations, collective agreements between employers and workers shall determine the vessels or classes of vessels which are to be regarded as seagoing vessels for the purpose of this Convention.

Article 2

For the purpose of this Convention the term "ship's cook" means the person directly responsible for the preparation of meals for the crew of the ship.

Article 3

1. No person shall be engaged as ship's cook on board any vessel to which this Convention applies unless he holds a certificate of qualification as ship's cook granted in accordance with the provisions of the following articles.

2. Provided that the competent authority may grant exemptions from the provisions of this Article if in its opinion there is an inadequate supply of certificated ship's cooks.

Article 4

1. The competent authority shall make arrangements for the holding of examinations and for the granting of certificates of qualification.

2. No person shall be granted a certificate of qualification unless—

(*a*) he has reached a minimum age to be prescribed by the competent authority;

(*b*) he has served at sea for a minimum period to be prescribed by the competent authority; and

(*c*) he has passed an examination to be prescribed by the competent authority.

3. The prescribed examination shall provide a practical test of the candidate's ability to prepare meals; it shall also include a test of his knowledge of food values, the drawing up of varied and properly balanced menus, and the handling and storage of food on board ship.

4. The prescribed examination may be conducted and certificates granted either directly by the competent authority or, subject to its control, by an approved school for the training of cooks or other approved body.

Article 5

Article 3 of this Convention shall apply after the expiration of a period not exceeding three years from the date of entry into force of the Convention for the territory where the vessel is registered: Provided that, in the case of a seaman who has had a satisfactory record of two years' service as cook before the expiration of the aforesaid period, national laws or regulations may provide for the acceptance of a certificate of such service as equivalent to a certificate of qualification.

Article 6

The competent authority may provide for the recognition of certificates of qualification issued in other territories.

Article 7

The formal ratifications of this Convention shall be communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration.

Article 8

1. This Convention shall be binding only upon those Members of the International Labour Organisation whose ratifications have been registered with the Director.

2. It shall come into force six months after the date on which there have been registered ratifications by nine of the following countries: United States of America, Argentine Republic, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Demark, Finland, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece, India, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey and Yugoslavia, including at least five countries each of which has at least one million gross register tons of shipping. This provision is included for the purpose of facilitating and encouraging early ratification of the Convention by Member States.

3. Thereafter, this Convention shall come into force for any Member six months after the date on which its ratification has been registered.

Article 9

1. A Member which has ratified this Convention may denounce it after the expiration of ten years from the date on which the Convention comes into force, by an act communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration. Such denunciation shall not take effect until one year after the date on which it is registered.

2. Each Member which has ratified this Convention and which does not, within the year following the expiration of the period of ten years mentioned in the preceding paragraph, exercise the right of denunciation provided for in this Article, will be bound for another period of ten years and, thereafter, may denounce this Convention at the expiration of each period of ten years under the terms provided for in this article.

Article 10

1. The Director of the International Labour Office shall notify all the Members of the International Labour Organisation of the registration of all ratifications and denunciations communicated to him by the Members of the Organisation.

2. When notifying the Members of the Organisation of the registration of the last of the ratifications required to bring the Convention into force, the Director shall draw the attention of the Members of the Organisation to the date upon which the Convention will come into force.

Article 11

The Director of the International Labour Office shall communicate to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations full particulars of all ratifications and acts of denunciation registered by him in accordance with the provisions of the preceding articles.

Article 12

At the expiration of each period of ten years after the coming into force of this Convention, the Governing Body of the International Labour Office shall present to the General Conference a report on the working of this Convention and shall consider the desirability of placing on the agenda of the Conference the question of its revision in whole or in part.

Article 13

1. Should the Conference adopt a new Convention revising this Convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new Convention otherwise provides—

(*a*) the ratification by a Member of the new revising Convention shall *ipso jure* involve the immediate denunciation of this Convention, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 9 above, if and when the new revising Convention shall have come into force;

(*b*) as from the date when the new revising Convention comes into force this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members.

2. This Convention shall in any case remain in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

Article 14

The English and French versions of the text of this Convention are equally authoritative.

The foregoing is the authentic text of the Convention duly adopted by the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation during its Twenty-eighth Session which was held at Seattle and declared closed the twenty-ninth day of June 1946.

IN FAITH WHEREOF we have appended our signatures this thirtieth day of August 1946.

The President of the Conference,
HENRY M. JACKSON
The Acting Director of the International Labour Office,
EDWARD J. PHELAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification with the understanding will be read.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive S, Eightieth Congress, first session, Convention (No. 69) Concerning the Certification of Ships' Cooks, with the following understanding:

It is the understanding of the Government of the United States of America that the words "seagoing vessel" appearing in this convention, shall mean a merchant vessel which in the usual course of her employment proceeds outside the line dividing the inland waters from the high seas as defined under section 2 of the act of February 19, 1895, 28 Stat. 672, as amended (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 151).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the understanding to the resolution of ratification.

The understanding was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution with the understanding. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution, with the understanding, is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

CONVENTION (NO. 73) CONCERNING THE MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF SEAFARERS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive Y (80th Cong., 1st sess.), an international convention concerning the medical examination of seafarers, adopted on June 29, 1946, which was read the second time, as follows:

EXECUTIVE Y (EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION)

CONVENTION (NO. 73) CONCERNING THE MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF SEAFARERS

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,

Having been convened at Seattle by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Twenty-eighth Session on 6 June 1946, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to the medical examination of seafarers, which is included in the fifth item on the agenda of the Session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of an International Convention,

adopts this twenty-ninth day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-six the following Convention, which may be cited as the Medical Examination (Seafarers) Convention, 1946:

Article 1

1. This Convention applies to every seagoing vessel, whether publicly or privately owned, which is engaged in the transport of cargo or passengers for the purpose of trade and is registered in a territory for which this Convention is in force.

2. National laws or regulations shall determine when vessels are to be regarded as sea-going.

3. This Convention does not apply to—

(*a*) vessels of less than 200 tons gross register tonnage;

(*b*) wooden vessels of primitive build such as dhows and junks;

(*c*) fishing vessels;

(*d*) estuarial craft.

Article 2

Without prejudice to the steps which should be taken to ensure that the persons mentioned below are in good health and not likely to endanger the health of other persons on board, this Convention applies to every person who is engaged in any capacity on board a vessel except—

(*a*) a pilot (not a member of the crew);

(*b*) persons employed on board by an employer other than the shipowner, except radio officers or operators, in the service of a wireless telegraphy company;

(*c*) traveling dockers (longshoremen) not members of the crew;

(*d*) persons employed in ports who are not ordinarily employed at sea.

Article 3

1. No person to whom this Convention applies shall be engaged for employment in a vessel to which this Convention applies unless he produces a certificate attesting to his fitness for the work for which he is to be employed at sea signed by a medical practitioner or, in the case of a certificate solely concerning his sight, by a person authorized by the competent authority to issue such a certificate.

2. Provided that, for a period of two years from the date of the entry into force of this Convention for the territory concerned, a person may be so engaged if he produces evidence that he has been employed in a sea-going vessel to which this Convention applies for a substantial period during the previous two years.

Article 4

1. The competent authority shall, after consultation with the shipowners' and seafarers' organisations concerned, prescribe the nature of the medical examination to be made and the particulars to be included in the medical certificate.

2. When prescribing the nature of the examination, due regard shall be had to the age of the person to be examined and the nature of the duties to be performed.

3. In particular, the medical certificate shall attest—

(*a*) that the hearing and sight of the person and, in the case of a person to be employed in the deck department (except for certain specialist personnel, whose fitness for the work which they are to perform is not liable to be affected by defective colour vision), his colour vision, are all satisfactory; and

(*b*) that he is not suffering from any disease likely to be aggravated by, or to render him unfit for, service at sea or likely to endanger the health of other persons on board.

Article 5

1. The medical certificate shall remain in force for a period not exceeding two years from the date on which it was granted.

2. In so far as a medical certificate relates to colour vision it shall remain in force for a period not exceeding six years from the date on which it was granted.

3. If the period of validity of a certificate expires in the course of a voyage the certificate shall continue in force until the end of that voyage.

Article 6

1. In urgent cases the competent authority may allow a person to be employed for a single voyage without having satisfied the requirements of the preceding articles.

2. In such cases the terms and conditions of employment shall be the same as those of seafarers in the same category holding a medical certificate.

3. Employment in virtue of this Article shall not be deemed on any subsequent occasion to be previous employment for the purpose of Article 3.

Article 7

The competent authority may provide for the acceptance in substitution for a medical certificate of evidence in a prescribed form that the required certificate has been given.

Article 8

Arrangements shall be made to enable a person who, after examination, has been refused a certificate to apply for a further examination by a medical referee or referees who shall be independent of any shipowner or of any organisation of shipowners or seafarers.

Article 9

Any of the functions of the competent authority under this Convention may, after consultation with the organisations of shipowners and seafarers, be discharged by delegating the work, or part of it, to an organisation or authority exercising similar functions in respect of seafarers generally.

Article 10

The formal ratifications of this Convention shall be communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration.

Article 11

1. This Convention shall be binding only upon those Members of the International Labour Organisation whose ratifications have been registered with the Director.

2. It shall come into force six months after the date on which there have been registered ratifications by seven of the following countries: United States of America, Argentine Republic, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, Finland, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece, India, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey and Yugoslavia, including at least four countries each of which has at least one million gross register tons of shipping. This provision is included for the purpose of facilitating and encouraging early ratification of the Convention by Member States.

3. Thereafter, this Convention shall come into force for any Member six months after the date on which its ratification has been registered.

Article 12

1. A Member which has ratified this Convention may denounce it after the expiration of ten years from the date on which the Convention comes into force, by an act communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration. Such denunciation shall not take effect until one year after the date on which it is registered.

2. Each Member which has ratified this Convention and which does not, within the year following the expiration of the period of ten years mentioned in the preceding paragraph, exercise the right of denunciation provided for in this Article, will be bound for another period of ten years and, thereafter, may denounce this Convention at the expiration of each period of ten years under the terms provided for in this Article.

Article 13

1. The Director of the International Labour Office shall notify all the Members of the International Labour Organisation of the registration of all ratifications and denunciations communicated to him by the Members of the Organisation.

2. When notifying the Members of the Organisation of the registration of the last of the ratifications required to bring the Convention into force, the Director shall draw the attention of the Members of the Organisation to the date upon which the Convention will come into force.

Article 14

The Director of the International Labour Office shall communicate to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations full particulars of all ratifications and acts of denunciation registered by him in accordance with the provisions of the preceding articles.

Article 15

At the expiration of each period of ten years after the coming into force of this Convention, the Governing Body of the International Labour Office shall present to the General Conference a report on the working of this Convention and shall consider the desirability of placing on the agenda of the Conference the question of its revision in whole or in part.

Article 16

1. Should the Conference adopt a new Convention revising this Convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new Convention otherwise provides,

(*a*) the ratification by a Member of the new revising Convention shall *ipso jure* involve the immediate denunciation of this Convention, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 12 above, if and when the new revising Convention shall have come into force;

(*b*) as from the date when the new revising Convention comes into force this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members.

2. This Convention shall in any case remain in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

Article 17

The English and French versions of the text of this Convention are equally authoritative.

The foregoing is the authentic text of the Convention duly adopted by the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation during its Twenty-eighth Session which was held at Seattle and declared closed the twenty-ninth day of June 1946.

IN FAITH WHEREOF we have appended our signatures this thirtieth day of August 1946.

The President of the Conference,
HENRY M. JACKSON
The Acting Director of the Internal Labour Office,
EDWARD J. PHELAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of ratification with the understanding will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive Y, Eightieth Congress, first session, Convention (No. 73) Concerning the Medical Examination of Seafarers, with the following understanding:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the United States of America that the words 'seagoing vessel' appearing in this convention, shall mean a merchant vessel which in the usual course of her employment proceeds outside the line dividing the inland waters from the high seas as defined under section 2 of the act of February 19, 1895 (28 Stat. 672), as amended (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 151)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the understanding to the resolution of ratification.

The understanding was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification with the understanding. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification, with the understanding, is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

CONVENTION (NO. 74) CONCERNING THE CERTIFICATION OF ABLE SEAMEN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive Z (80th Cong., 1st sess.), an international convention concerning the certification of able seamen, adopted on June 29, 1946, which was read the second time, as follows:

EXECUTIVE Z (EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION)

CONVENTION (NO. 74) CONCERNING THE CERTIFICATION OF ABLE SEAMEN

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,

Having been convened at Seattle by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Twenty-eighth Session on 6 June 1946, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to the certification of able seamen, which is included in the fifth item on the agenda on the Session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of an International Convention,

adopts this twenty-ninth day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-six the following Convention which may be cited as the Certification of Able Seamen Convention, 1946:

Article 1

No person shall be engaged on any vessel as an able seaman unless he is a person who by national laws or regulations is deemed to be competent to perform any duty which may be required of a member of the crew serving in the deck department (other than an officer or leading or specialist rating) and unless he holds a certificate of qualification as an able seaman granted in accordance with the provisions of the following articles.

Article 2

1. The competent authority shall make arrangements for the holding of examinations and for the granting of certificates of qualification.

2. No person shall be granted a certificate of qualification unless—

(*a*) he has reached a minimum age to be prescribed by the competent authority;

(*b*) he has served at sea in the deck department for a minimum period to be prescribed by the competent authority; and

(*c*) he has passed an examination of proficiency to be prescribed by the competent authority.

3. The prescribed minimum age shall not be less than eighteen years.

4. The prescribed minimum period of service at sea shall not be less than thirty-six months. Provided that the competent authority may—

(*a*) permit persons with a period of actual service at sea of not less than twenty-four months who have successfully passed through a course of training in an approved training school to reckon the time spent in such training, or part thereof, as sea service; and

(*b*) permit persons trained in approved sea-going training ships who have served eighteen months in such ships to be certificated as able seamen upon leaving in good standing.

5. The prescribed examination shall provide a practical test of the candidate's knowledge of seamanship and of his ability to carry out effectively all the duties that may be required of an able seaman, including those of a lifeboatman; it shall be such as to qualify a successful candidate to hold the special lifeboatman's certificate provided for in Article 22 of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1929, or in the corresponding provision of any subsequent Convention revising or replacing that Convention for the time being in force for the territory concerned.

Article 3

A certificate of qualification may be granted to any person who, at the time of the entry into force of this Convention for the territory concerned, is performing the full duties of an able seaman or leading deck rating or has performed such duties.

Article 4

The competent authority may provide for the recognition of certificates of qualification issued in other territories.

Article 5

The formal ratifications of this Convention shall be communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration.

Article 6

1. This Convention shall be binding only upon those Members of the International Labour Organisation whose ratifications have been registered with the Director.

2. It shall come into force twelve months after the date on which the ratifications of two Members have been registered with the Director.

3. Thereafter, this Convention shall come into force for any Member twelve months after the date on which its ratification has been registered.

Article 7

1. A Member which has ratified this Convention may denounce it after the expiration of ten years from the date on which the Convention comes into force, by an act communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration. Such denunciation shall not take effect until one year after the date on which it is registered.

2. Each Member which has ratified this Convention and which does not, within the year following the expiration of the period of ten years mentioned in the preceding paragraph, exercise the right of denunciation provided for in this Article, will be bound for another period of ten years and, thereafter, may denounce this Convention at the expiration of each period of ten years under the terms provided for in this Article.

Article 8

1. The Director of the International Labour Office shall notify all the Members of the International Labour Organisation of the registration of all ratifications and denunciations communicated to him by the Members of the Organisation.

2. When notifying the Members of the Organisation of the registration of the second ratification communicated to him, the Director shall draw the attention of the Members of the Organisation to the date upon which the Convention will come into force.

Article 9

The Director of the International Labour Office shall communicate to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations full particulars of all ratifications and acts of denunciation registered by him in accordance with the provisions of the preceding articles.

Article 10

At the expiration of each period of ten years after the coming into force of this Convention, the Governing Body of the International Labour Office shall present to the General Conference a report on the working of this Convention and shall consider the desirability of placing on the agenda of the Conference the question of its revision in whole or in part.

Article 11

1. Should the Conference adopt a new Convention revising this Convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new Convention otherwise provides—

(*a*) the ratification by a Member of the new revising Convention shall *ipso jure* involve the immediate denunciation of this Convention notwithstanding the provisions of Article 7 above, if and when the new revising Convention shall have come into force;

(*b*) as from the date when the new revising Convention comes into force this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members.

2. This Convention shall in any case remain in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

Article 12

The English and French versions of the text of this Convention are equally authoritative.

The foregoing is the authentic text of the Convention duly adopted by the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation during its Twenty-eighth Session which was held at Seattle and declared closed the twenty-ninth day of June 1946.

IN FAITH WHEREOF we have appended our signatures this thirtieth day of August 1946.

The President of the Conference,
HENRY M. JACKSON

The Acting Director of the International Labour Office,
EDWARD J. PHELAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification with the understandings will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive Z, Eightieth Congress, first session, Convention (No. 74) Concerning the Certification of Able Seamen, with the following understandings:

It is the understanding of the Government of the United States of America that nothing in this convention will interfere with the practice in the United States of America of issuing limited certificates as able seamen to persons of less service or training than prescribed in the convention and of the signing on such persons, who are considered as holding an intermediate rating which is outside the terms of the convention; and

It is the understanding of the Government of the United States of America that this convention shall apply to seagoing vessels only, and that for this purpose the words "seagoing vessel" shall mean a merchant vessel of more than 100 gross tons, which in the usual course of her employment proceeds outside the line dividing the inland waters from the high seas as defined under section 2 of the act of February 19, 1895, 28 Stat. 672, as amended (U. S. C. title 33, sec. 151).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the understanding to the resolution of ratification.

The understanding was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution with the understandings. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution, with the understandings, is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE HIGH SEAS FISHERIES OF THE NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN WITH A PROTOCOL RELATING THERETO

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive S (82d Cong., 2d sess.), an international convention for the high seas fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Tokyo, May 9, 1952, on behalf of the United States, Canada, and Japan, which was read the second time, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE HIGH SEAS FISHERIES OF THE NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN

The Governments of the United States of America, Canada, and Japan, whose respective duly accredited representatives have subscribed hereto.

Acting as sovereign nations in the light of their rights under the principles of international law and custom to exploit the fishery resources of the high seas, and

Believing that it will best serve the common interest of mankind, as well as the interests of the Contracting Parties, to ensure the maximum sustained productivity of the fishery resources of the North Pacific Ocean, and that each of the Parties should assume an obligation, on a free and equal footing, to encourage the conservation of such resources, and

Recognizing that in view of these considerations it is highly desirable (1) to establish an International Commission, representing the three Parties hereto, to promote and coordinate the scientific studies necessary to ascertain the conservation measures required to secure the maximum sustained productivity of fisheries of joint interest to the Contracting Parties and to recommend such measures to such Parties and (2) that each Party carry out such conservation recommendations, and provide for necessary restraints on its own nationals and fishing vessels,

Therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. The area to which this Convention applies, hereinafter referred to as "the Convention area", shall be all waters, other than territorial waters, of the North Pacific Ocean which for the purposes hereof shall include the adjacent seas.

2. Nothing in this Convention shall be deemed to affect adversely (prejudice) the claims of any Contracting Party in regard to the limits of territorial waters or to the jurisdiction of a coastal state over fisheries.

3. For the purposes of this Convention the term "fishing vessel" shall mean any vessel engaged in catching fish or processing or transporting fish loaded on the high seas, or any vessel outfitted for such activities.

ARTICLE II

1. In order to realize the objectives of this Convention, the Contracting Parties shall establish and maintain the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, hereinafter referred to as "the Commission."

2. The Commission shall be composed of three national sections, each consisting of not more than four members appointed by the governments of the respective Contracting Parties.

3. Each national section shall have one vote. All resolutions, recommendations and other decisions of the Commission shall be made only by a unanimous vote of the three national sections except when under the provisions of Article III, Section 1 (c) (ii) only two participate.

4. The Commission may decide upon and amend, as occasion may require, by-laws or rules for the conduct of its meetings.

5. The Commission shall meet at least once each year and at such other times as may be requested by a majority of the national sections. The date and place of the first meeting shall be determined by agreement between the Contracting Parties.

6. At its first meeting the Commission shall select a Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary from different national sections. The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary shall hold office for a period of one year. During succeeding years selection of a Chairmany, Vice-Chairman and Secretary from the national sections shall be made in such a manner as will provide each Contracting Party in turn with representation in those offices.

7. The Commission shall decide on a convenient place for the establishment of the Commission's headquarters.

8. Each Contracting Party may establish an Advisory Committee for its national section, to be composed of persons who shall be well informed concerning North Pacific fishery problem of common concern. Each such Advisory Committee shall be involved to attend all sessions of the Commission except those which the Commission decides to be in camera.

9. The Commission may hold public hearings. Each national section may also hold public hearings within its own country.

10. The official languages of the Commission shall be Japanese and English. Proposals and data may be submitted to the Commission in either language.

11. Each contracting Party shall determine and pay the expenses incurred by its national section. Joint expenses incurred by the Commission shall be paid by the Commission through contributions made by the Contracting Parties in the form and proportion recommended by the Commission and approved by the Contracting Parties.

12. An annual budget of joint expenses shall be recommended by the Commission and submitted to the Contracting Parties for approval.

13. The Commission shall authorize the disbursement of funds for the joint expenses of the Commission and may employ personnel and acquire facilities necessary for the performance of its functions.

ARTICLE III

1. The Commission shall perform the following functions:

(a) In regard to any stock of fish specified in the Annex, study for the purpose of determining annually whether such stock continues to qualify for abstention under the provisions of Article IV. If the Commission determines that such stock no longer meets the conditions of Article IV, the Commission shall recommend that it be removed from the Annex. Provided, however, that with respect to the stocks of fish originally specified in the Annex, no determination or recommendation as to whether such stock continues to qualify for abstention shall be made for five years after the entry into force of this Convention.

(b) To permit later additions to the Annex, study, on request of a Contracting Party, any stock of fish of the Convention area, the greater part of which is harvested by one or more of the Contracting Parties, for the purpose of determining whether such stock qualifies for abstention under the provisions of Article IV. If the Commission decides that the particular stock fulfills the conditions of Article IV it shall recommend, (1) that such stock be added to the Annex, (2) that the appropriate Party or Parties abstain from fishing such stock, and (3) that the Party or Parties participating in the fishing of such stock continue to carry out necessary conservation measures.

(c) In regard to any stock of fish in the Convention area;

(i) Study, on request of any Contracting Party, concerned, any stock of fish which is under substantial exploitation by two or more of the Contracting Parties, and which is not covered by a conservation agreement between such Parties existing at the time of the conclusion of this Convention, for the purpose of determining need for joint conservation measures;

(ii) Decide and recommend necessary joint conservation measures including any relaxation thereof to be taken as a result of such study. Provided, however, that only the national sections of the Contracting Parties engaged in substantial exploitation of such stock of fish may participate in such decision and recommendation. The decisions and recommendations shall be reported regularly to all the Contracting Parties, but shall apply only to the Contracting Parties the national sections of which participated in the decisions and recommendations.

(iii) Request the Contracting Party or Parties concerned to report regularly the conservation measures adopted from time to time with regard to the stocks of fish specified in the Annex, whether or not covered by conservation agreements between the Contracting Parties, and transmit such information to other Contracting Party or Parties.

(d) Consider and make recommendations to the Contracting Parties concerning the enactment of schedules of equivalent penalties for violations of this Convention.

(e) Compile and study the records provided by the Contracting Parties pursuant to Article VIII.

(f) Submit annually to each Contracting Party a report on the Commission's operations, investigations and findings, with appropriate recommendations, and inform each Contracting Party, whenever it is deemed advisable, on any matter relating to the objectives of this Convention.

2. The Commission may take such steps, in agreement with the Parties concerned, as will enable it to determine the extent to which the undertakings agreed to by the Parties under the provisions of Article V, section 2 and the measures recommended by the Commission under the provisions of this Article and accepted by the Parties concerned have been effective.

3. In the performance of its functions, the Commission shall, insofar as feasible, utilize the technical and scientific services of, and information from, official agencies of the Contracting Parties and their political subdivisions and may, when desirable and if available, utilize the services of, and information from, any public or private institution or organization or any private individual.

ARTICLE IV

1. In making its recommendations the Commission shall be guided by the spirit and intent of this Convention and by the considerations below mentioned.

(a) Any conservation measures for any stock of fish decided upon under the provisions of this Convention shall be recommended for equal application to all Parties engaged in substantial exploitation of such stock.

(b) With regard to any stock of fish which the Commission determines reasonably satisfies all the following conditions, a recommendation shall be made as provided for in Article III, Section 1, (b).

(i) Evidence based upon scientific research indicates that more intensive exploitation of the stock will not provide a substantial increase in yield which can be sustained year after year,

(ii) The exploitation of the stock is limited or otherwise regulated through legal measures by each Party which is substantially engaged in its exploitation, for the purpose of maintaining or increasing its maximum sustained productivity; such limitations and regulations being in accordance with conservation programs based upon scientific research, and

(iii) The stock is the subject of extensive scientific study designed to discover whether the stock is being fully utilized and the conditions necessary for maintaining its maximum sustained productivity.

Provided, however, that no recommendation shall be made for abstention by a Contracting Party concerned with regard to: (1) any stock of fish which at any time during the twenty-five years next preceding the entry into force of this Convention has been under substantial exploitation by that Party having regard to the conditions referred to in Section 2 of this Article; (2) any stock of fish which is harvested in greater part by a country or countries not party to this Convention; (3) waters in which there is historic intermingling of fishing operations of the Parties concerned, intermingling of the stocks of fish exploited by these operations, and a long-established history of joint conservation and regulation among the Parties concerned so that there is consequent impracticability of segregating the operations and administering control. It is recognized that the conditions specified in subdivision (3) of this proviso apply to Canada and the United States of America in the waters off the Pacific Coasts of the United States of America and Canada from and including the waters of the Gulf of Alaska southward and, therefore, no recommendation shall be made for abstention by either the United States of America or Canada in such waters.

2. In any decision or recommendation allowances shall be made for the effect of strikes, wars, or exceptional economic or biological conditions which may have introduced temporary declines in or suspension of productivity, exploitation, or management of the stock of fish concerned.

ARTICLE V

1. The Annex attached hereto forms an integral part of this Convention. All references to "Convention" shall be understood as including the said Annex either in its present terms or as amended in accordance with the provisions of Article VII.

2. The Contracting Parties recognize that any stock of fish originally specified in the Annex to this Convention fulfills the conditions prescribed in Article IV and accordingly agree that the appropriate Party or Parties shall abstain from fishing such stock and the Party or Parties participating in the fishing of such stock shall continue to carry out necessary conservation measures.

ARTICLE VI

In the event that it shall come to the attention of any of the Contracting Parties that the nationals or fishing vessels of any country which is not a Party to this Convention appear to affect adversely the operations of the Commission or the carrying out of the objectives of this Convention, such Party shall call the matter to the attention of other Contracting Parties. All the Contracting Parties agree upon the request of such Party to confer upon the steps to be taken towards obviating such adverse effects or relieving any Contracting Party from such adverse effects.

ACTICLE VII

1. The Annex to this Convention shall be considered amended from the date upon which the Commission receives notification from all the Contracting Parties of acceptance of a recommendation to amend the Annex made by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of Article III, Section 1 or of the Protocol to this Convention.

2. The Commission shall notify all the Contracting Parties of the date of receipt of each notification of acceptance of an amendment to the Annex.

ARTICLE VIII

The Contracting Parties agree to keep as far as practicable all records requested by the Commission and to furnish compilations of such records and other information upon request of the Commission. No Contracting Party shall be required hereunder to provide the records of individual operations.

ARTICLE IX

1. The Contracting Parties agree as follows:

(a) With regard to a stock of fish from the exploitation of which any Contracting Party has agreed to abstain, the nationals and fishing vessels of such Contracting Party are prohibited from engaging in the exploitation of such stock of fish in waters specified in the Annex, and from loading, processing, possessing, or transporting such fish in such waters.

(b) With regard to a stock of fish for which a Contracting Party has agreed to continue to carry out conservation measures, the nationals and fishing vessels of such Party are prohibited from engaging in fishing activities in waters specified in the Annex in violation of regulations established under such conservation measures.

2. Each Contracting Party agrees, for the purpose of rendering effective the provisions of this Convention, to enact and enforce necessary laws and regulations, with regard to its nationals and fishing vessels, with appropriate penalties against violations thereof and to transmit to the Commission a report on any action taken by it with regard thereto.

ARTICLE X

1. The Contracting Parties agree, in order to carry out faithfully the provisions of this Convention, to cooperate with each other in taking appropriate and effective measures and accordingly agree as follows:

(a) When a fishing vessel of a Contracting Party has been found in waters in which that Party has agreed to abstain from exploitation in accordance with the provisions of this Convention, the duly authorized officials of any Contracting Party may board such vessel to inspect its equipment, books, documents, and other articles and question the persons on board.

Such officials shall present credentials issued by their respective Governments if requested by the master of the vessel.

(b) When any such person or fishing vessel is actually engaged in operations in violation of the provisions of this Convention, or there is reasonable ground to believe was obviously so engaged immediately prior to boarding of such vessel by any such official, the latter may arrest or seize such person or vessel. In that case, the Contracting Party to which the official belongs shall notify the Contracting Party to which such person or vessel belongs of such arrest or seizure, and shall deliver such vessel or persons as promptly as practicable to the authorized officials of the Contracting Party to which such vessel or person belongs at a place to be agreed upon by both Parties. Provided, however, that when the Contracting Party which receives such notification cannot immediately accept delivery and makes request, the Contracting Party which gives such notification may keep such person or vessel under surveillance within its own territory, under the conditions agreed upon by both of the Contracting Parties.

(c) Only the authorities of the Party to which the above-mentioned person or fishing vessel belongs may try the offense and impose penalties therefor. The witnesses and evidence necessary for establishing the offense, so far as they are under the control of any of the Parties to this Convention, shall be furnished as promptly as possible to the Contracting Party having jurisdiction to try the offense.

2. With regard to the nationals or fishing vessels of one or more Contracting Parties in waters with respect to which they have agreed to continue to carry out conservation measures for certain stocks of fish in accordance with the provisions of this Convention, the Contracting Parties concerned shall carry out enforcement severally or jointly. In that case, the Contracting Parties concerned agree to report periodically through the Commission to the Contracting Party which has agreed to abstain from the exploitation of such stocks of fish on the enforcement conditions, and also, if requested, to provide opportunity for observation of the conduct of enforcement.

3. The Contracting Parties agree to meet, during the sixth year of the operation of this Convention, to review the effectiveness of the enforcement provisions of this Article and, if desirable, to consider means by which they may more effectively be carried out.

ARTICLE XI

1. This Convention shall be ratified by the Contracting Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged as soon as possible at Tokyo.

2. This Convention shall enter into force on the date of the exchange of ratifications. It shall continue in force for a period of ten years and thereafter until one year from the day on which a Contracting Party shall give notice to the other Contracting Parties of an intention of terminating the Convention, whereupon it shall terminate as to all Contracting Parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the respective Plenipotentiaries, duly authorized, have signed the present Convention.

DONE in triplicate, in the English and Japanese languages, both equally authentic, at Tokyo this ninth day of May, one thousand nine hundred fifty-two.

United States of America:
ROBERT MURPHY
Canada:
A. R. MENZIES
Japan:
K. OKAZAKI
K. HIROKAWA
[seal]
[seal]
[seal]

ANNEX

1. With regard to the stocks of fish in the respective waters named below, Japan agrees to abstain from fishing, and Canada and the United States of America agree to continue to carry out necessary conservation measures, in accordance with the provisions of Article V, Section 2 of this Convention:

(a) Halibut (*Hippoglossus stenolepis*)

The Convention area off the coasts of Canada and the United States of America in which commercial fishing for halibut is being or can be prosecuted. Halibut referred to herein shall be those originating along the coast of North America.

(b) Herring (*Clupea pallasii*)

The Convention area off the coasts of Canada and the United States of America, exclusive of the Bering Sea and of the waters of the North Pacific Ocean west of the meridian passing through the extremity of the Alaskan Peninsula, in which commercial fishing for herring of North America origin is being or can be prosecuted.

(c) Salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha, Oncorhynchus keta, Oncorhynchus kisutch, Oncorhynchus nerka, Oncorhynchus tschawytscha*)

The Convention area off the coasts of Canada and the United States of America, exclusive of the Bering Sea and of the waters of the North Pacific Ocean west of a provisional line following the meridian passing through the western extremity of Atka Island; in which commercial fishing for salmon originating in the rivers of Canada and the United States of America is being or can be prosecuted.

2. With regard to the stocks of fish in the waters named below, Canada and Japan agree to abstain from fishing, and the United States of America agrees to continue to carry out necessary conservation measures, in accordance with the provisions of Article V, Section 2 of this Convention:

Salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha, Oncorhynchus keta, Oncorhynchus kisutch, Oncorhynchus nerka and Oncorhynchus tschawytscha*)

The Convention area of the Bering Sea east of the line starting from Cape Prince of Wales on the west coast of Alaska, running westward to 168°58'22.59'' West Longitude; thence due south to a point 65°15'00'' North Latitude; thence along the great circle course which passes through 51° North Latitude and 167° East Longitude, to its intersection with meridian 175° West Longitude; thence south along a provisional line which follows this meridian to the territorial waters limit of Atka Island; in which commercial fishing for salmon originating in the rivers of the United States of America is being or can be prosecuted.

PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE HIGH SEAS FISHERIES OF THE NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN

The Governments of the United States of America, Canada and Japan, through their respective Plenipotentiaries, agree upon the following stipulation in regard to the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, signed at Tokyo on this ninth day of May, nineteen hundred fifty-two.

The Governments of the United States of America, Canada and Japan agree that the line of meridian 175° West Longitude and the line following the meridian passing through the western extremity of Atka Island, which have been adopted for determining the areas in which the exploitation of salmon is abstained or the conservation measures for salmon continue to be enforced in accordance with the provisions of the Annex to this Convention, shall be considered as provisional lines which shall continue in effect subject to confirmation or readjustment in accordance with the procedure mentioned below.

The Commission to be established under the Convention shall, as expeditiously as practicable, investigate the waters of the Convention area to determine if there are areas in which salmon originating in the

rivers of Canada and of the United States of America intermingle with salmon originating in the rivers of Asia. If such areas are found the Commission shall conduct suitable studies to determine a line or lines which best divide salmon of Asiatic origin and salmon of Canadian and United States of America origin, from which certain Contracting Parties have agreed to abstain in accordance with the provisions of Article V, Section 2, and whether it can be shown beyond a reasonable doubt that this line or lines more equitably divide such salmon than the provisional lines specified in sections 1 (c) and 2 of the Annex. In accordance with these determinations the Commission shall recommend that such provisional lines be confirmed or that they be changed in accordance with these results, giving due consideration to adjustments required to simplify administration.

In the event, however, the Commission fails within a reasonable period of time to recommend unanimously such line or lines, it is agreed that the matter shall be referred to a special committee of scientists consisting of three competent and disinterested persons, no one of whom shall be a national of a Contracting Party, selected by mutual agreement of all Parties for the determination of this matter.

It is further agreed that when a determination has been made by a majority of such special committee, the Commission shall make a recommendation in accordance therewith.

The Governments of the United States of America, Canada and Japan, in signing this Protocol, desire to make it clear that the procedure set forth herein is designed to cover a special situation. It is not, therefore, to be considered a precedent for the final resolution of any matters which may, in the future, come before the Commission.

This Protocol shall become effective from the date of entry into force of the said Convention.

In witness whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Protocol.

Done in tripulicate at Tokyo this ninth day of May, one thousand nine hundred fifty-two.

United States of America:
ROBERT MURPHY
Canada:
A. R. MENZIES
Japan:
K. OKAZAKI
K. HIROKAWA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this convention is designed to provide protection for the fishery resources of the North Pacific Ocean. By its terms Japanese fishermen will abstain from fishing for salmon, herring, and halibut in areas where United States and Canadian fishermen now fully exploit existing stocks and where adequate conservation measures are under way.

The convention provides for the creation of an International North Pacific Fisheries Commission to which the United States and Canada and Japan are parties. This commission will engage in research and recommend to the parties to the convention such measures as will conserve the vast fishery sources of the North Pacific.

The convention also makes provision for patrol of the fisheries covered by the convention.

The Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on the pending convention. No one asked to be heard in opposition to the convention. The committee did receive, however, a number of letters and statements indicating widespread support for the treaty. The committee believes that it will be in the interests of the United States to ratify this convention.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the convention before the Senate is, of course, of most vital importance to those of us who come from the Pacific coast, and particularly from the Pacific Northwest.

A great deal could be said about this convention matter; but, inasmuch as we are in the closing hours of the session, I shall not take time to make a long statement, but shall ask to have my full statement printed in the RECORD.

A great deal of work has gone into the making of this treaty between Japan, the United States, and Canada. The background of the treaty goes back to 1884, when the first salmon cannery was established in Alaska, although, of course, the Japanese had been fishing in the North Pacific for many hundreds of years, no doubt.

Since that time, relations between Japan, Canada, and the United States, particularly in the early days, in respect to conflicts over the fisheries of the North Pacific, were of a friendly nature, because, generally speaking, fishermen did not venture very far from their own shores.

However, with the coming of more modern means of fishing, and with the development of the world demand for salmon, herring, halibut, and the huge Japanese crab, conflicts at times flared up between these three countries, particularly prior to World War II.

There have been many negotiations and conferences. All in all, our relationships in the North Pacific have, with rare exceptions, been of a friendly nature.

Except for agreements between the United States and Canada in connection with halibut fiishing and in connection with part of the Fraser River salmon run, there never existed a treaty to establish what might be called the ground rules in this area—for instance, an arrangement similar to the ground rules applying to the fisheries on the Newfoundland Banks.

So, realizing that there might be possible conflicts following the war with Japan, many of us who had a deep interest in this matter suggested that, since we were entering upon a new era of relationship with Japan, we might well settle this fisheries problem by means of a treaty. To that end, approximately a year ago, the Senator from Washington, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Marine and Fisheries of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and because of my geographical interest and experience in the matter, was asked by John Foster Dulles and by members of the State Department to go to Japan, if possible, to participate in the preliminary negotiations which led to the signing of the general treaty. I did so. On my way to Tokyo, at that time, which was a year ago last April, I had many conferences, not only with my own people on the Pacific coast, but with Canadians who were interested in fisheries, and, upon my arrival in Japan, with the Japanese who were interested in the matter. We found in all instances a great willingness on the part of the Japanese to enter into negotiations for the treaty, and the treaty is today before the Senate.

The purpose of the treaty is to establish so-called ground rules to govern in the future fishing in the North Pacific. At first there was great agitation on the part of certain people on the Pacific coast to have included within the general Japanese treaty provisions covering our future relations with Japan the matter of fisheries, and to have an agreement spelled out for that purpose. We dissuaded them as best we could, holding to the view that the general treaty should deal, not with commercial or conservation matters, but with present and future political relations between Japan and the United States. So, in order to forestall the possibility that, if such provisions were included, opposition might arise to the general treaty, which, because of the existing situation in Asia at the time, we felt should be made and signed as soon as possible. We prevailed upon Mr. Dulles and the Japanese, including the Premier, and we also prevailed upon the State Department and members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who took great interest in this matter, particularly the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Alabama, not to include in the general treaty matters pertaining to the subject of fishing, since it dealt with the prime industry of Japan. The interest of the Japanese people in that matter is of course very great, as is also the interest of our people on the Pacific coast.

It was, however, felt desirable to place in the general treaty an obligation on the part of Japan, that, following ratification of the general treaty and Japan's becoming technically a nation, she would enter into a fishing agreement with other nations bordering on the North Pacific. That was done. The Foreign Relations Committee on many occasions stressed the importance of our making some progress in the fishing negotiations, in order that it might be unnecessary to include reservations in the general treaty.

The State Department acted promptly. It did an excellent job. I compliment the Department upon having done, in the course of the negotiations for the treaty, the one thing that was particularly needful. I think criticism of the State Department would not have been less had the matter been attended to sooner, that is, had it been attended to between the time of the writing of the text of the general treaty and the signing of the treaty at San Francisco. The State Department established a sort of task force, very ably headed by Mr. Harrington, and, instead of confining their activities solely to the political level and the writing of the general treaty, attention was also given to the matter of the fishing agreement, in which, as I say, the people of Japan, as well as our own people, were vitally interested.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I rise, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and as a member of the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, simply to express to the Senator from Washington my appreciation of the very effective work he did in developing the background for this treaty, and in having the vision to realize that it was wise to deal with these negotiations in the way in which they were handled. Having been one of the participants in the preparation of the Japanese Peace Treaty, I was very much interested in this separate agreement, lest, as the Senator said, it might interfere with the general treaty negotiations. The way in which it was handled, separately, is a matter of congratulation.

Later, while I was in Japan in connection with the signing of the treaty, I talked with Japanese leaders. That was at the time the treaty was actually concluded with the Japanese people.

I should like merely to say for the record that I think this is a good example of the way international negotiations of this kind can be handled, and handled to the best interest of all parties. Obviously, there were conflicting interests. The parties were brought together around the conference table, and questions were resolved by an across-the-table discussion, not merely by one side telling the other side to "take it or leave it." It is an example of a splendidly negotiated treaty, and the Senator from Washington is entitled to tribute for his part in it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

This was not done at the political level. As has been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, this treaty meets with widespread approval in the Pacific Northwest. Our reason for expediting it is that we are advised by the Japanese that they would like to have this treaty as soon as possible, since, without the treaty, they have no control over certain people within their country who might be inclined to create incidents similar to those which occurred prior to the beginning of World War II. So they are very anxious that we ratify this treaty. Some of them are a little dubious about it, but I think the RECORD ought to show that this treaty represents one of the three steps taken in the general arrangements between the United States and Japan; first, the general treaty on the political level, in which Japan became obligated to sign a fishing treaty; second, the treaty which is now before the Senate, and third, the consummation of a reciprocal trade agreement between this country and Japan, which it is our hope the State Department will expedite.

Questions are asked about the processing of tuna and other canned fish. I have tried to explain that to the Foreign Relations Committee. This treaty relates only to the taking of fish. The matter of processing would be the subject of a trade agreement, which I believe, will follow. I think there are certain preliminary negotiations now under way in regard to a reciprocal trade agreement; and that is vitally necessary, too. I think we could promise the people of the Pacific coast in particular that such a treaty will now be worked out between this country and Japan.

With the general treaty, the fishing treaty, and a reciprocal trade agreement, there will be a two-way street, so to speak. The two countries will be able to work economically, hand in hand. Lacking such an agreement, we could anticipate other unfortunate instances, such as the raising of questions about the amount of canned fish that should come from Japan, or about frozen tuna, salmon, or Japanese crab. Those matters must be dealt with expeditiously through a reciprocal trade agreement. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me that the ratification of the treaty with Japan has resulted in a sincere willingness on the part of the Japanese people to work out these problems now, so that in the future we shall have a relationship free from the possibility of occurrences such as those which took place prior to World War II; which occurrences, I may add, most of the Japanese people, I think, now realize to have been among the worst mistakes of their entire history.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the point just made by the Senator is most important. As the Senator knows, I have long advocated, as I did during the debate regarding the tariff on tuna, that the way to deal with this matter is to sit around the conference table, to try to arrive at a reciprocal understanding as to the relative rights of the parties, and to proceed from there. What offends our friends, especially in the Far East, is the matter of one country's acting singly and then expecting another country to follow its judgment. I think the way to deal with these problems is through reciprocal agreements, arrived at after free conferences.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think they should be handled in that way, and I believe that will be done. As soon as the fishing agreement is ratified, we shall then have established the ground rules, not only to govern future relationships between this country and Japan but also ground rules in the matter of this great economic potential, the fisheries, as well as the ground rules governing our future trading in general. I am sure that this attitude will culminate in a lasting friendship.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have about 2 or 3 minutes remaining, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina. This is an important matter.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can appreciate its importance to the people of the Pacific coast, as well as to other parts of the country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The treaty reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations is not only a very simple but it is also a very sensible approach to the question of north Pacific fisheries.

I merely want to add, Mr. President, that the importance of this treaty will be much greater in the future, because the fish potential in the great Bering Shelf, in the North Pacific, has hardly been scratched. The treaty should result in good relations between Japan and the United States.

I should like to place in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement by John Laurence Kask, Assistant Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, before the Committee on Foreign Relations, which sets forth the views of the Fish and Wildlife Service in this matter.

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

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE HIGH SEAS FISHERIES OF THE NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN

(Statement of John Laurence Kask, Assistant Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, June 27, 1952)

The Department of the Interior recommends approval of the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, considering it to be a significant step toward the goal of protection and sound management of the great fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean. The employment in this treaty of a formula providing for abstention from a fully exploited, regulated fishery to a large degree removes a threat which has in the past cast its shadow over the North Pacific fisheries which are of great importance to the United States. The Department of the Interior has long felt the need for such a convention.

It will be recalled that as early as 1906, the Congress recognized the importance of the fisheries of Alaska, and the need for protection thereof. In that year an Act for the Protection and Regulation of the Fisheries of Alaska was voted, establishing certain protective regulations. Since that year a number of additional statutes have been enacted, all designed to further the protection of the fisheries of Alaska. In each case the law has placed severe restrictions upon fishermen. For example, since 1924, fishermen have been permitted to take no more than 50 percent of the runs of salmon in Alaska. The law has required that at least half of the salmon be permitted to escape to the spawning grounds in order that the populations might reproduce themselves. These restrictions were formulated after intensive and costly study of the fishery had made clear the need for protection. These restrictions have required the fishermen to make sacrifices—sacrifices which they have been generally unwilling to make until convinced that the exercise of restraint is in reality an investment in the future. It is axiomatic in fishery management that the effective enforcement of fishery regulations is virtually impossible without the understanding and cooperation of the great majority of the fishermen affected. The laws protecting the fisheries of Alaska would be ineffective, in fact probably would not have been enacted, had not much time, effort, and money been devoted to a study of the fisheries and to bringing fishermen to the realization that sacrifices in the form of reduced catches today mean profits tomorrow, that permitting an escapement of spawning fish is like putting money in the bank.

The United States has spent in the neighborhood of $20,000,000—more than twice the

original cost of Alaska—since the beginning of this century for the protection and management of the fisheries of the North Pacific; American fishermen have made sacrifices totaling many more millions of dollars, believing such sacrifices to be in their best interest. As a result these fisheries today yield products worth approximately $200,000,000 annually.

In spite of the past efforts of the United States toward conservation, in spite of the sacrifices of United States fishermen, these fisheries and others like them are threatened by foreign fishermen operating off our costs beyond the limits of the United States jurisdiction and without regard for the restraints placed upon American fishermen. The committee will recall that in 1936 such a threat arose when plans were made for a factory ship of British registry to operate on the halibut banks off the Pacific coast of North America. The halibut fishery had been since 1923 the subject of an international agreement between the United States and Canada, both of which Governments had devoted much time, energy, and money to a study of the fishery in order to maintain it at a level of productivity. As a result of these studies American and Canadian halibut fishermen were subjected to stringent regulations, were required to make sacrifices in the interest of long-term yields. Now, in 1936 a foreign vessel proposed to operate in this fishery which was already being exploited to the maximum by United States and Canadian fishermen. If the vessel disregarded the treaty regulations, the fishery would be quickly destroyed. If she complied with the regulations, it simply meant that the Canadian and American fishermen would get less fish, a smaller return on their investment. The reaction from the fishermen, of course, was violent, and the United States Government lodged a protest with the British Government. Fortunately, the factory-ship operation was never undertaken and there was a minimum of friction.

However, in the following year a similar threat was posed by Japanese salmon vessels operating in Bristol Bay, just beyond the limit of United States jurisdiction. In this case the reaction was even more violent. The United States brought strong diplomatic pressure to bear upon the Japanese Government, and that Government, possibly not desiring to force the issue, required its salmon vessels to withdraw.

These incidents, fortunately, amounted to little. However, the threat may well arise again, and at a time when, for one reason or another, the United States Government might not find it desirable or possible to resort to such action. The result in that case would be disastrous. It would require no more than a few years of unrestricted exploitation by foreign fishermen to deplete the salmon or halibut fisheries. American fishermen, helpless to prevent destruction of stocks which they had labored to maintain, faced with the loss of long years investments, would abandon conservation principles in favor of a quick killing before the stocks were completely destroyed.

The Department of the Interior has lived close to this problem for many years. While it is true that during much of that time Japan, the country which has caused our fishermen the greatest concern, has been strictly limited in its fishing operations, the Department has, nevertheless, with the Department of State, worked steadily toward a solution to the problem which might be applied when Japan regained sovereignty.

It has been the traditional position of this Department that sound conservation in high seas fisheries would best be served by an agreement among the nations concerned which would permit the joint and equal application of such conservation measures as careful study of the fisheries might dictate. This position has been reflected in the halibut and salmon conventions between the United States and Canada. However, in negotiating the present agreement, it was necessary to consider an additional fact. Be they right or wrong, be they sanctioned by international law or no, the Americans who have developed the salmon fishery in Bristol Bay consider it to be an exclusively American fishery and they will tolerate no foreign fishermen; the Americans and Canadians, who have developed the halibut fishery, the sockeye salmon fishery of the Fraser River and the North Pacific herring fishery, consider those to be exclusively American-Canadian fisheries and they will tolerate no foreign fishermen. It is the opinion of the Department of the Interior that, before they would accept the presence of Japanese fishermen in the Alaska salmon fisheries, regardless of the type of regulations imposed upon the Japanese, American fishermen themselves might well cast conservation measures aside and enter upon a ruthless exploitation of the stocks. The halibut and sockeye salmon fisheries would probably meet the same fate. It is certain that a treaty which did not, in one way or another, exclude Japanese fishermen from the more important of these fisheries would not receive the endorsement of the industry and fishermen's organizations on the west coast of this country and in Alaska. Any approach to a solution of the problem which is to have a reasonable chance of meeting with approval at this time must take into consideration this proprietory feeling on the part of American and Canadian fishermen.

The Department of the Interior considers that the abstention provisions contained in the North Pacific Fisheries Convention go a long way toward solving this problem. Specifically, the three countries, party to this treaty, have agreed that when a fishery resource exploited by one of them is producing at a level at which intensified fishing will not increase the total yield; when exploitation of that resource is limited or otherwise regulated by the party engaged in its exploitation for the purpose of maintaining or increasing its maximum sustained productivity; and when the resource is a subject of extensive scientific study designed to discover whether the stock is being fully utilized and the conditions necessary for maintaining its maximum sustained productivity—when these conditions are met, it is agreed that the countries not previously exploiting this resource shall abstain from it. Canada, Japan, and the United States have agreed that at present three fishery resources in the Pacific Ocean off the coast of North America meet these conditions. Japan and Canada have agreed to abstain from the Alaska salmon fishery in the Bering Sea, while Japan has agreed to abstain from halibut, herring, and salmon fisheries in waters off the west coast of this continent, exclusive of the Bering Sea. With respect to the Alaska salmon fishery, the United States has agreed to continue necessary conservation measures, and with respect to halibut, herring, and salmon fisheries exclusive of the Bering Sea, the United States and Canada have agreed to do likewise.

It will be noted that at present only three of the many fisheries in the waters off the Pacific Coast of the United States and Canada qualify for abstention under the provisions of this treaty. This, of course, does not mean that the other stocks of fish in these waters will be deprived of protection. The drafters of this convention, in addition to dealing with immediate problems, looked into the future. They realized that Canadian, Japanese, and United States interests in fisheries would follow increasingly converging courses in the future and that opportunities for conflict would increase rather than decrease. They have provided in the convention a means whereby such conflicts may be anticipated and equitable solutions to problems be found before they become issues. Article II of the convention establishes the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission which shall promote and coordinate the scientific studies necessary to ascertain what conservation measures may be required to secure the maximum sustained productivity of fisheries of joint interest to the contracting parties. That Commission which will consist of not more than four members from each of the contracting governments, will, upon the request of one or more of the three governments, study any stock of fish exploited by one or more of them to determine the need for protective measures. Thus the Commission might, at the request of Canada, undertake a study of the albacore stocks off the Alaskan and British Columbia coasts to determine whether or not this fishery was in need of further protection. As the Department of the Interior understands it, the Commission's investigation would be directed at establishing certain broad facts, i. e. (a) is the fishery producing at a level of maximum supervised yield? (b) is the exploitation of the fishery limited or regulated by the Government of the United States or Canada for the purpose of maintaining maximum productivity? (c) is the fishery the subject of extensive scientific study to discover whether the stock is being fully utilized and the conditions for maintaining it maximum productivity? (d) has the United States or Canada alone developed this fishery over the last two decades? Should the Commission, upon conclusion of its study, find that the answer to each of these questions was "yes" it would recommend to Japan that that government require its fishermen to abstain from exploiting the stock, and would recommend that the Government of the United States or Canada continue that conservation measures in effect. If, on the other hand, the Commission found that the answers were negative, it might recommend that no further protection was needed and Japan might engage in exploitation of the resource. Thus, any fishery developed exclusively by Americans or by Americans and Canadians may receive the same protection which the Convention would now afford the Alaska salmon fishery and the North Pacific halibut fishery.

It is not contemplated that the Commission will employ a large staff of its own to conduct investigations. Instead the Commission, insofar as feasible, will utilize the technical and scientific services of official agencies of the contracting parties and their political subdivision and may, when desirable and if available, utilize the services of public or private institutions or organizations, or any private individual. In conducting its investigations the Commission might thus call upon the Fisheries Research Board of Canada, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States, the Fisheries Agency of the Japanese Government, or possibly private organizations such as the Fisheries Institute of the University of Washington to obtain information for it. In performing this function, the Commission will, in effect, encourage a broader approach to research than can be made by any single agency attacking the problems alone. The Department of the Interior believes that, by promoting cooperative operations involving the research agencies of several governments, many problems can be avoided or solved unless they become serious and relations in the field of fisheries between the United States and Canada and Japan may be expected to become increasingly more friendly.

In short, the Department of the Interior believes that this treaty, with its provision

for abstention and for the establishment of a joint commission, provides the best solution possible at this time to the problems stemming from the converging interest of the United States, Canada, and Japan in the fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean. I may say, however, that the Department does not consider the abstention provisions to constitute a principle necessarily suitable to universal application in the solution of fishery problems. Rather it considers the provisions to be a device which is mutually accepted by the three nations directly interested and which provides a solution to the problems peculiar to the North Pacific. The Department of the Interior recommends that the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean receive the favorable consideration of this committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a very excellent article by Edward W. Allen, entitled "The North Pacific Fisheries Treaty—Friendly Settlement of a 20-Year Dispute."

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

THE NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES TREATY—FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT OF A 20-YEAR DISPUTE

(By Edward W. Allen)

Meeting at Tokyo, delegations from Japan, Canada, and the United States, on December 14, 1951, recommended to their three Governments the ratification of a North Pacific Fisheries Treaty which they had drafted during 5 weeks of almost continuous session.

The basic objective of the proposed treaty is to stimulate production from the sea by making it profitable to the fishermen of each nation to support sound fishery conservation practices. This is to be accomplished by granting protection as to the fruits of conservation so long, but only so long, as it is practiced.

An immediate objective is to eliminate one of the most potent causes for dispute and ill will between the peoples on opposite sides of the North Pacific, and instead, to promote a spirit of friendliness and cooperation. To this end the Japanese propose to abstain from fishing salmon, halibut, and herring (as to herring only, the abstention agreement excludes Bering Sea) off the northwest coast of America for a period of 5 years and thereafter as long as the treaty is in effect unless otherwise recommended to the three countries pursuant to provisions of the treaty, and agreed to by them.

This draft treaty is the culmination of many years of work and study. Under it, each of the three nations will have equal opportunity to avail itself of the provisions for the protection of its own coastal fisheries which comply with the formula that is set forth. No party gives up any claim of legal rights, nor does the treaty attempt to define or change any rule of international law. It is an agreement which should benefit all three of the nations. It is being entered into voluntarily, but once in effect, it becomes binding and carries its own enforcement provisions. Its ratification should go far toward popularizing that sound principle of fishery management referred to in the draft as "maximum sustained productivity," and should also constitute a real contribution toward the preservation of peace on the Pacific.

Some of the background may be of historical interest, and a brief analysis of the proposed treaty may be useful in connection with future negotiations between other nations.

From 1884, when the first salmon cannery to operate in the Bristol Bay area of Alaska was built at Nushagak, this area and the Puget Sound-Gulf of Georgia area became the great rivals in the production of canned red, or sockeye, salmon. When disastrous slides occurred at Hells Gate Canyon on the Fraser River in 1913 and 1914, the sockeye were largely blocked from ascending to their spawning grounds, and Bristol Bay was left in undisputed predominance. For decades, it was the source of one of the most dependable and profitable fisheries in the world. The annual production ran from 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 cases of 48 pounds each.

Because of its rich color, oil content, flakiness, and firmness, red, or sockeye, salmon has had a special appeal to the housewife and has generally found a ready market. The British were particularly fond of Alaska reds. The old sailing fleets which took their loads of cans, grub, gill-net fishermen, and Chinese cannery workers north in the early summer through the passes of the Aleutian Islands, on into the Nushagak or Kvichak as soon as the ice gave way and, when the short, intensive season was over, brought back loads of canned salmon along with the workers, were picturesque sights to denizens of Pacific coast ports. Stories like the Silver Hoard, by Rex Beach, cast a romance about the region.

Yet it was serious business, this operating thousands of miles from home ports, forced to bring everything that was needed for an entire season into a forbidding region of long tidal runoffs, storms, and mosquitoes. In time, too, overfishing began to tell on the supply. At last the Bureau of Fisheries stepped in and, when it received authority under the White Act of 1924, research and regulation superseded the previous unrestricted exploitation.

Both under the Bureau of Fisheries and its successor, the Fish and Wildlife Service, scientific investigation had become intensified and restrictions tightened. In spite of this, the average catch has been falling off so that in the last 10 years it is lower than during the previous decade. In fact, the salmon canners who operate in the Territory became so concerned that for several years they have themselves been contributing several hundred thousand dollars to the University of Washington to conduct scientific research as to Alaska salmon.

Biologists have injected certain phrases into the field of fisheries. One of the most popular is "maximum sustained yield" as the sound objective of fishery conservation. This means to allow as many fish to be taken in any year as will permit of the highest average annual catch which can be maintained on a continuous basis. In other words, the objective is to avoid catching an excessive amount in any one year or period of years and then having this followed by a period of scarcity. When a fishery has been depleted below what is believed to be the largest sound annual average, it may be necessary to reduce the legal catch severely in order to restore the fishery to a maximum condition.

It was in this Bristol Bay area of Alaska, where, in spite of regulation, the fishing was probably still excessive, the Japanese fishing vessels appeared in 1930. The reaction by the American fishermen was exactly what one would expect. Vigorous protests were sent to Washington. One fish-boat captain demanded guns.

These Japanese vessels were said only to be fishing for and canning king crabs. Now our own fishery people had been having trouble over processing crabs. Only the winter before, the organization by Seattle and San Francisco promoters of a company to can crabs in Bering Sea had fallen through for the sole reason that the proposed financial backers were not convinced that the canning process would be successful.

So a curious thing is said to have happened. An informal and unpublished understanding is supposed to have been negotiated between our Government and the Japanese that the Japanese would stay out of the Bristol Bay salmon fishery but would not be interfered with in their crab operations north of the Alaska Peninsula.

It is probable that, at first, the Japanese lived up to this understanding, but as the early 1930's rolled along, increasing complaints were heard among American fishermen that the Japanese were also fishing salmon. * * *

Coastal irritation increased when it became known, late in 1935, that Japanese fishery interests had requested their Government to issue licenses to operate floating canneries off Alaska. This rose to still higher pitch when in 1936 the Japanese Diet appropriated a sum equivalent to about $75,000 for investigating the fishery resources in the waters off Alaska and, with the apparent approval of our own Government, sent a vessel into Bristol Bay said to be manned with fishery students but which our fishermen were convinced was staffed by officers who were surveying more than fisheries.

In the spring of 1937, a delegation of Japanese businessmen sought to make a deal with Alaska cannery men for joint operation of Japanese floating salmon canneries on the American side of the ocean. This was, of course, rejected, but it tended to arouse even greater suspicion that the Japanese were also fishing salmon. In spite of denials from our own Government, it is highly probable that the suspicion had considerable foundation. Since the Japanese occupation, information has come to light indicating that during the 1930's the Japanese had conducted thorough systematic fishery (and probably other) surveys covering Bering Sea right up to the Alaskan coast. There is also indication of Japanese industry participation in these surveys, and it is unlikely that the salmon which were caught were dumped.

In 1936, an Assistant Secretary of State had brushed off Pacific Coast representatives with the charge that they were prejudiced by their failure to appreciate that "the Japanese were the best friends this country had in the world." But some of the fishery people who were less confident of this friendship chartered a plane in July, 1937, flew out over Bristol Bay, caught and photographed a Japanese floating cannery with salmon on her deck and fishing boats about her. Only last year, one of these American fishermen who was in the plane met and compared notes with the Japanese fishery official who was aboard the floater.

In this same year (1937), Senator Lewis B. Schwellenbach and the writer finally secured an interview with Secretary Cordell Hull and found that he had not been made conversant with the situation but was heartily responsive to taking action when it was brought home to him. In fact, from then on, as long as he was active, Mr. Hull was most cooperative with the American fishing industry in seeking to protect the coastal fisheries of this country.

The matter was assigned first to a committee of assistant secretaries, then to Judge R. Walton Moore, counselor of the Department. Leo Sturgeon, who had been a consul at Tokyo for many years, was recalled from Birmingham, England, made a special adviser on fisheries to Judge Moore, and went diligently to work.

On November 22, 1937, a strong representation was made to Japan asserting that—

"But for consistent adherence to a policy of conservation, the Alaska salmon fisheries unquestionably would not have reached anything like their present state of development."

It was also stated:

"The cost of the extensive efforts made by the Government to regulate salmon fishing and to perpetuate the supply of salmon has been borne by the American people, and not infrequently American fishermen have suffered loss of employment and income as a result of the various restrictions imposed. Because of such sacrifices, and the part that American citizens have played in bearing the cost of conserving and perpetuating the salmon resources, it is the strong conviction and thus far unchallenged view on the part of millions of American citizens on the Pacific Coast interested in the salmon industry and on the part of the American public generally that there has been established a superior interest and claim in the salmon resources of Alaska.

"It must be taken as a sound principle of justice that an industry such as described which has been built up by the nationals of one country cannot in fairness be left to be destroyed by the nationals of other countries."

An announcement the next spring indicated that the Japanese Government agreed temporarily to issue no licenses for salmon fishing in this area, but clearly asserted a right to have its fishing vessels reenter this fishery if it chose to do so. It now appears clear that this concession was probably due to the fact that the militarists who, unfortunately, were then dominating Japan were not yet ready to precipitate trouble.

The fishing industry appreciated this progress but was not satisfied with this temporary solution. It demanded something more permanent. War came on and later Mr. Stettinius made his notorious reorganization of the Department of State in which among other dislocations, he shifted fisheries to a subordinate position in the Commodity Division of the Economics Branch, not realizing that fishing is an activity, not a commodity.

In spite of handicaps, Mr. Sturgeon, in cooperation with industry representatives, worked out a proclamation which was issued September 28, 1945, and became known as the Truman proclamation. In harmony with Mr. Hull's communication to Japan above referred to, this proclamation asserted the special interest of this country in its coastal fisheries and authorized the creation of ocean fishery zones. According to the official announcement which accompanied the proclamation, protection would now be provided for the Bristol Bay salmon. The Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior were directed to implement the proclamation, but have never done so.

Persistent efforts of the industry, made more effective by the organization of Pacific Fisheries Conference, a federation of all branches of the fishing industry—employees, employers, vessel owners, and fishery biologists, from Alaska to the Mexican border—finally (with congressional assistance) persuaded Mr. Robert A. Lovett, as Under Secretary of State, to rescue the Fishery Division from its low status in the Department by creating the position of Special Adviser on Fisheries and Wildlife to the Under Secretary of State. Dr. W. M. Chapman, then director of the School of Fisheries of the University of Washington, was the first appointee. Dr. Chapman resigned and in June 1951, was succeeded by Mr. W. C. Herrington who had the excellent background of 4 years spent in Japan as Chief of the Fisheries Division of the Natural Resources Section of SCAP.

Mr. Herrington secured industry backing of a form of treaty which resulted from many conferences with the industry and presumably within the Department, which sought to effect a compromise between the theoretical concepts of the Department and the practical views of the fishing industry. In the meantime, Mr. John Foster Dulles had entered into correspondence with Mr. Shigeru Yoshida, Japanese Prime Minister, to the effect that until Japan became independent she would respect the restrictions imposed by SCAP to stay off the American coast and would then enter into negotiations for a fishery treaty.

This noncommittal correspondence only whetted the industry's insistence for immediate negotiations for a treaty, and the Department finally agreed to institute such negotiations immediately following the peace treaty meeting at San Francisco. The Department furthermore gave assurance that this Nation's delegation would include industry advisers. This agreement was carried out and as a result of such negotiations Japan invited delegations from this country and Canada to come to Tokyo to meet with a Japanese delegation. The present treaty draft is the result of this meeting.

The preamble recognizes that Japan, as a sovereign nation (which she will be when the peace treaty becomes effective), has equal rights with other sovereign nations, but does not attempt to define such rights. The desirability of fishery conservation is also set forth with emphasis.

An International North Pacific Fisheries Commission is provided for to carry out the administrative features of the treaty and to encourage ocean fishery conservation. This Commission is authorized to conduct investigations, among other things, for the purpose of recommending to the three Governments that certain fisheries should be classified as entitled to the protection provided for in the treaty against the intrusion of one or two of the three nations into a coastal fishery not off its own shores, in which it has not theretofore substantially participated, and which has been subjected to scientific research and governmental regulation by the party or parties to the treaty who have been exploiting this particular fishery, and which is being utilized approximately upon a maximum sustained yield basis.

The draft furthermore provides that Canada and the United States now qualify under the provisions referred to as to their salmon, halibut, and herring fisheries (herring, however, limited with a northerly boundary) as far seaward as they are being or can be fished commercially; hence that Japan will abstain from participating in these particular fisheries while these conditons continue and the treaty is in effect. Canada also agrees to abstain from Bristol Bay salmon fishery participation.

Although Japan probably has fisheries which would qualify under the proposed treaty formula, she did not consider it expedient in view of existing Asiatic conditions to press for their protection.

The treaty is to run for 10 years and thereafter until terminated by 1 year's notice from any of the three countries.

One feature which has aroused undue apprehension on the Pacific coast is that as to Bering Sea salmon it was necessary to designate some specific boundary line. This line was fixed at 175° W. longitude but was left subject to adjustment according to the appropriate actual division line between Asiatic and Alaskan salmon. Our biologists and officials all appear to be confident that the line indicated gives complete protection to the salmon of Bristol Bay.

* * * * *

It must be admitted that our Government declined to ask for the simple reciprocal solution demanded by the fishing industry—that the Japanese stay out of our coastal fisheries and we stay out of theirs. Neither is the present proposal in complete conformity with Secretary Hull's communication to Japan, with the Presidential Proclamation of September 28, 1945, or with some modern trends in the interpretation of international law. Nevertheless, nothing is stated which negatives our legal right to reassert these various claims, the proposed treaty does contain a formula which may prove of general encouragement to ocean fishery conservation and, if adopted, this treaty should provide sound protection to the salmon, halibut, and herring fisheries which are so important to the Pacific coast of both Canada and the United States.

It is to be hoped that the treaty will be ratified by the three nations directly concerned and that it may be profitably emulated by others.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I close with the statement that here is another step forward in our relations with Japan. We still have one more step to go, and that is the expeditious handling of a reciprocal trade agreement with Japan in connection with the economic side of the question, including not only fish but other trade that will come between the two countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive S, Eighty-second Congress, second session, an international convention for the high-seas fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, together with a protocol realting thereto, signed at Tokyo, May 9, 1952, on behalf of the United States, Canada, and Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE BUREAU OF AUDIT AND REVIEW

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and as a member of that committee has been able to view the growth of Government and the increasing cost of the growing Government during the past several years.

I think it is appropriate today, on the 4th of July, 1952, which the American people celebrate as the anniversary of the day on which the Declaration of Independence was signed and our Nation came into being, that I speak on the question of big government.

Mr. President, there is clearly today something about the evolution of the Federal Government which is fundamentally wrong.

Has it not grown too large and complex for the Congress to control?

Has it not grown beyond the power of the Executive to control?

Has not the phenomenal growth of the Federal Government upset the fundamental basis on which government in the United States was designed to rest?

Is there not now a dangerous lack of balance between the Federal Government and the States and local governments?

Has not the division of powers between the three branches of the Federal Government—which is the real safeguard of our freedom—broken down?

Congress has all but completely lost control of the purse and can no longer keep track of the activities of the far-flung departments, agencies, and bureaus. Even the Chief Executive has lost most of the essential control over the complex ramifications of the executive branch. Today, we have a government without a true rudder, running amuck in the tempestuous sea of political, social, and economic storms of our times. I am seriously concerned about our ability to weather those storms with our present ship of state.

Today the Federal Government is a big, sprawling, inefficient, wasteful, costly, and purposeless collection of departments, bureaus, boards, offices, agencies, administrations, commissions, services, authorities, sections, and units. These multitudinous units of administration are like thousands of ratholes down which are drained millions of dollars of taxpayers' money away from the real purpose for which they were originally collected from the people.

Amid this vast array of Federal Government units, the people themselves are lost. They cannot possibly know where they stand.

The great multitude of Americans have not been able to locate their tax dollars in terms of productive return—return in the form of a positive foreign policy—return in the way of more tanks and planes for Korea—return to individuals in the form of full employment and the general betterment of their living standards.

Where is all our money going when we see only these few results? One answer is that we have had no evaluation of our Government in terms of what it should be able to achieve to meet our needs in a free society. We have not explored the reasonable limits of Federal activities in the matters of returnable tax dollars, national strength, and security.

Clearly it is time to take stock. It is time to determine what powers and duties can best be carried by the States and communities and what others belong to the Federal Government. We must carefully study the conditions which make it all but impossible for the representatives of the people in Congress to govern. Only through that evaluation will the people know the answer to the riddle of where they stand, and where Government stands.

It is difficult for the Congress, without an approach such as I am going to suggest, to make any headway against the ever-expanding Federal Government. Under the present system, the direction which this vast Federal Government will take in its twistings and turnings into new highways and byways is largely determined by the executive branch. The Congress, with the limited facilities currently at its disposal, is only occasionally able to determine the speed of the movement and almost never to determine the direction or the course which this unwieldy and overgrown ship of state will take.

From time to time Congress seeks to increase its staffs on its various committees. Steps like that are certainly in the right direction. But a bold new approach such as I suggest must be taken before the country is entirely overwhelmed by its own government.

There was nothing haphazard about the way the founding fathers designed the American form of government.

They had come to our shores from Old World countries, where kings and dictators tyrannized the people. They were thoroughly acquainted with the work of great philosophers and of political writers of all ages. They knew the dangers of strong government and of weak government, of kings and demagogs. They had a profound knowledge of the right principles upon which government had to be founded if it was to be good government, self-government by the people, and if it was to safeguard the freedom and liberties of the people.

Out of this deep understanding of human nature and the principles of good government the founding fathers established a representative republic with certain unique features.

One of these features was the division of government into proper spheres of activities based upon Federal, State, and local concerns. This was absolutely essential for three reasons:

First, to enable a new form of government to succeed in a nation of continental proportions; second, to provide governmental bodies appropriate to different levels—Federal, State, and local; and, third, to place the exercise of government as close to the people as possible. That was one of the secrets that our forefathers unlocked in order that we might have this Republic, Mr. President.

A second feature closely related to the first is the distribution of power geographically among Federal, State, and local bodies, and structurally among the three branches of the Federal Government.

The wisdom of the political theories upon which the founding fathers built this Nation has been amply demonstrated over the years of the country's growth and development into the richest and most productive in the world.

Our form of government, which has released the energies of the American people, has made America great. When lapses occur now and then, they occur, not in the form of government, but in the administration of government. As Abraham Lincoln said, we must always distinguish between administrators and the form of government.

But recent years have seen the evolution of a widespread drift away from the original American principles of a Federal Republic. The power of the Federal Government has been expanded to an extent that would have been unbelievable a few years ago.

Through this increase of Federal power, many forms of free competition and productive private capital are being destroyed. By price fixing and profit control, the Government is eliminating possibly our greatest claim to progress—free competition. By taxation and subsidization of industry, the Government can corrupt the public with the public's own money.

Two or three political axioms spell out the basis for still greater inroads by the Federal Government into the lives of every citizen, every business, every individual liberty or freedom.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. The right to subsidize is the right to control.

Mr. President, our form of government also can be destroyed either by private monopoly or by Government monopoly. Monopoly can destroy what we have here in America.

These truths, in and of themselves, are sufficient, if applied by an unchecked and uncontrolled Federal Government, to write an obituary to the American way of life as we have known it.

And so Mr. President, realizing this danger and the need for an evaluation of our Government, I am introducing this bill to create a Legislative Bureau of Audit and Review, which would find ways to cut the Federal Government down to size and would report its findings to Congress, together with specific recommendations.

The agency which I seek to create would be an independent arm of the legislative branch of Government, and would be charged with a continuing audit, analysis and review of the programs and projects and I emphasize the words "programs and projects" of the Federal Government with respect to the elimination of unnecessary activities, and for returning to State and local governments or other agencies, private or public, such activities as they can perform with greater economy and efficiency than can the Federal Government.

I believe this to be one answer to the growing riddle of how to maintain individual liberty and at the same time a strong Nation.

The need for one, over-all sweeping evaluation of Federal activities on a continuous basis is increasingly becoming apparent.

Therefore, I contend that we cannot achieve any degree of success by investigating the Government piecemeal. Congress must be provided with the right tools to do the job.

Let me say that in introducing this bill I hope it will be given the most thoughtful consideration by the taxpayers and citizens. It is a bill to protect their interests, and to permit those of us who serve in the Congress to give them the "breaks" they deserve—in other words, to control the Government, the size of the Government, and the policies of the Government of the United States.

Between now and next January, when the new Congress will convene, I hope to

receive the constructive views of those interested in assisting, so that we may perfect this plan through adoption of ideas which may have escaped my attention.

Mr. President, I hope each Senator and Representative will study this subject, so I may have the benefit of his views on what may be done along this line. I sincerely believe that it is most urgent that we establish some procedure of this sort, and that we do so at a very early date.

A great deal is involved and much is at stake in this bill to reverse the trend toward socialism.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference the bill, and I request that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3482) to establish a legislative bureau for the audit, analysis, and review of Federal Government programs and projects for the purpose of making recommendations to the Congress with respect to the elimination of unnecessary, wasteful, and extravagant activities and for returning to State and local governments or other agencies, public or private, those Government activities which they can perform with greater economy and efficiency than the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to curtail unnecessary and duplicating projects and programs of the Federal Government, to reduce the cost of maintaining and operating the Federal Government, to restore to State and local governments the powers which were reserved to them under the Constitution but which have been gradually assumed by the Federal Government, and to leave to the States sufficient sources of revenue to enable them to carry out their responsibilities, by eliminating those activities now being performed by the Federal Government: (a) which are no longer essential, desirable, useful, or productive; (b) the benefits from which are not commensurate with the costs involved; (c) which can be performed more efficiently or economically by State and local governments or other agencies, public or private; and (d) the performance of which by State or other governmental units is closer to and more responsive to the people as they determine their local needs and which would be more consistent with American principles.

DUTIES OF LEGISLATIVE BUREAU OF AUDIT AND REVIEW

SEC. 2. There is created an establishment of the Government to be known as the Legislative Bureau of Audit and Review, and which shall be independent of the executive department, and under the control and direction of a legislative commissioner. This Bureau shall make a continuing and comprehensive audit, analysis, and review of existing activities of the Federal Government, and of relationships between the Federal Government and State and local governments, and upon the basis thereof to make recommendations with respect to the enactment of such legislation, the proposal of such constitutional amendments, and the taking of such other action as may be necessary to carry out the policies expressed in section 1.

APPOINTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMISSIONER AND DEPUTY LEGISLATIVE COMMISSIONER

SEC. 3. (a) There shall be in the Legislative Bureau of Audit and Review a legislative commissioner and a deputy legislative commissioner who shall be appointed jointly by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House with the advice and consent of the Senate, and they shall receive such compensation as may be determined from time to time by the Congress. The deputy legislative commissioner shall not be of the same political party as the legislative commissioner and he shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the legislative commissioner, and during the absence or incapacity of the legislative commissioner, or during a vacancy in that office, shall act as legislative commissioner.

(b) Except as hereinafter provided in this section, the legislative commissioner and the deputy legislative commissioner shall hold office for — years. The legislative commissioner or the deputy legislative commissioner may be removed at any time by joint resolution of Congress after notice and hearing, when, in the judgment of Congress the legislative commissioner or deputy legislative commissioner has become permanently incapacitated or has been inefficient, or guilty of neglect of duty, or of malfeasance in office, or of any felony or conduct involving moral turpitude, and for no other cause and in no other manner except by impeachment. When a legislative commissioner or deputy legislative commissioner attains the age of 70 years, he shall be retired from his office.

STAFF OF THE LEGISLATIVE BUREAU

SEC. 4. The legislative commissioner shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the classification act of 1949. The legislative commissioner also may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government services, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C., sec. 22a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE LEGISLATIVE BUREAU

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

POWERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSIONER

SEC. 6. (a) The legislative commissioner, or any member of the bureau authorized by the legislative commissioner, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the legislative commissioner or such bureau member may deem advisable. Any bureau member may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the legislative commissioner or before such member.

(b) The legislative commissioner is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the commissioner upon request made by the legislative commissioner or the deputy legislative commissioner.

REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. 7. The legislative commissioner shall transmit to the Congress from time to time reports of his activities under this act.

WORKLOAD OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have to go to a conference committee, and I would like to have some matters inserted in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement of the workload performed by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate during this session.

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

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE WORK AND WORKLOAD, AS OF JULY 1, 1952, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

The workload of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the Eighty-second Congress, as of July 1, 1952, comprised 47.3 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced; 59.6 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented in the Senate; 50.4 percent of all bills and resolutions irrespective of origin.

Not only has the Judiciary Committee received a far larger share of the Senate's total workload than any other standing committee of the Senate; it has also performed a larger share of all committee work than any other committee. Of 2,047 written reports filed in the Senate by all committees, the Judiciary Committee has filed 1,199, which represents 58.5 percent.

The total of reports filed to the Senate does not give the whole picture of committee activity, because committee consideration of many bills resulted in adverse action and indefinite postponement. Furthermore, the committee has handled and disposed of more than 7,145 individual immigration cases, involving suspension of deportation, and 2,216 cases involving adjustment of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended. Each case is equivalent to a bill.

Through July 1, 1952, during the Eighty-second Congress, the Judiciary Committee received 1,918 Senate bills and resolutions, and 787 House bills and resolutions, making a total of 2,705 bills and resolutions.

As of July 1, 1952, the committee had disposed of 1,195 Senate bills and resolutions, and 719 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 1,914 bills and resolutions.

Of the bills thus disposed of 172 were general bills other than claims or immigration; 448 were private relief bills, 1,243 were private immigration bills, 18 were general claims bills, and 33 were general immigration bills.

Committee approval was granted to 593 Senate bills and resolutions, and 608 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 1,201 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

(It will be noted that written reports were filed by the committee with respect to all but 2 of the 1,201 bills and resolutions approved.)

Of the bills and resolutions acted upon favorably 106 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 277 were private relief bills, 796 were private immigration bills, 11 were general claims bills, and 11 were general immigration bills.

Bills postponed indefinitely by the committee included 602 Senate bills and resolutions, 111 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 713 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of the bills thus acted upon unfavorably 66 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 171 were private relief bills, 447 were private immigration bills, 7 were general claims bills, and 22 were general immigration bills.

Measures pending before the committee as of July 1, 1952, included 723 Senate bills and

resolutions, and 68 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 791 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of these bills 143 are general bills other than immigration and claims, 112 are private relief bills, 516 are private immigration bills, 15 are general claims bills, and 5 are general immigration bills.

Committee action, in most cases, must await reports from interested departments and agencies in the executive branch. As of July 1, 1952, the number of bills and resolutions pending before the committee, with respect to which reports have been requested, but not received, was 601, of which 56 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 51 were private relief bills, 485 were private immigration bills, 8 were general claims bills, and 1 was a general immigration bill.

Thus, it will be seen that out of the 2,705 bills and resolutions referred to the committee, the number of cases in which the committee has not acted but in which the committee either had received the reports or deemed reports unnecessary, totaled 190, of which 87 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 61 were private relief bills, 31 were private immigration bills, 7 were general claims bills, and 4 were general immigration bills.

It will be noted the committee has disposed of 719 House bills and resolutions, out of 787 such measures referred to it, leaving only 68 House bills and resolutions pending at the close of the session.

This means the committee took action on 91.3 percent of all House measures received.

In comparison, out of 1,918 Senate bills and resolutions referred to it, the committee acted upon 1,195, leaving 723 Senate bills and resolutions pending. This means that although the committee had to "start from scratch" in all such cases, action was taken on 62.2 percent of all Senate measures received.

Suspensions of deportation by the Attorney General, and adjustments of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, are, under authority delegated by the Congress, reported to the Congress in groups; but in the committee, each such individual case requires separate investigation, appraisal, and action. At the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress, there were pending in the committee 2,761 cases of suspension of deportation, to which were added 10,529 additional cases submitted since the beginning of the Congress, making a total of 13,290 cases, of which 7,145 were approved, 2,568 were held for further consideration, 81 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, leaving 3,496 cases "in process" as of July 1, 1952.

At the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress, there were pending 845 cases of adjustment of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, to which were added 2,448 additional cases submitted during this Congress, making a total of 3,293 cases, of which 2,216 were approved, and 28 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, 514 were held for further consideration, leaving 535 cases in process, as of July 1, 1952.

Through July 1, 1952, Eighty-second Congress, the committee received 146 executive nominations, of which 38 were Federal judges, 51 were United States district attorneys, 40 were United States marshals, 1 was Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, 1 was Assistant Commissioner of Patents, 1 was Attorney General of the United States, 1 was Deputy Attorney General, 2 were Assistant Attorneys General, 2 were Examiners in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office, and 9 were members of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

As of July 1, 1952, nominations pending totaled 6.

JULY 4, 1952.

MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. Sourwine:

As of July 1, 1952, during the Eighty-second Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary had reported 53 of the 437 bills and resolutions which were enacted into public laws. The 53 measures reported by the committee are as follows:

Public Law	Bill No.	Title
5	H. R. 335	Sedgwick, Kans., commissioners.
6	H. R. 1090	Alien spouses.
14	H. R. 2339	Federal regulations re subversive aliens.
31	H. R. 3291	Bankruptcy.
32	H. R. 3292	Do.
56	H. R. 389	For relief of State of Maryland.
60	H. R. 3576	To amend DP Act.
61	S. J. Res. 51	Commemorating Independence Day.
62	H. R. 2924	Parole of prisoners.
65	H. R. 2396	Passport frauds.
71	H. R. 1746	Bankruptcy.
75	S. 1042	Motor Carrier Claims Commission.
79	H. R. 2395	Secret Service, basic authority.
93	H. R. 1899	Amending charter, Daughters of American Revolution.
98	H. R. 3455	Parole of prisoners.
114	H. R. 400	Expeditious naturalization of former citizens.
116	H. R. 3142	Japanese evacuation claims.
117	H. R. 3442	To protect emblems, etc., of Girl Scouts.
126	S. 248	Audubon Centennial Year.
128	S. J. Res. 42	Interstate oil and gas compact.
129	H. R. 4106	Permitting photographic reproductions of business records as evidence.
141	S. 15	Employment agency fees.
154	S. 24	Customs Bureau land and building facilities.
194	H. R. 4693	Bankruptcy (Long Island R. R.).
220	H. R. 1181	Payment of claims re correction military or naval records.
223	H. R. 4945	Refunding of forefeited bail.
225	H. J. Res. 308	Stephen Foster MemorialDay.
232	S. 1482	Relief of town of Mount Desert, Maine.
248	H. R. 3899	To amend certain titles of U. S. Code.
250	H. R. 2176	Relief of Fort Pierce Port District.
256	H. R. 4687	Withholding patents for security purposes.
261	H. J. Res. 314	Citizenship Day.
281	S. 1345	Court fees for the District of Columbia, United States district court.
283	S. 1851	Preventing illegal entry of aliens (wet-backs).
300	S. 1184	Youth Correction Act for District of Columbia.
301	S. 1212	Federal savings and loan association.
303	S. 1415	War Claims Act (increased compensation, etc.).
304	S. 1669	War Claims Act (persons under legal disability).
306	S. 2266	Pay increases of certain Navy Department employees.
307	S. 2549	Relief of sheepherding industry.
313	H. J. Res. 423	Temporary extension of emergency statutes.
324	H. J. Res. 382	National Prayer Day.
333	S. 2160	Admission of State prisoners to Federal prisons.
342	S. 1365	Rehabilitation of Federal prisoners.
344	H. J. Res. 445	Proclaiming Olympic Week.
359	S. 2322	Protecting the name of "Smokey Bear."
368	S. J. Res. 156	Extension of emergency statutes to June 15, 1952.
378	S. 302	Amending the Trading With Enemy Act.
395	S. 1932	Establishment of facilities for detention of aliens.
414	H. R. 5678	Revision and codification of immigration laws.
432	S. 2198	Relating to theft or receipt of stolen mail.
435	S. 968	Interstate compact relating to mutual military aid.
437	S. 1537	Extension of patents of World War II veterans.

Fifteen bills and resolutions bypassed Senate committees, among which were Senate Joint Resolution 40, amending War Claims Act; House Joint Resolution 284, one hundredth anniversary of John Howard Payne; Senate Joint Resolution 147, Bataan Day; House Joint Resolution 481 and House Joint Resolution 490, temporary extension of emergency powers; which normally would have come to this committee.

Public laws resulting from bills reported by other Senate committees are:

Agriculture	21
Appropriations	28
Armed Services	51
Atomic Energy	1
Banking and Currency	19
District of Columbia	50
Finance	55
Foreign Relations	10
Government Operations	14
Interior and Insular Affairs	43
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	22
Labor and Public Welfare	10
Post Office and Civil Service	21
Public Works	20
Rules and Administration	4
Total	369

GLOSSARY OF LEFTIST LANGUAGE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, Mr. Robert Donner, of Colorado Springs, Colo., has sent me a two-page "Glossary of Leftist Language," the author of which is Mr. Wanden M. Kane, of Fountain, Colo. This list contains, according to its entitlement, "words, phrases, and proper names, as used by Communists, comrades, fellow travelers, Socialists, Socialist fronters, anti-anti-Communists and others of their color." Because I think there is real humor, as well as a great deal of useful information in this little document, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

A GLOSSARY OF LEFTIST LANGUAGE

(By Wanden M. Kane, Fountain, Colo.)

Containing words, phrases and proper names, as used by Communists, comrades, fellow travelers, Socialists, Socialist fronters, anti-anti-Communists, and others of their color, shading from shell pink to bloody red.

Academic freedom: The right to go left.

America: A land of milk and honey. Hurry, honey, and let's milk it for Moscow.

Anti-Defamation League: Our cloak and suit boys—out to get your pants.

Artists: Do we have to say?

Authors: Who said "Take us the foxes, the little foxes, that spoil the vines; for our vines have tender grapes"?

Bible: The most dangerous book in the world. Must be destroyed.

Bourgeoisie: A bunch of old fuddy-duddies who own their homes, go to church, and plan for their children's future. They must go.

Brotherhood: Sucker-bait for the warm-hearted and soft-minded—who never catch on anyway.

Capitalist: A man who bought a bicycle for his kid and wants to hang on to it.

Christianity: A lot of superstitious notions that are standing in our way.

Constitution: The second most dangerous document in existence. Must be destroyed or bypassed.

C. I. O.: See point 7 of Karl Marx Communist manifesto; then see Brannan farm plan.

Civil rights: Speaking for a lot of people who didn't mention it in the first place.

Democracy: Mob rule, and we rule the mob.

Education: Seeing that the kids learn the right lessons—or nothing at all.

Fascist: That's a good one; they're just like us, but the dopes don't know it.

Foundation: A million-dollar touch. Old man Rockefeller only gave out dimes.

Freedom: Freedom from want—anybody want a Cadillac?

Hatemonger: A good thing to call those who didn't take the bait.

Human rights: They give up everything they've got for this one; lucky they don't understand it.

Isolationist: Someone who doesn't want to help us conquer the world.

Junk pusher: A good man to have around. He'll always peddle the heroin, so the dollars can go back to "good old Joe."

Korea: Bleeding ground.

Left-wing laborites: Highly recommended. Can furnish several bosses trained in school of sabotage at Moscow.

Liberal: Leftist—but they haven't figured that out either.

McCarthyism: People who are breathing down our necks and must be stopped.

Mink: Well, what does it rhyme with?

Mossback: Won't play.

Movie actors: Stout fellers, most of them our boys.

Movie directors: Ditto.

Newspapers: Very good—got most of 'em.

Peace: It's wonderful. Good sucker bait; the Kremlin loves it.

Progressive: Everything going our way—it won't be long now, boys.

Property rights: These guys are tough; try reactionary, hatemonger, mossback, and Fascist on them.

Proletariat: All the underprivileged people we're supposed to be working for; don't tell a soul—they all have cars and washing machines—but keep it quiet.

Psychoanalysis: If the right doctor does it to a millionaire, he can relieve him of his money and his guilt complex (because he's rich) in no time flat. A lot of our boys work this racket.

Reactionary: A man who doesn't want to give up what he's got for what he ain't.

Sex: If they're too dumb to understand the new social order, we call out the bed brigade.

Smear: Our perfected technique. Yell like hell if anyone is on to you—scream they've called you dirty names and hurt your civil liberties.

United Nations: A wolf in Bear's clothing.

U. N. flag: Will you come into my parlor, said the spider to the fly?

Women's organizations: Very receptive to packaged birdbrain frozen thinking.

Workingman: Sucker.

Universities: Several have turned out some dillies for us. We recommend Harvard, Columbia, Chicago, Vassar, and Sarah Lawrence.

Youth organizations: Hotbeds of interracial amity.

THE DISPUTES CLAUSE OF THE GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT—ITS MISCONSTRUCTION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion on S. 2487, relating to the finality clauses in Government contracts, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks today an extremely able article on this subject prepared for the Law Review of Notre Dame University by the Honorable William Hughes Mulligan, a professor at Fordham University and a member of the bar of the city of New York.

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

THE DISPUTES CLAUSE OF THE GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT—ITS MISCONSTRUCTION

The Government of the United States has been and will continue to be the largest, most extensive, and prolific client of the construction industry in this country. The tremendous military expansion required for World War II saw the erection of Army, Navy, and Air Force installations of unprecedented scope and geographic distribution. The postwar era continued apace with the construction of mammoth hospitals for veterans in mute valedictory to the carnage of victory. The present period, which may well be a prewar era, brings further extension of national defense facilities, construction of atomic energy installations, and rehabilitation of the sprawling posts, camps, and stations of the past war. This recent history of concentrated building on behalf of the United States has brought with it a corresponding flood of litigation which accentuates the importance of a document undramatically entitled "United States Standard Form of Contract No. 23," the legal instrument creating, defining, and describing the mutual rights and obligations of the contractor and his Government in all of the varied construction operations described.[1] Much of the litigation arising from the performance of this gigantic program of construction involves the interpretation of the various standard clauses found in United States Standard Contract No. 23. With the tightening of credit controls and the conservation and allocation of scarce building materials, the contractor, small as well as large, is more and more occupied with Federal building programs. The subcontractor (the plumber, the painter, the electrician, the ironworker, the plasterer and lather, the mason, and the excavator) does not escape the requirements of the standard Government construction contract, since it is usual to incorporate in the private subcontract a provision subjecting the subcontractor to all of the terms, agreements, and provisions of the contract subsisting between the prime contractor and the United States. It therefore behooves an ever-widening segment of the bar to be familiar with the standard contract.[2] This article will be limited to a discussion of the legal aspects of one of the clauses, article 15, the disputes provision, found in this contract.

Perhaps most of the litigation involving the standard Government contract has been created by the very provision which was designed to avoid it. The disputes clause usually provides: [3]

"ART. 15. Disputes: Except as otherwise specifically provided in this contract, all disputes concerning questions of fact arising under this contract shall be decided by the contracting officer subject to written appeal by the contractor within 30 days to the head of the department concerned or his duly authorized representative, whose decision shall be final and conclusive upon the parties thereto. In the meantime the contractor shall diligently proceed with the work as directed."

The object of the quoted article has been stated by the Supreme Court of the United States as follows:[4]

"It creates a mechanism whereby adjustments may be made and errors corrected on an administrative level, thereby permitting the Government to mitigate or avoid large damage claims that might otherwise be created. * * * This mechanism, moreover, is exclusive in nature. Solely through its operation may claims be made and adjudicated as to matters arising under the contract."

However laudable and refreshing the thought of saving Government funds may be, a study of the cases will reveal that the failure of the Supreme Court to supply the mechanism with the necessary lubrication of reasonable construction and interpretation has resulted in a Frankenstein creation. Retooling and replacement of parts appear to be in order.

At the outset it should be noted that this procedure set up by article 15 provides an exclusive avenue of relief. An aggrieved contractor must exhaust the administrative procedure before he can litigate in the Court of Claims.[5] He must first protest to the contracting officer; [6] if redress is not forthcoming, he must then appeal in writing within

[1] The United States Standard Form of Construction Contract No. 23 was adopted and approved by the President in 1926 and revised in 1940. On the back of the last page it is noted: "1. This form shall be used for every formal contract for the construction of or repair of public buildings or works, but its use will not be required in foreign countries. 2. There shall be no deviation from this standard contract form, except as provided for in these directions, and except as authorized by the Director of Procurement." See *Pfotzer* v. *United States* (77 Supp. 390 (Ct. Cl. 1948)).

[2] Thus in *United States ex rel. Gillioz* v. *John Kerns Const. Co.* (50 F. Supp. 692 (E. D. Ark. 1943)), the subcontractor's right to recover against the contractor for delays was denied by reason of the finality of the contracting officer's decision which was binding not only upon the contractor, but also on the relator whose subcontract was expressly made subject to the main contract.

[3] The contracting officer named in the contract is usually a professional engineer regularly employed by the department of Government requesting the construction. He might be the district engineer, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, or a corresponding official in the U. S. Air Force, Navy, or in a civilian department of the Government. The head of department is, as the name implies, the administrative official in control, subject only to the President. Thus, the head of the department might be the Secretary of the Army, Navy, Interior, etc. He may have delegated his duties under this type contract to a Board of Contract Appeals" sitting in Washington, D. C. See the discussion of these boards in *McWilliams Dredging Co.* v. *United States* (118 Ct. Cl. 1, 16, 17 (1950)).

[4] *United States* v. *Holpuch Co.* (328 U. S. 234, 239–40, 66 S. Ct. 1,000, 90 L. Ed. 1192 (1946)).

[5] Id., 328 U. S. at 240. The controlling statute, 28 U. S. C., sec. 1491 (Supp. 1951), provides: "The Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to render judgment upon any claim against the United States: (4) Founded upon any express or implied contract with the United States."

[6] Usually the contracting officer has representatives on the job site, project engineers, inspectors or superintendents. Protest to the contracting officer is usually required by the contract to be in writing. Oral protest, even though followed by a written opinion of the Judge Advocate General favorable to the contractor and approved by the Assistant Secretary of War, and unfruitful negotiation were held insufficient to waive the requirement of the contract. *Sanford & Brooks Co.* v. *United States* (267 U. S. 455, 45 S. Ct. 341, 69 L. Ed. 734 (1925)); accord, *United States* v. *Cunningham* (125 F. (2d) 28 (D. C. Cir. 1941)).

30 days to the head of the department concerned.[7] Failure to exhaust the administrative remedy is fatal to the contractor.[8] This rule has been adhered to by the Supreme Court[9] even though the conduct of the representative of the contracting officer was so abusive and flagrantly unreasonable that the contractor had concluded that protest and appeal would be a waste of time. In a dissenting opinion, Justice Frankfurter characterized the conduct of the Government engineers as "willful and oppressive" and as a "systematic practice of unjustified demands and vexations."[10] The majority of the Court argued that it was not reasonable for the contractor to assume that the same antisocial attitude of the minor officials involved would pervade the entire department to top levels.[11] The contractor had been successful in the Court of Claims, urging inter alia, that as a practical matter, appeals and protests would only further antagonize the on-the-site representative of the Government who resented any reflections upon his judgment and who would further harass operations as the job continued.[12]

AN AVENUE OF ESCAPE?

At first blush it would seem that article 15 does not completely shut the door to judicial review. As the clause in question is quoted above, it appears that the jurisdiction of the contracting officer and the department head are limited to questions of fact. The ready suggestion would be that with respect to questions of law, access to the Court of Claims could be gained without resorting first to administrative remedies. There is authority for this distinction and the contractor has been afforded a judicial review without appealing to the department head where the dispute involved a question of law rather than fact.[13] However, the contractor must be wary and his attempt to avoid the administrative toils may be thwarted.

First: In some cases article 15 is not limited on its face to questions of fact. There are cases where the article provides that "all disputes arising under the contract" are to be determined by the contracting officer subject to appeal to the department head. The Court of Claims vigorously challenged the validity of the "all disputes" clause:[14]

But the competency of the parties to so stipulate, as the courts have many times pointed out, is limited to the decision of questions of fact arising under the contract, such as the quantity and quality of materials delivered, whether the work performed meets contract requirements, causes of delay in the performance of the work, etc. These are questions of fact, the correct solution of which is usually largely dependent on professional knowledge and skill. * * * "But the disputed question here—whether the plaintiff under the terms of the contract was required to furnish the materials demanded by the contracting officer—was not one of fact. It was a disputed question of law—the proper construction of the contract—a question the decision of which was outside the jurisdiction of the contracting officer or head of the department, it being the province of the courts to declare the law of the contract."

Three years later, the Court of Claims in *John McShain, Inc.* v. *United States*,[15] reaffirmed this specific holding. The Solicitor General petitioned for a writ of certiorari, urging that the decision was the "culmination of a recent tendency in the Court of Claims to whittle away the authority of designated officers of the United States to make final decisions under contracts."[16] Certiorari was granted[17] and the judgment reversed by the Supreme Court of the United States in a per curiam opinion.[18] In a later decision the Court emphatically reaffirmed the validity of the "all disputes" clause.[19] With some reluctance[20] the Court of Claims has followed the determination of the Supreme Court.

It would seem clear, therefore, that if article 15 provides for administrative jurisdiction of "all disputes," the contractor must exhaust his remedy in the department before proceeding to the Court of Claims.[21]

Second: Even if the disputes clause is limited to disputed questions of fact, the contractor's attorney must still be cautious. Article 15 commences with the language "except as otherwise specifically provided in this contract. * * *" Normally, article 1 of the contract incorporates into the main agreement the drawings and specifications. In these voluminous documents counsel for the contractor may find some interesting language which precludes escape from administrative appeal and finality of the determination of the department head. In *Pfotzer* v. *United States*,[22] the Court of Claims was faced with a situation where the contractor and the contracting officer had differed as to whether certain work performed was included within the drawings and specifications. The contractor urged that the decision of the contracting officer and department head denying him extra compensation was based upon an interpretation of the contract and was therefore a question of law and not fact. The Government relied on paragraph 1–07 of the specifications which provided:[23]

"Unless otherwise specifically set forth, the contractor shall furnish all materials, plant, supplies, equipment, labor, etc., necessary to complete the work according to the true intent and meaning of the drawings and specifications, of which intent and meaning the contracting officer shall be the interpreter."

Despite the incorporation by reference of the specifications, the Court of Claims held that where article 15 mentions "this contract," it refers to the Standard Form 23 and not the specifications; that article 15 was paramount to the specifications and that the quoted language of the specifications was only intended to keep the work progressing under the direction of the contracting officer and was not designed to give him final authority with respect to an interpretation of the contract, which was held to be a question of law and not fact. The Supreme Court denied the Government's petition for certiorari.[24] The Court of Claims, in *Moorman* v. *United States*,[25] was presented with a similar problem. The contractor had agreed to grade the site of an aircraft assembly plant at a unit price of 24 cents per cubic yard in strict accordance with the drawings and specifications. A taxiway was shown on the drawings but was not located within the plant site as described in the specifications. A dispute arose as to whether or not the contractor was required to grade the taxiway and whether the unit price applied. Paragraph 2–16 of the specifications provided that if the contractor objected to performing any work as not within the contract, he must protest in writing to the contracting officer and, if not satisfied, may appeal to the Secretary of War whose decision would be "final and binding." There was the usual article 15 limiting administrative jurisdiction to questions of fact. Following its decision in the *Pfotzer* case, the Court of Claims held that article 15, limited to fact questions, was governing; that the specification section involved, properly interpreted, only meant that such decision was final and binding to the extent provided in article 15 of the contract; and that since under article 15, only decisions upon disputed questions of fact were final, the instant determination involving a question of contract interpretation was one of law and thus not conclusive upon the contractor. The Court of Claims therefore made its own findings and permitted the contractor to recover 59.3 cents per cubic yard for the taxiway grading instead of the 24-cent unit price provided in the specifications. The Solicitor General again petitioned for a writ of certiorari which was granted.[26] The petition urged that this decision plus pre-

---

[7] Upon appeal the contracting officer usually prepares findings of fact which are forwarded to the contractor who responds by comment and brief. Failure to serve the contractor with a copy of the findings has been held to nullify the finality of the department head's decision and to permit the contractor to proceed in the Court of Claims. *Sachs* v. *United States* (63 F. Supp. 59 (Ct. Cl. 1945)).

[8] *United States* v. *Callahan Walker Co.* (317 U. S. 56, 63 S. Ct. 113, 87 L. Ed. 49 (1942)).

[9] *United States* v. *Holpuch Co.* (328 U. S. 234, 66 S. Ct. 1000, 90 L. Ed. 1192 (1946)); *United States* v. *Blair* (321 U. S. 730, 64 S. Ct. 820, 88 L. Ed. 1039 (1944)).

[10] *United States* v. *Blair* (321 U. S. 730, 740, 64 S. Ct. 820, 88 L. Ed. 1039 (1944)).

[11] Id., 321 U. S. at 736. The unreasonable conduct of a contracting officer, who is "repellant" of appeal, as distinguished from similarly unreasonable conduct of a contracting officer's underling, excused administrative appeal in *United States* v. *L. P. & J. A. Smith* (256 U. S. 11, 41 S. Ct. 413, 65 L. Ed. 808 (1921)).

[12] *Blair* v. *United States* (99 Ct. Cl. 71 (1924), rev'd, 321 U. S. 730, 64 S. Ct. 820, 88 L. Ed. 1039 (1944)).

[13] See *Western Well Drilling Co.* v. *United States*, 96 F. Supp. 377 (N. D. Calif. 1951), where a contractor was permitted to sue under the Tucker Act, 28 U. S. C., §§ 1346, 2401, 2402 (Supp. 1951), even though he did not first appeal to the department head, since the finding of the contracting officer that no "changed condition," as defined by article 4 of the contract, existed was a determination of law and not of fact. *Rust Engineering Co.* v. *United States*, 86 Ct. Cl. 461 (1938), permitted the contractor to sue in the Court of Claims on a similar distinction.

[14] *Davis* v. *United States*, 82 Ct. Cl. 334, 346–7 (1936).

[15] 88 Ct. Cl. 284, 297 (1939).

[16] The petition is noted in *United States* v. *Moorman* (338 U. S. 457, 460, 70 S. Ct. 288, 94 L. Ed. 256 (1950)).

[17] *United States* v. *John McShain, Inc.*, (307 U. S. 619, 59 S. Ct. 1043, 83 L. Ed. 1499 (1939)).

[18] *United States* v. *John McShain, Inc.* (308 U. S. 512, 60 S. Ct. 134, 84 L. Ed. 437, order amended, 308 U. S. 520, 60 S. Ct. 134, 84 L. Ed. 437 (1939)).

[19] *United States* v. *Moorman* (338 U. S. 457, 460–462, 70 S. Ct. 288, 94 L. Ed. 256 (1950)).

[20] *George F. Driscoll Co.* v. *United States* (63 F. Supp. 657 (Ct. Cl. 1945) (Whitaker J., and Madden, J., dissenting), cert. denied, 328 U. S. 854, 66 S. Ct. 1340, 90 L. Ed. 1626 (1946)).

[21] The vast weight of authority supports the validity of clauses in contracts appointing an impartial umpire as a final arbiter of all disputes arising under the contract. See Notes, 54 A. L. R. 1255 (1928), 110 A. L. R. 137 (1937), Indiana is contra. *McCoy* v. *Able* (131 Ind. 417, 30 N. E. 528 (1892)). There it was held that such a provision was an improper attempt to oust the courts of jurisdiction. The arbitrator's finding was entitled only to prima facie validity and was not conclusive.

[22] 77 F. Supp. 390 (Ct. Cl. 1948).

[23] Id. at 399.

[24] *United States* v. *Pfotzer*, 335 U. S. 885, 69 S. Ct. 237, 93 L. Ed. 424 (1948).

[25] 82 F. Supp. 1010 (Ct. Cl. 1949).

[26] *United States v. Moorman*, 338 U. S. 810, 70 S. Ct. 58, 94 L. Ed. 490 (1949).

vious holdings of the [27] Court of Claims had "weakened and narrowed the effectiveness of the well-established policy of the Government to settle, without expensive litigation disputes arising under its contracts."

The Supreme Court reversed the judgment of the Court of Claims in a unanimous opinion written by Justice Black which castigated the lower court with obvious relish.[28] The Court reaffirmed the legality of contractual provisions designed to effect speedy settlement of all disputes, factual or legal, at an administrative level. Whether the determination at issue was one of fact or law, the contracting officer was held to have jurisdiction and the determination of the department head was final under the specific language of paragraph 2–16 of the specifications, which was to be construed with article 15 and which was not nullified by it. The Court pointed out: [29]

"The oft-repeated conclusion of the Court of Claims that questions of interpretation are not questions of fact is ample reason why the parties to the contract should provide for final determination of such disputes by a method wholly separate from the fact-limited provisions of article 15."

The stanch judicial blessing of the Supreme Court to specification provisions conferring finality upon decisions of the contracting officer (if affirmed by the department head) in interpreting the requirements of the contract, makes it mandatory for counsel representing the contractor to read beyond the standard printed contract form to the bewildering engineering and architectural data of the specifications, if he is to advise his client properly as to his remedies under the contract. The avenue of escape from appeal to department head or from the finality of his decision may well be a mirage.

HOW FINAL IS FINAL

Assume that an aggrieved contractor has appealed from an adverse determination of the contracting officer whose decision has been upheld by the department head. Assume further that the dispute involves a question of fact within the contracting officer's jurisdiction under the usual article 15, or a question of law wihin his jurisdiction under the judicially sanctioned all-disputes article 15 or under a special clause of the specifications. The vexatious question arises: to what extent is his decision "final and conclusive" as the contract literally provides?

The Supreme Court in 1854,[30] in determining the conclusiveness to be accorded a commercial arbitration award provided for by contract, warned that a court of equity should not set aside an award simply for error in judgment or to substitute its judgment for that of the arbiter selected by the parties. However, the Court pointed out that "corruption" or "gross mistake" [31] on the part of the arbitrator would warrant equitable intervention. In 1878 the Court, in upholding the validity of the disputes clause, stated that the findings of a contracting officer were final "in the absence of fraud or such gross mistake as would necessarily imply bad faith. * * *" [32] The rule was restated in a later case which held that such determination was final and conclusive "unless impeached on the ground of fraud, or such gross mistake as necessarily implied bad faith." [33]

An even more complete exposition of the obligations of the contracting officer is revealed in *Ripley* v. *United States*,[34] decided by the Supreme Court in 1912. There, the contractor claimed that he was prejudiced by the arbitrary refusal of the contracting officer to permit blocks to be placed on a jetty, which delayed the progress of the job. The Court stated: [35]

"But the very extent of the power and the conclusive character of his decision raised a corresponding duty that the agent's judgment should be exercised not capriciously or fraudulently, but reasonably, and with due regard to the rights of both the contracting parties. The finding by the court that the inspector's refusal was a gross mistake and an act of bad faith necessarily, therefore, leads to the conclusion that the contractor was entitled to recover the damages caused thereby."

In 1950 the Supreme Court, in the Moorman case,[36] reiterated its position that either fraud or gross mistake would lift the curtain of conclusiveness so as to permit judicial scrutiny.[37] In Penner Installation Corp. versus United States [38] which was held in abeyance until the Supreme Court reached a decision in the Moorman case, the Court of Claims reviewed its prior holdings on the question and concluded that it was not bound by the determination of the contracting officer on a question of fact, affirmed by the department head, when the evidence disclosed that "The decisions of the contracting officer and the head of the department * * * were arbitrary and so grossly erroneous as to imply bad faith." [39] The court had in the past formulated and continued to announce the rule in substantially that language.[40] The rationale of this rule espoused by the Court of Claims had its genesis in the language of the Ripley case [41] referred to above. The Court of Claims, after reviewing its prior rulings, admitted in the Penner decision that the contracting officer was properly in a unique, unenviable position. Although the representative of the Government in the performance of the contract and charged with the responsibility of insuring that the Government receives precisely what it bargained for, he must, in the event of a dispute, assume the capacity of an impartial referee eager to do justice to the rights of both contracting parties. And if the evidence discloses his failure to act impartially, if there is no substantial basis upon which his decision can be supported ("arbitrary and capricious" seem to be the judicial epithets characterizing this situation) or when it is grossly erroneous, he has not been faithful to his duty to act impartially, he is in bad faith and his determination is not conclusive. Bad faith, therefore, does not imply that the contracting officer has been unfaithful to his employer, but unfaithful to his duty as impartial arbiter. The Court of Claims concluded that the contracting officer had betrayed that trust in the Penner case and awarded judgment to the contractor.[42] The Supreme Court granted certiorari,[43] affirmed the judgment by an equally divided Court [44] and finally denied a rehearing.[45] One might conclude that the law was rather well settled.

THE WUNDERLICH CASE

In *Wunderlich* v. *United States*,[46] the Court of Claims was again faced with the usual problems which have been discussed. The plaintiff had contracted to erect a dam in Colorado in 1938. He performed certain work which was allegedly beyond the contract requirements. A principal dispute involved the amount recoverable for the maintenance and repair of machinery and equipment. The contracting officer fixed rates on an hourly basis which did not reflect any substantial variation in amount for equipment ranging from a $207 jack hammer to a $39,000 drag line. This allowance was termed "arbitrary" and "capricious" by the court which permitted the contractor to recover some $172,000.[47] Certiorari was granted by the Supreme Court.[48] and judgment was reversed in a 6–3 decision with a startling opinion by Justice Minton.[49] The opinion is startling not because it reversed judgment for Wunderlich but because the rule it announces has "wide application and a devastating effect." [50] The Court emasculated "gross mistake" from the exception to administrative finality and announced that fraud was the only exception to the conclusiveness of the determination under article 15. The Court defined fraud as "conscious wrongdoing, an intention to cheat or be dishonest." [51] The Court further stated: "The decision of the department head, absent fraudulent conduct, must stand under the plain meaning of the contract." [52] The Court admitted that other words such as negligence, incompetence, capriciousness, and arbitrary had appeared in the opinions but stated that "this Court has consistently upheld the finality of the department head's

---

[27] The petition for certiorari is quoted in the opinion of the Supreme Court on the merits, *United States* v. *Moorman*, 338 U. S. 457, 460, 70 S. Ct. 288, 94 L. Ed. 256 (1950).

[28] Id., 338 U. S. at 462–3.

[29] Id., 338 U. S. at 463.

[30] *Burchell* v. *Marsh*, 17 How. 344, 15 L. Ed. 96 (U. S. 1854).

[31] Id., 15 L. Ed. at 99.

[32] *Kihlberg* v. *United States*, 97 U. S. 398, 24 L. Ed. 1106, 1108 (1878).

[33] *Martinsburg & P. R. R.* v. *March*, 114 U. S. 549, 5 S. Ct. 1035, 1038, 29 L. Ed. 255 (1885).

[34] 223 U. S. 695, 32 S. Ct. 352, 56 L. Ed. 614 (1912).

[35] Id., 32 S. Ct. at 355.

[36] *United States* v. *Moorman* (338 U. S. 457, 70 S. Ct. 288, 94 L. Ed. 256 (1950)).

[37] The Court, id., 338 U. S. at 461, cited with approval the language of the Court in *Martinsburg & P. R. R.* v. *March* (114 U. S. 549, 5 S. Ct. 1035, 29 L. Ed. 255 (1885)). See note 33 supra.

[38] 89 F. Supp. 545 (C. Cl. 1950).

[39] Id. at 563.

[40] See, e. g., *Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co.* v. *United States* (90 F. Supp. 963, 965 (Ct. Cl. 1950)); *Loftis* v. *United States* (76 F. Supp. 816, 827 (Ct. Cl. 1948)); *Needles* v. *United States* (101 Ct. Cl. 535, 601–7 (1944)); *Bein* v. *United States* (101 Ct. Cl. 144, 166 (1943)). But see *Henry Ericsson Co.* v. *United States* (62 F. Supp. 312 (Ct. Cl. 1945)), where the court found that the contracting officer had ruled adversely to the contractor because he was "unaware" of the basis of the claim. The court, id. at 327, saw "no point in applying words as 'arbitrary,' 'capricious,' or 'bad faith,' which are obviously inapplicable, in order to reach the result which justice demands. We think that unawareness of the problem on the part of the deciding officer is an equally good reason why his decision should lack finality."

[41] *Ripley* v. *United States* (223 U. S. 695, 32 S. Ct. 352, 56 L. Ed. 614 (1912)). See discussion in text at note 34 supra.

[42] *Penner Installation Corp.* v. *United States* (89 F. Supp. 545, 548–50 (Ct. Cl. 1950)).

[43] *United States* v. *Penner Installation Corp.* (340 U. S. 808, 71 S. Ct. 55, 95 L. Ed. 594 (1950)).

[44] *United States* v. *Penner Installation Corp.* (340 U. S. 898, 71 S. Ct. 278, 95 L. Ed. 651 (1950)).

[45] 340 U. S. 923, 71 S. Ct. 356, 95 L. Ed. 667 (1951).

[46] 117 Ct. Cl. 92 (1950).

[47] Id. at 217–9.

[48] *United States* v, *Wunderlich* (341 U. S. 924, 71 S. Ct. 795, 95 L. Ed. 1356 (1951)).

[49] *United States* v. *Wunderlich* (— U. S. —, 72 S. Ct. 154, 96 L. Ed. *67 (1951)). Justices Douglas and Jackson each dissented in separate opinions. Justice Reed concurred in the opinion of Justice Douglas.

[50] Id., (72 S. Ct. at 156).

[51] Id. (72 S. Ct. at 155).

[52] Ibid.

decision unless it was founded on fraud, alleged and proved." [53] The Court suggested that the respondent was not coerced, but had voluntarily entered the contract providing for the settlement of disputes in this manner. If the standard of fraud proposed was too narrow, the Court suggested that this was a matter for Congress to determine.

In his dissenting opinion Justice Douglas eloquently expressed his abhorrence at a rule which dispensed such uncontrolled discretion to a contracting officer who would be immune from judicial intervention no matter how negligent, capricious, stubborn, or incompetent he might prove to be. Justice Jackson, in a separate dissenting opinion, commented unfavorably on the excision of gross mistake from the rule to which the Court had previously subscribed. He observed that "Men are more often bribed by their loyalties and ambitions than by money." [54]

The holding of the majority opinion would seem not only to be a departure from precedent, which was both unnecessary and unfortunate, but to be based upon specious reasoning. The argument that the plain meaning of the contract requires that only fraud be excepted overlooks the fact that neither "fraud" nor "mistake" is mentioned in article 15. Both exceptions have been engrafted by the judicial interpretation of the Supreme Court in the line of decisions discussed above. The argument that the contractor voluntarily entered the contract and therefore agreed to the arbitral disposition overlooks the following points: (1) If the contractor had consulted counsel with respect to the finality of article 15, he could hardly have had the good fortune to retain a combination lawyer, prophet, seer who would have been able to predict this departure from precedent. One of the homely virtues of stare decisis is the reasonable expectation of properly advising clients; (2) the argument further overlooks the fact that the Government construction contract is about as flexible as an insurance contract insofar as its standard clauses are concerned.[55] It is in reality a contract of "adhesion." The contractor is in no position to bargain as to its terms, to select an independent arbiter, or to propose an entire elimination of the disputes clause. Even if the courts do not go to the extremes of interpretation found in the insurance cases, it should not be overlooked that the Government prepared the instrument. Moreover, the Supreme Court has held: [56]

"Although there will be exceptions, in general the United States as a contractor must be treated as other contractors under analogous situations. When problems of the interpretation of its contracts arise the law of contracts governs."

This judicial accolade upon unfettered discretion of the arbiter has little support in analogous situations in the law.[57] (3) The argument finally overlooks a fact already adverted to: the lack of availability of other civilian work of comparable size. Tightening of credit requirements and shortages of materials constantly exert economic pressure upon the contractor to undertake governmental work. Choice to sign the contract may simply be choice to remain in business.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Id., 72 S. Ct., at 157.

[55] See note 1, supra.

[56] *United States* v. *Standard Rice Co.* (323 U. S. 106, 65 S. Ct. 145, 89 L. Ed. 104 (1944)).

[57] See, e. g., the architect certificate cases, Restatement, Contracts, sec. 303 (f) (1932), excusing the condition if the architect, surveyor or engineer is guilty of gross error in regard to the facts on which the refusal is based. See also 13 McQuillin, Municipal Corporations, sec. 37.155 (3d ed. 1950).

AFTERMATH TO WUNDERLICH

More important than its questionable legal basis, the Wunderlich case presents grave practical and political difficulties which Congress should remedy. The clash between Court of Claims and Supreme Court has not been restricted to the interpretation of article 15 alone.[58] The attitude of the lower bench has been consistently responsive to the fact that the contractor did not prepare and could not vary the terms of the instrument. That court has implied constructive conditions of good faith and cooperation on the part of the Government.[59] The Supreme Court has rarely acknowledged these considerations, although in a dissenting opinion in the Blair case,[60] Justice Frankfurter observed rather elegantly that "* * * Government contracts have interstices that secrete relevant implications." [61] The unreasonable, vexatious, and oppressive conduct of the Government agents in that case prompted the dissenting Justice to agree with the Court of Claims that appeal within the department involved was excused.

The Court of Claims has also been much more familiar with and cognizant of the stresses and strains accompanying the Government construction project and the relationship between the contractor and the contracting officer. The contracting officer is properly charged with the responsibility of assuring the Government of the performance it has bargained for. His presence personally or by representative, as the job progresses, is indispensable. Left to his own devices, the contractor might attempt to disregard the stringent requirements of Government contracts. When a question of interpretation of drawings or specifications arises it must be his responsibility to make decisions and keep the work progressing. No reasonable person could suggest otherwise. The difficulty arises where a dispute occurs and he is required to temporarily forsake his role of Government representative and act as impartial arbiter. It becomes extremely difficult in practice to suddenly change character. It is roughly comparable to suggesting that the attorney for the defendant who has represented his client through the pleadings, motions, and negotiations be now the judge of the merits of the case on trial. The contracting officer, no matter how well disposed, does not and cannot operate in a vacuum. He can hardly help but be partial to the Government. Moreover, the actual performance of the work often engenders an aura of mutual suspicion and distrust. The Government representative may feel that the contractor's sole concern is to make a profit at Government expense. On the other hand, the contractor may consider him an unbending civil servant enmeshed in reams of red tape, directives, and channels of command which have deprived him of any independence or flexibility of action. Whether one or the other is accurate in his appraisal or whether both are partially correct is wholly immaterial. The undeniable fact is that the atmosphere exists in many cases.

The unfortunate Wunderlich decision takes no cognizance of this reality. Incompetence, caprice, stubborn, or unimaginative adherence to supposed duty are not proscribed; the sole criterion is a conscious design to be dishonest or to cheat. A striking example of the necessity of much broader judicial review was revealed in *Stafford* v. *United States*.[62] The contractor had agreed to plant some 10,000 trees and shrubs upon a Government project over an area 15 blocks by 3 blocks. The contract provided for liquidated damages in the event of delay beyond the specified time. There was only one Government inspector on the job and he insisted on personally supervising the planting of each tree and shrub. He even demanded the uprooting of those which were planted in his absence. The contractor's demand for more inspections was refused. The contractor, "between the rock and the whirlpool," [63] as the Court of Claims described it, had no alternative but to work with a single crew. The court permitted a recovery for the damages caused by this action. However, the court emphasized that it had no doubt of the inspector's sincerity.[64] It is precisely this type of arbitrary action which Wunderlich has placed beyond review. Rare indeed will be the case where the contracting officer is consciously attempting to defraud or cheat the contractor. And rare will be the case where it could be proved. The Wunderlich case teaches that fraud cannot be presumed. A determination which could not be arrived at by reasonable men could be the product of incompetence or of an overdeveloped, out-of-proportion sense of duty as well as the result of fraud.

That appeal to a department head is an unsatisfactory method of curing improper action in lower echelons would seem to be attested by reviewing the cases in the Court of Claims. The reports and recommendations of subordinate officials, acquiring age, bulk, and respectability as they proceed to swim upstream to top levels through the mystifying channels of Government departments, may well find acceptance at face value. The tendency to emphasize the solution of factual and legal disputes within the limits of Government agencies to the practical exclusion of courts of record, is alarming. Traditionally a suitor is entitled to a "day in court": this should be literally true, he should not be relegated to administrative bureaus. The jurisdiction of the Court of Claims has been seriously whittled down by these decisions. It would seem entirely proper and just that Congress revise and rewrite article 15 so as to assure the contractor a day in the Court of Claims if the action taken below is "arbitrary, capricious, or so grossly erroneous as to imply bad faith." If the contracting officer and department head are to be placed in the incongruous position of impartial arbiter, then their jurisdiction should not extend to the determination of questions of contract law. Presumably the Court of Claims is a more competent forum for the settlement of legal disputes if the system of "checks and balances" is to be maintained.

WILLIAM HUGHES MULLIGAN.[65]

[58] The courts have also differed in their interpretations of articles 3, 4, and 9. See *United States* v. *Rice* (317 U. S. 61, 63 S. Ct. 120, 87 L Ed. 53 (1942) (articles 3 and 4 referring to changed conditions)); *United States* v. *Foley Co.* (329 U. S. 64, 67 S. Ct. 154, 91 L. Ed. 44 (1946) (article 9 referring to delays)). The law review comments were adverse to the rulings of the Supreme Court: Anderson, Damages for Delays in the Law of Government Contracts, 21 So. Calif. L. Rev. 125 (1948); Coblens, Liability of the Owner for Delaying Contractor's Work—The Foley Case, 21 So. Calif. L. Rev. 36 (1947); 26 Nebr. L. Bull. 457 (1947).

[59] See, e. g., *Kehm Corp.* v. *United States* (93 F. Supp. 620, 623 (Ct. Cl. 1950)).

[60] *United States* v *Blair* (321 U. S. 730, 64 S. Ct. 820, 88 L. Ed. 1039 (1944)).

[61] Id.. 321 U. S. at 738.

[62] 74 F. Supp. 155 (Ct. Cl. 1947).

[63] Id. at 162.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Professor of Law, Fordham University. A. B., 1939, LL. B., 1942, Fordham University. Associated with the firm of Manning, Harnisch, Hollinger, Quinnan & Shea, New York City. Member, New York County Lawyers Association. Contributor of articles to various legal periodicals.

ALTERATION OF CERTAIN BRIDGES OVER NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, because I have to attend a committee meeting, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 2015, House bill 8127, which was unanimously passed by the Public Works Committee. I may say that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] had a similar bill in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator have any knowledge of whether the bridge over the Delaware River has been included?

Mr. MAYBANK. It provides for the alteration of bridges over navigable waters so as to include highway bridges.

I can only say that the Senate of the United States passed the bill unanimously in 1950. The House passed it the other day unanimously, and it came to the Senate.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, it is a bill the Senate has passed once before——

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And it permits the building or rebuilding of bridges over navigable waters under the Federal Highway Act, which allows contributions by the Federal Government to the States. That is all it would do.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is all it would do.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the acting minority leader that I believe the bill is perfectly fair, and is in accord with what we have already done.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is in accordance with what we have already done.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 5248) to suspend certain import duties on tungsten, together with the accompanying papers.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2190) to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, and Mr. D'EWART were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 7645) for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7645) for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 7317. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2097).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

H. R. 5567. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo; without amendment (Rept. No. 2098).

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

H. R. 948. A bill to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 2096);

H. R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Milagros Aujero; without amendment (Rept. No. 2107);

H. R. 2358. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. La Porta; without amendment (Rept. No. 2099);

H. R. 2840. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck; without amendment (Rept. No. 2108);

H. R. 4634. A bill for the relief of Johann Komma; without amendment (Rept. No. 2109);

H. R. 5442. A bill for the relief of Martin A. Dekking; without amendment (Rept. No. 2110);

H. R. 5624. A bill for the relief of Iokusaburo Imamura Glasscock; without amendment (Rept. No. 2111);

H. R. 6915. A bill for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill; without amendment (Rept. No. 2112);

H. R. 6939. A bill for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2113);

H. R. 7645. A bill for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto; without amendment (Rept. No. 2114);

H. R. 7665. A bill for the relief of Annalyn Earley; without amendment (Rept. No. 2115);

H. R. 7713. A bill for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2116); and

H. R. 8163. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Hobmeier; without amendment (Rept. No. 2117).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 3186. A bill to authorize the President to appoint to the grade of general in the Army of the United States those officers who, in grade of lieutenant general, commanded the Army ground forces or commanded an Army during World War II, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2105).

By Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 7722. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 2106).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 8321. A bill to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor Minnesota and Wisconsin; without amendment (Rept. No. 2104).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 4792. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Jeremiah Curtin home and underlying land to the Milwaukee County Historical Society by the Public Housing Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 2103).

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 9380–9396 of House Proceedings of July 3, 1952.)

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. The conference report is unanimous, signed by all the conferees, and has just been adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote of 321 to 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NORTH DAKOTA HIGHWAY SAFETY CONFERENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two letters which I inadvertantly omitted in connection with an insertion I made in the RECORD yesterday.

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

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMITTEE,
Bismarck, N. Dak., June 13, 1952.

Mr. PYKE JOHNSON,
President, Automotive Safety Foundation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Our Governor's highway safety conference held at Bismarck on

May 12 and 13 adopted the attached resolution.

In order to carry forward the purpose of this resolution it is the intent of the legislative research committee to prepare an interim report that can furnish the basis for legislative action at the next general assembly.

The objectives of the resolution have been discussed with various members of your staff, as well as the director of the State and Local Officials' National Highway Safety Committee.

The purpose of this letter is to request that the Foundation make available to the committee the services of Norman Damon, vice president, in charge of safety, to assist us in the development of this interim report.

Yours very truly,

ROY A. HOLAND, *Chairman.*

AUTOMOTIVE SAFETY FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1952.

Mr. ROY A. HOLAND,
Chairman, Legislative Research Committee, Bismarck, N. Dak.

DEAR MR. HOLAND: In response to your request of June 13 for Norman Damon's services in the development of an interim legislative safety report, I am glad to advise that Mr. Damon is available. He now plans to be in Bismarck on Tuesday, July 15, at which time he will, no doubt, discuss with you, your staff, and others the necessary steps in the formulation of the report to which you refer.

We have always felt that the leadership for responsibility of this kind is one for people of the State through their legislature, and your committee's decision to carry this study forward is one that certainly is welcome here, and we want to do everything possible to assist.

Sincerely,

PYKE JOHNSON, *President.*

COMPENSATION OF INDIANS FOR TRAVEL EXPENSES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on various occasions I have called attention of the Senate to the fact that of all the treaties ever made with Indians, not a single one has ever been kept. As a matter of fact, the Indians today are worse off than when we took them over a long time ago.

In that connection, I wish to say that I agree with a letter that was written by an Indian tribe. I ask unanimous consent that I may have the letter 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:

Re S. 2338, H. R. 5857.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: S. 2338, "To authorize pay to delegates representing Indians of California from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California," is important to the Indians and merits your consideration.

The fund is the result of efforts of a few of the Indians, beginning back in 1920, who insisted the Indians of California had never been compensated for their rights in land within the State. It was their united persistence that culminated in a jurisdictional act to determine the amount due that resulted in judgment of more than $5,000,000.

At the time Congress appropriated, to satisfy the judgment, Senator Elmer Thomas told his Committee on Senate Appropriations:

"I am free to say that Mr. Collett has been here for many years and has done a vast amount of work. Had it not been for Mr. Collett and his associates, I am doubtful if the Indians of California would have gotten a penny."

The work and necessary expense money were furnished by Indians, assisted by a few friends in and out of Congress. The judgment was for all of the Indians of California. The work, through many years, by delegates who have journeyed to Washington on many occasions, should not now find it necessary for a few Indians, by personal donations, to finance the official expenses of the delegates. They should be able to make occasional trips to Washington to represent their people and be paid from funds now in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California.

Authority for delegates to be paid from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California would mean that all enrolled Indians who share and share alike in benefits secured for them and should also share and share alike in necessary expenses of their delegates. The cost under these conditions would be divided equally among all enrollees and would amount to only a few cents for each such enrollee.

The report of the Secretary of the Interior on S. 2338 gives reasons why he recommended that the bill be not enacted. His prime reason is embodied in the following words:

"Any part of the funds remaining after such distribution (presently authorized per capita payments) should be considered in connection with the general plan to facilitate termination of Federal supervision over all Indians in California."

This quotation refers to S. 3005 which is entitled "A bill to facilitate the termination of Federal supervision cver Indian affairs in California."

The bill S. 2338 is supported by cogent evidence as to why the delegates representing Indians of California should have congressional authority to use some of the funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California for their official expenses. We urge that the bill to facilitate the termination of Federal supervision over Indian affairs in California and other bills affecting the rights of the Indians of California be not enacted without the delegates having had the right and privilege to be heard. Delegates are here to present the views of Indians of California on that and several other bills relating to their welfare. Bills affecting the rights of Indian delegates and their people are very vital and their delegates should be heard.

It has been asserted that the provisions of S. 2338 would encourage a large number of delegates who might come to Washington in the hope of being paid. This is an exaggeration beyond all reason. However, we here offer limiting amendments to further safeguard the funds of the Indians of California.

On page 2, line 11, strike the words "any person" and insert in lieu thereof "any enrollee."

On page 2, line 15, after the words "District of Columbia", insert the following: "*Provided,* That not more than seven delegates shall be entitled to per diem, compensation, and other expenses within any one calendar year, unless otherwise authorized by a committee of Congress in charge of pending legislation that affects Indians of California. The Secretary shall recognize such delegates in the order they shall have been selected and qualified: *Provided further,* That after the date of the approval of this act, not more than three such delegates shall be representative of any tribe, band, or organization. The stay of delegates within the District of Columbia shall not exceed 60 days on any occasion."

As enrollees and delegates, we believe enrollees should be authorized to choose any person they believe best qualified to represent them. In the several years past, different organizations of the Indians of California, consisting of enrollees, have seen fit to choose one or more persons who was not an enrollee to assist them in their activities in California and here. This has been true of the Federated Indians of California, the Mission Indian Federation, and the Indians of California, Inc. On account of objections that might be offered to any person serving as a delegate of enrolled Indians, Mr. Collett has suggested that there be stricken from the bill "any person" and in place of those words there be inserted the words "any enrollee." We believe the original wording was well justified, but in the interest of speedy enactment of this bill, we agree to the proposed change.

In these days of determined effort by the Congress, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and others to free the Indians of California from Federal supervision, we are confident Indian delegates should appear before your committee, officials of the Indian Bureau, the Department of the Interior, and Members of Congress, and that funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California should be used for the official expenses of the delegates.

For these reasons we earnestly petition your committee and Congress to enact the provisions of S. 2338, together with the amendments suggested.

With the adoption of the suggested amendments there should be no objection to this proposed legislation. Indian delegates from Oregon and over a period of many years have been paid for their official expenses from Tribal funds to come to Washington, D. C. The funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California are tantamount to tribal funds. Authority for the use of some of these funds for the purposes of the Indian Bureau to revise the roll of the Indians of California have been authorized by Congress without any specific authority from the Indians. It is, however, an estimated fact recognized by the courts that Congress has plenary authority to direct the use of tribal funds for the benefit of the Indians.

Authority for the payment of the official expenses of delegates is equally important to authority to pay the expenses of agents of the Indian Bureau. We believe the authority for expenses of the delegates is more important. The rights of every tribe, band, and individual Indian of California is in jeopardy.

In this connection it should be noted that under date of June 1949 the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Greenwood, recommended to the Senate Committee on Appropriations a proposed amendment to read as follows:

"For the payment from and after January 1, 1946, of a per diem (not exceeding $10) in lieu of subsistence, and of other expenses to Indian delegates representing Indians of California while in Washington, D. C., while enroute from their homes and return, and while away from their homes in California engaged in receiving instruction from or making reports to the Indians whom they represent, $50,000 to remain available until expended, payable from funds in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Indians of California: *Provided,* That the payment of other expenses shall include transportation based on the cost of railroad and Pullman fares, stenographic services, mimeographing,

printing, postage, telephone, and telegraph charges and stationery, except that any such payment shall be based upon the presentation of receipts satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further,* That no delegate shall be paid a per diem for more than 180 days in any one calendar year nor receive reimbursement for expenses, other than transportation, in excess of $100 in any one calendar year: *Provided further,* That payments under this authorization shall be made only to such Indians who upon a satisfactory showing to the Secretary of the Interior are determined by him to be delegates representing the Indians of California, but not more than seven persons shall be determined to be delegates for any one calendar year."

Senator Thomas concluded that the proposed amendment was in the nature of legislation and could not properly under the Senate rules be made a part of an appropriation bill. He advised that appropriate language for the purpose should be undertaken as an independent or a part of a bill that dealt exclusively with legislation.

S. 2338 embodies substantially the language suggested by the Acting Commissioner and is in conformity with the suggestion made by Senator Thomas.

The proposed legislation is justly retroactive beginning with January 1, 1946. The delegates who have appeared in Washington, D. C., heretofore have had to obtain from a few of their people contributions, in the form of loans and otherwise, to meet their expenses. It has always been with the understanding that the delegate if and when paid would reimburse his financial sponsors. Books have been kept as to the amounts furnished.

The provisions of S. 2338 apply equally to the delegates that might be sponsored by any group or organization of enrollees.

Respectfully submitted.

ELLEN NORRIS,
ROBERT CROMWELL,
LINWOOD WARD,
Delegates Representing Indians of California.
F. G. COLLETT,
Executive Representative, Indians of California, Inc.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I stated earlier today that we would try to have a call of the calendar. Before doing so, I think it will be necessary to have a quorum called, so that all Senators may have notice. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS TO POTTER COUNTY, TEX.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am engaged in a conference committee, and I should like to make a very brief statement on House bill 5567, which, as I understand, will be on the calendar later this afternoon.

The question has been asked as to whether or not my objection to this bill will prevail. I wish to explain why my objection to the bill will not prevail.

This is a bill to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo, Tex. I wish the record to show that the facts as they have been represented to me in regard to this bill, in my judgment, place this case on all-fours with the facts in the Kentucky case of some 2 years ago, in which land was turned over to the Federal Government for a specific purpose. When it was no longer needed for that specific purpose it was sought by Kentucky to be used for 4–H Club purposes. I took the position then, as I have consistently taken the position since, that when land is given to the Federal Government for a specific purpose and it is no longer needed by the Federal Government for that purpose, the State under those circumstances is entitled to a return of the land.

In this particular case the principle is the same, although the facts vary to this extent from the Kentucky case: In this case the land was made available to the Federal Government in the first instance by the American Legion in this area, in order to have a veterans' hospital built. The land was made available to the Federal Government for $3. Entirely too much land was made available for the use for veterans' hospital purposes so the part of the land referred to in the bill is, at the request of the Veterans' Administration, being made available for use for 4–H Club purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill referred to?

Mr. MORSE. I wish to conclude my statement.

I think that because of the type of precedent which I have already applied in the Kentucky case, this case is on all fours with it, and the Morse formula does not apply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5567.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5567) to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I gave notice yesterday that there would be a call of the calendar today. I ask unanimous consent that the calendar be called for unobjected-to bills, beginning where the last call of the calendar left off.

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

The clerk will state the first bill on the calendar beginning where the call left off yesterday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there are one or two bills on the calendar in which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is interested. He is engaged in a conference committee. I ask unanimous consent that the bills in which he is interested be called up out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, there are two bills in that category.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania indicate which bills they are?

SUPPLEMENTAL COMPACT BETWEEN NEW JERSEY AND PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the majority leader is very kind. We are all working to facilitate the business of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 2011, House bill 8316.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8316) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLEMENTAL COMPACT BETWEEN NEW JERSEY AND PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. The next bill is Calendar No. 2012, House bill 8315.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8315) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I wish publicly to express my appreciation to the majority leader for his courtesy.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I had intended to address the Senate on the subject matter of these two bills, but inasmuch as they have passed without any difficulty, I now send to the desk a statement which I had prepared, and ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

I may add that what I have to say in this statement goes for my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who concurs in everything I have said in this statement.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

The two great States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, after extended consideration and careful studies, both by their elected representatives and by their peoples, formally and respectfully presented to the Congress for its approval, proposals to undertake at their own expense, and without requests for Federal aid, public improvements vitally needed in the lower Delaware River metropolitan area.

These measures mean a great deal to the two sovereign States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania and especially to the more than 12,000,000 people in the whole of the Delaware River valley.

I believe that the vital need for this legislation and the high public purposes which it will serve, has been amply demonstrated during the course of the public hearings recently had both before the House committee and the Senate committee of which the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico is chairman.

The testimony of the able chief executives of the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, Governor Driscoll and Governor Fine, respectively, made it patently clear that the legislation now before the Senate will be of infinite benefit to the future progress of both States as well as proving to be a vital force in our national defense.

A glance at a highway map will show how much has been done in modern times to improve interstate and intrastate communication and transportation, by the application of the toll principle to the financing, construction, and operation of adequate and properly designed modern roads and highways.

The purpose of the bill H. R. 8315 of which S. 2187 which was introduced and sponsored by both Senators from New Jersey and Pennsylvania as a companion measure, is to give congressional consent to a supplemental compact which spells out the grant of powers to the Delaware River Joint Commission which was established under a 1931 compact and 1932 consent, to develop and promote commerce on, and across, the Delaware River by rail, highway, and water between Philadelphia, Pa., and Camden, N. J., and the sea. Heretofore, the Commission has operated and maintained the Philadelphia-Camden Bridge and a rapid transit system thereover for the transportation of passengers, and investigated and reported on the need for additional bridges or tunnels, and facilities for transportation, terminals, and port improvement to develop and promote the ports of Philadelphia and of Camden, and the use by commercial vessels of their facilities.

The principal changes effected by the supplemental compact would be (1) to change the name of the Commission to the "Delaware River Port Authority"; (2) to define as a port district the area of its operations in Pennsylvania and New Jersey; (3) to extend its jurisdiction northward to the boundary line between Bucks and Philadelphia Counties as extended across the Delaware River to the New Jersey shore of said river; (4) to authorize the establishment of a rapid-transit system for passengers, express, and mail between points within Philadelphia and points in New Jersey within the port district by extending existing facilities or constructing new facilities for such system; and (5) to authorize the port authority, subject to prior approval by the Legislatures and the Governors of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, to provide other transportation, terminal, or port improvement facilities needed for the commerce and welfare of the port district, and, subject to the written consent of the Governors of said States, to acquire the Socony-Palmyra Bridge between Philadelphia County and New Jersey.

The second of these two measures, H. R. 3816 (companion measure to S. 2188), which was likewise introduced by the junior Senator from New Jersey and cosponsored by the senior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, and both Senators from Pennsylvania, Messrs. MARTIN and DUFF, would grant the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact which would authorize the Delaware River Joint Commission, established under a 1931 compact and 1932 consent, by whatever name said commission may be designated, to finance and construct an additional crossing over the Delaware River, either bridge or tunnel, between Philadelphia and Camden, to be located 2 or 3 miles south of its existing bridge, but only upon the filing with the Commission of the written consents by the Governors of the two States.

The supplemental compact would regulate the undertaking of the new construction and would clarify and modernize certain incidental powers vested in the commission. The bill would permit the commission to combine into one project, for financing and operating, the new crossing and any other of the facilities it provides for the public.

It is contemplated that these bridges or tunnels, when constructed, will become one of the facilities described in H. R. 8315 and thus eventually be under the jurisdiction of the Delaware River Port Authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning with Order No. 2003, where the previous calendar call left off.

PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 218) to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control and for recovery of critical matrials from atmospheric contaminants and for other purposes, was announced as first in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire first to have an explanation as to exactly what the joint resolution would do.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the joint resolution calls for a study of the causes and methods of preventing a situation which is poisoning the people in many parts of the country. Several catastrophes have resulted from poisoned air coming from plants which could be regulated and controlled.

A similar situation existed in my State at one time. Conditions caused by smoke became such as to bring about serious effects. It seems to me that some effort should be made to control this nuisance. Many of the cities of the country are very seriously affected by it. The joint resolution only calls for a study and development of methods of preventing such conditions.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Along that line, in my State during the war there was a Government plant which caused almost incalculable damage to the community in which the State University is situated. I think it is high time that some effort such as this be made.

Mr. MURRAY. Several cases have arisen in the State of Pennsylvania which were very serious. Many people died as a result of contamination of the air.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to say to the able Senator from Montana that the joint resolution provides for the recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes. Does the phrase "for other purposes" in the joint resolution mean that the departments listed may go into business establishments and make certain requirements, effect certain changes, and control the business operations or the engineering operations of such concerns?

Mr. MURRAY. No; it does not mean that at all. It merely calls for a study and recommendations of methods and means for eliminating pollution.

Similar work was done many years ago, as far back as 1900, when Theodore Roosevelt took an interest in the problem. The forests of the United States were being destroyed. As a result of those studies the smelters were required to build their plants in such a manner that the chemicals could be saved, preventing pollution of the air. The smelters have profited from such regulation. All the joint resolution calls for is merely a study, and the designing of programs to prevent pollution.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I heartily approve of research and attempts to determine the best possible methods of eradicating, removing, and eliminating completely the injurious fumes and poisonous refuse which must of necessity follow in the wake of some of our manufacturing techniques, and as to which we have not yet determined the best preventive measures.

However, I am certainly wondering whether, as the Senator says—and I am willing to take his word for it, because he is the chairman of the distinguished committee which has reported the bill—the purpose of the joint resolution is for research and guidance only; and it does not mean the control of certain business practices which good engineering design would indicate a business concern should follow. Along those lines I might not have serious objection. I am wondering whether it is necessary to put the following language in the joint resolution. I am reading from page 3, at the top of the page:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Public Health Service, the Department of the Interior, and to the De-

partment of Agriculture such sums for each fiscal year for the next 5 years, following enactment of this resolution, as may be necessary to intensify such activities.

Does the able Senator feel that it is necessary to have three or four departments handling the matter, and why? Does the able Senator believe it is necessary to give this open-end appropriation for 5 years?

Mr. MURRAY. Several departments are interested in the problem for different reasons. For example, the Department of the Interior is interested in protecting and preserving forests. In my State of Montana the situation was so bad at one time that policemen on the night shift had to wear sponges in their noses to keep them from being poisoned by swallowing the arsenic, sulfur, and other chemicals which were expelled into the air. It seems to me that the study should be carried on by those who are already familiar with the subject. They can make recommendations.

That is all that would be done. It would not interfere with any business concern except to the extent of advising them and encouraging them to adopt ways and means of preventing the fouling of the air.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I will say frankly that I have not had an opportunity to read the report. Can the Senator from Montana give any indication as to what the cost of it each year would be?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not know what the exact cost would be, but——

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Would the Senator say whether the outlay would be nominal or excessive?

Mr. MURRAY. It would be nominal. Naturally a very extensive study will not be required. Already the agencies are largely familiar with the problem, and the country is very much interested. The State of Pennsylvania is very much interested in it because of the serious condition which developed about a year ago when many people died because of the pollution of the air. I am sure that it will not be an expensive program. In any event, the agencies must come to Congress for an appropriation, and it can be controlled in that way.

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

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana why a measure of this kind has been delayed for so long, if it is so important. We have had smoke and fumes in the air for several years. Now in the last days of the Eighty-second Congress we are presented with a measure which at least has been indicated to me will give more power to three governmental agencies to hire more people and spend more money. I want to know how much the program will cost before I consent to it. I will find out about its cost, or I will object to it.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure it will not require the building up of any personnel. The departments involved are already equipped with the personnel. The Public Health Service already has the staff with which to carry on the necessary studies and investigations. I am sure the same is true with reference to the other departments. If they were to require appropriations which were regarded as excessive, the situation could be controlled when they requested the money.

Mr. WELKER. I disagree with the Senator from Montana on that point, because once we authorize an expenditure very rarely do we not appropriate the money. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho objects.

FEDERAL EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT ACT

The bill (S. 3368) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOEY. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

COMPACTS AND AGREEMENTS BETWEEN STATES FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION ON THE GREAT LAKES–ST. LAWRENCE RIVER SYSTEM

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 167) to grant the consent of the Congress to the entry of certain States into compacts and agreements for the improvement of navigation on the boundary waters of States within the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River drainage system, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the sponsor of the joint resolution whether it is a compact between States similar to other compacts which have been entered into between States, such as the New York Port Authority, which was formed by the States of New York and New Jersey.

Mr. MOODY. That is precisely correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the sponsor whether, instead of designating the United States Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, or other appropriate Federal agency, as provided on page 2, line 21, the Senator would accept an amendment to provide for the establishment of a commission, as set forth in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and myself, to the St. Lawrence seaway measure, with a slight change in the language, so that an independent commission would be required to make a very thorough study of the subject with relation to the compact, and also to make a study of the seaway and power facilities, and all that goes with it?

Mr. MOODY. I should like to ask my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, whether such a study would abridge the rights of States to enter into a compact or delay the development of the seaway by the States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would not. It would simply come within the clause on page 2, line 20. The commission would report to Congress as to whether the United States should become a party to the compact or agreement.

Mr. MOODY. So long as such a survey would be made by a competent and impartial commission of experts and would not delay carrying the seaway forward, I would be glad to accept it if the Senator from Massachusetts insists.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont objects.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Vermont to reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. AIKEN. I favor the resolution but I cannot permit such an amendment to be added to it. I will reserve my objection if the Senator from New Jersey wants me to do so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall not discuss the amendment which has been suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, much as I approve of it. I wish to say, however, that I am entirely in accord with the purpose of the joint resolution, permitting the States involved to enter into compacts and agreements. I was one of the Senators who voted to recommit the St. Lawrence seaway measure because I was not satisfied with respect to several points, such as depth, for example. I am thoroughly in accord with the principle of letting the States form compacts. I hope the Senator from Vermont will withdraw his objection. I believe it is a very fine approach to the whole subject. I believe it is very proper for us at this time to approve of such compacts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont object?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague. The joint resolution embodies a principle which has done much for the economic development of the various sections of our country. We should encourage States to enter into such compacts. I cite the Port of New York Authority as one of the greatest agencies of that kind. If the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway could be realized through the passage of a measure of this kind, which would permit States on their own initiative to enter into compacts and go to work on great projects of this character, I certainly would approve procedures to obtain such worthy objectives.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WELKER. I thought objection had been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont withheld his objection.

Mr. WELKER. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the joint resolution goes over.

FEES OF COMMISSIONERS, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next bill on the calendar will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 3209) amending section 25 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Without objection——

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, although I do not object, I should like to know the purpose of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the bill merely provides for the fees of condemnation commissioners under the Federal courts, in connection with the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority. There is a board of appraisal which has to do with the Tennesee Valley Authority, under direction of the Federal court. That board inspects and appraises land to be acquired by the Government. The commissioners who perform that work are presently allowed fees not in excess of $15 a day, as the ceiling. That is the present arrangement, under the court's order and direction.

The bill will permit the court to allow up to $30 a day for those who do that work. The total amount involved is approximately $2,000 a year.

Mr. HOEY. This bill will not change the basic procedure; is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the bill does not change it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask how many employees are involved.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The commissioners are already employed; there are already three employees of the United States for this purpose. This bill, when enacted, will merely increase the maximum fees they may be paid from not to exceed $15 a day to not to exceed $30 a day. Only three persons are involved, and the total amount involved will be approximately $2,000 a year.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. This matter involves condemnation cases. As the Senator knows, the court usually appoints commissioners, who represent the court and arrive at a fair value for the property.

This bill does not provide for permanent employees; it merely provides that when commissioners are temporarily appointed for a particular condemnation, the court will have authority, within its discretion, to allow up to $30 a day for the services of each commissioner who appraises the property.

This bill, when enacted, will not involve any permanent appointments or any employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The bill merely involves the commissioners who serve in condemnation cases in the Federal courts.

Let me say to my friend, the Senator from Kansas, that the bill is before us really at the request of the Federal judges who serve in that area. They find it difficult to obtain persons whom they regard as qualified and competent to appraise such property; it is difficult at present to obtain such persons, by reason of the fact that the ceiling on the fees was fixed in 1933. The Federal judges feel that unless the ceiling is raised from $15 a day to $30 a day, they will be very much handicapped.

Today they are handicapped in respect to obtaining properly qualified appraisers to do the work.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Alabama has now touched on a matter about which I am satisfied. In other words, I have always understood that the Federal courts in Federal condemnation matters, or the District courts in such matters within State jurisdictions—certainly this is true in our area, in the case of all condemnations—fix the salaries or fees of the appraisers and experts who are called upon, and there is no limitation.

If, as the distinguished Senator from Alabama has indicated, the courts themselves have requested the enactment of this bill, and if the bill is strictly limited to appraisers on such projects, I have no objection to consideration of the bill.

Mr. HILL. I assure the Senator from Kansas that he has stated the case correctly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3209) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT TO EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC POWER CO. FOR COSTS OF PROTECTING OZARK BEACH POWER PLANT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next bill on the calendar will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 7241) to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill, particularly with respect to the amount of payment involved? My information is that this bill involves payment in the amount of approximately $750,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say to the Senator from Kansas that the committee was unable to obtain a printed report in time to submit it to the Senate.

However, we have the report on this matter by the House committee, and I now read from that report:

The Bull Shoals Dam, authorized by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 638, 645), is a multiple-purpose project located about 86 miles downstream from the Ozark Beach Dam and hydroelectric plant of the Empire District Electric Co. Work on the dam is practically completed.

Testimony of witnesses supported the claim of the utility company that backwater from the Bull Shoals Dam during the storing of floodwaters will, under certain conditions, damage the Ozark Beach Dam and hydroelectric plant unless protective works are provided. Any flooding of the plant would render it useless for an extended period of time.

Army engineers informed the committee that at the time the Bull Shoals project was authorized and construction under way it was believed protective works would be necessary for the plant operated by the Empire District Electric Co. and that such protection could be provided. After construction had started a study was made of the legal technicalities involved and it was found that the Department of the Army did not have the authority to provide the necessary protective works.

At the request of the Corps of Engineers an investigation and report of the works necessary to protect the Ozark Beach plant was made by the Ambursen Engineering Corp., independent consulting engineers. Protective works planned as a result of this report include a wall or similar protecting device outside of the power plant on the downstream side; raising of the transmission crossing; riprapping or other suitable protection for the earthen left bank section of the dam; and the necessary protection of other smaller parts of Empire's plant facilities. Details of the necessary protection is to be the subject of negotiation between the Empire District Electric Co. and the Corps of Engineers.

While the exact cost of the protective works to be provided by this legislation has not been officially determined, the Corps of Engineers has estimated the cost at approximately $500,000. The committee was advised that the total cost might exceed this estimate, and to meet unusual cost variations, amended the bill to provide a ceiling of $700,000.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question.

Did I correctly understand the Senator from New Mexico to say that the Empire District Electric Co. is 86 miles upstream of the new dam?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. At the time when the authorization was made for the Bull Shoals Dam, did the Army engineers or the private engineers know that when the dam was built, it would back water up to this particular piece of private property?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The information is to the effect that the Army engineers knew that. That is why we think we are justified in allowing the private enterprise to collect at least for the damages which were brought about by construction by the Government of the Bull Shoals Dam.

Mr. FREAR. They knew that, but apparently the committees which authorized the appropriation did not know it. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assume they did not; I do not recall.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7241) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE CALUMET RIVER

The bill (H. R. 8190) to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT BETTENDORF, IOWA

The bill (H. R. 8194) to amend an act approved May 26, 1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OFFICE OF SUPERVISOR OF NEW YORK HARBOR

The bill (H. R. 8234) to amend section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of Supervisor of New York Harbor was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask whether this measure will effect—as I assume it will—a saving.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; $100,000.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill simply transfers the supervisors from the port authority to the Army engineers.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HIGHWAY AND RAILROAD BRIDGES OVER COLUMBIA RIVER OR ITS NAVIGABLE TRIBUTARIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2572) to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 3, beginning in line 13, to strike out "Engineers. (b) In the event of a failure to agree upon the terms and conditions of any such contract, or upon any default in the performance of any contract entered into pursuant to this act, the bridge owner or the Secretary of the Army shall have the right to bring suit to enforce his rights or for a declaration of his rights under this act, or under any such contract, in the district court of the United States for the district in which the structure in question is located. In any such proceeding the court shall apportion the total cost of the work between the Secretary of the Army and the owner in accord with the provisions contained in this act. Any judgment, award, or decree rendered against the Secretary of the Army under this act may be satisfied out of appropriations available for construction of the McNary Lock and Dam, or out of appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for the maintenance and improvement of rivers and harbors" and insert "Engineers", and on page 4, in line 10, before the word "This", to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

IMPROVEMENT OF GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, N. Y.

The bill (H. R. 7855) for improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am delighted to explain the bill, Mr. President.

The situation existing in the case of the report on the Arkansas matter also applies in this instance. I shall read now from the report of the House committee, which was submitted by Representative BUCKLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Public Works:

> The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7855) for improvement of Gowanus Creek channel, New York, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.
>
> The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors on March 19, 1946, adopted a resolution authorizing the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review reports previously submitted on Gowanus Creek channel, New York, with a view to determining if it would be advisable to modify the existing project. That review report has been completed, was transmitted to Congress on January 8, 1952, and is designated as House Document No. 318, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
>
> Gowanus Creek is a tidal waterway on the east side of Upper New York Bay, in the Borough of Brooklyn, about 4 miles by water southeast of the Battery, New York City. It extends 1.8 miles northeasterly from the north end of Bay Ridge Channel in Gowanus Bay and includes the 1-mile upper portion known as Gowanas Canal, which local interests have improved to depths ranging from 12 feet at the lower end to 7 feet at the head. The lower part of Gowanus Creek has been improved by the United States under a project known as Gowanus Creek channel. The locally dredged Henry Street Basin enters Gowanus Creek channel from the north, 750 feet upstream from the lower end of the Federal project. This basin, about 2,000 feet long and 200 feet wide, has depths decreasing from 21 feet in a strip 100 feet wide in the lower 1,000 feet of the basin to 5 feet at the head.
>
> Local interests have expended approximately $6,000,000 in developing water-front terminals and berthing facilities in the section of Gowanus Creek under consideration.

In other words, they want a deeping of the channel. It is a dual project. The estimated cost to the Government is $287,000, and the estimated non-Federal cost is $141,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONTROL OF DURATION OF THE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

The bill (H. R. 6856) to control the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS REPORTED TODAY

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the call of the calendar. About a dozen bills which have been reported today are not on the calendar. If there is no objection, those bills will be called, in order that Senators may object to them, if they desire to do so, or, if not, that the bills may be passed. The clerk will call the first of the bills reported today, which are not on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2337) to provide for the national defense by enabling the States to make provision for maternity and infant care for wives and infants, and hospital care for dependents, of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the measure, particularly a statement of the cost, and whether it is retroactive?

Mr. LEHMAN. This is a bill which was introduced by me, for myself, on behalf of certain of my colleagues. I think I should say in justice to the members of the Labor Committee that this bill was reported only this morning. The report was completed only yesterday. I believe that some of the members of the Labor Committee have not had an opportunity to study the report. I gave my assurance to fellow members of the Labor Committee that I would not press for action on this bill this afternoon, in order that they might have more time in which to study the report and reach a decision. I therefore ask that the bill go over until tomorrow, to be called up

at that time, if there is to be another call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it has been my thought we would have a short call of the calendar tomorrow, so as to dispose of bills which, in the meantime, Senators would have an opportunity to study.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if it is the intention of the majority leader to have a call of the calendar tomorrow, might we not at that time be in a better position to consider some of the measures which were reported this morning, as the reports will then be available to us, unless the measures which it is intended to bring up at this time have received full concurrence on the part of members of the committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that as to some of the bills reported today there will be no question. The House may have to take some action, because of amendments or otherwise. I suggest that the Senate proceed with the bills reported today, and any to which there is objection can be placed on the calendar for tomorrow.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is my understanding correct that tomorrow it will be the intention of the majority leader to call up only the House bills on the calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know about that. I do not think there will be many, and I doubt if it would make much difference. Perhaps one or two of them might go over. I do not know what business might come up tomorrow. That was the principal reason for having the bills called at this time, I may say to my good friend from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I understand that.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think we should commit ourselves to consider only House bills, because there might be an apparently small Senate bill which, nevertheless, it might be important to send to the House immediately.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to say that I gained that impression in conversation with the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the Senator gained it correctly. However, upon reflection, I believe Senate bills should also be called up.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection so long as that is understood.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the next bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the time at which he expects to call the calendar tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. Perhaps we can determine that before we get through this afternoon. The proper time probably would be shortly after the Senate convenes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. What are the Senator's plans with respect to the hour at which we shall convene tomorrow—10 or 11 o'clock?

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator will let me do a little checking, I shall be glad to let him know. It would depend upon whether we could probably accomplish anything by convening early. Meeting earlier might enable us to get through sooner tomorrow. If it would, we would convene earlier; if not, we might as well convene tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next bill.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS TO HOPE, N. MEX.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7317) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, as I remember from having read the first part of the bill, it pertains to a matter in which the Senator from Oregon is interested, and as to which I must object on his behalf.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to withhold it for an explanation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the purpose is to authorize the conveyance of lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex. It is land which was taken over by the Soil Conservation Service. They do not need it any more. It lies within the corporate limits of the little town of Hope, N. Mex., and the committee insists that it be paid for, if it is turned over. The Government cannot use it, but the little town of Hope can use it. I am sure the Senator from Oregon would not object, if he knew the explanation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. If the Senator will yield, I may say he does not have to convince me on the proposition, but I am bound to object, since the Senator from Oregon has requested it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

GEORGE BLECH AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 6558) for the relief of George Blech and others, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May we have an explanation of the bill, Mr. President?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, prior to about the middle of World War II, there was a definite limitation of time within which an officer could claim credit for the expense of moving his household furniture. At that time, the minimum assignment to duty was for 2 years, but the practice was later followed of making emergency assignments. Some of the men were compelled to move their household furniture. The Congress, realizing the situation, changed the law. This bill would be unnecessary but for the fact that there were presented 11 claims, totalling $2,383.19, for moving personal effects, resulting from a permanent change of station of 11 naval officers. This is merely to reimburse them and place them on a parity with others.

I may say that when this bill first was taken up in the Judiciary Committee, I objected to it, because I thought it might be the forerunner of a great number of similar bills. At that time the Navy Department assured the committee there were no other such claims within the Department. I still objected, because I did not know about the Air Corps and the Department of the Army. I have since that time received a letter from General Reber, assuring the committee that there are no claims in the Army—which at the time in question also included the Air Corps—so that these 11 claims are the only ones that are not now taken care of by substantive law. So the total amount of $2,383.19 will take care of these three emergency war cases. It is purely a reimbursement for the out-of-pocket cost of shipping personal effects from one station to another, when the removal was made by order of the Government, not for the convenience of the men, and prior to a certain time limit, which in peace times is normally observed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, his statement has refreshed the memory of the Senator from Kansas regarding a discussion on the part of several Senators. I regret that, because of the precedent it would establish, I must object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

TERMS OF COURT TO BE HELD AT WEST PALM BEACH AND FORT MYERS, FLA.

The bill (H. R. 948) to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, I think we should have an explanation of the bill for the purposes of the RECORD.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, before the Committe on the Judiciary the matter was explained, as I recall, by one of the Senators from Florida. The purpose is to provide that Federal courts shall be held in two different places. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and I think the statement was that the Judicial Conference endorsed this proposal. That is why we reported the bill.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 948) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH R. LA PORTA

The bill (H. R. 2358) for the relief of Joseph R. La Porta was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the United States Department of Labor, pursuant to the administration of the benefits provided for under the head "Civilian war benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947, to receive, consider, and adjudicate a claim from Joseph R. La Porta for compensation for disability sustained by him on or about August 26, 1944, as a result of a plane crash.

Mr. La Porta was a cadet in the Civil Air Patrol when he was injured, and he filed his claim with the Veterans' Administration within the statutory period. It took that agency 7 months to inform the claimant he had no rights as a veteran. As a result of this delay the statute of limitations ran against Mr. La Porta and his claim was barred.

The committee is of the opinion that the claimant has shown "good cause" for his failure to file this claim timely, and consequently this bill is favorably recommended.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I was wondering if it is a referral case.

Mr. KILGORE. It is a case to be referred to the board only.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2358) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JANE P. MYERS

The bill (H. R. 3268) for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Mexico to explain the bill? He is thoroughly familiar with it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this bill pertains to a citizen of my State. The record shows that Jane P. Myers, wife of John A. Myers, was receiving Class E allotment in the sum of $50, and Class F allowance in the sum of $50. John A. Myers was killed in action in the European area on December 3 and the wife's entitlement was declared to have ceased on that date, though she was paid through December 1944.

On December 23 Mrs. Myers was sent a form letter, Adjudication Form 605, stating, in effect, that she might be entitled to a pension, and enclosing Application Form 534. She took the form to Mr. E. C. Crampton, an attorney in the law office of Crampton and Robertson. I know Mr. Crampton personally. He is a very fine man, quite advanced in age. I think he is between 80 and 90 years of age. "Senator Crampton" as we know him, assisted Mrs. Myers as a matter of charity, as he has advised me, in preparing the form which was forwarded to the Veterans' Administration. It was received there on January 8, 1945. In the form Mrs. Myers stated that she was expecting a child. Shortly thereafter she was confined and her child was born February 2, 1945.

It is one of those cases where, because of a Government agency's confusion, an effort is being made to get a little money back from the lady, and this bill will give her help.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As I recall, the bill was reported by the Judiciary Committee unanimously.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Jane P. Myers, of Raton, N. Mex., the sum of $953, representing the amount of compensation she would have received for the period beginning on January 1, 1945, and ending on March 27, 1946 had her claim filed within 1 year after the date fixed by the Department of the Army as the date of the death of her husband, Staff Sgt. John A. Myers, been completed by the timely filing of certified copies of her marriage certificate and of her child's birth certificate: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act 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 amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF PRESIDENT TO APPOINT CERTAIN OFFICERS TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (S. 3186) to authorize the President to appoint to the grade of general in the Army of the United States those officers who, in grade of lieutenant general, commanded the Army Ground Forces or commanded an army during World War II, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this measure?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is a bill introduced by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. It involves no money. It was recommended by the Defense Department and was reported unanimously by the Armed Services Committee. It involves a few officers who served during World War II with three-star rank, although they were actually filling positions calling for higher rank.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint to the grade of general in the Army of the United States those officers who, while serving in the grade of lieutenant general, commanded the Army ground forces at any time between March 8, 1942, and August 16, 1945, or who commanded an army or armies of the United States in either the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations at any time between December 11, 1941, and May 8, 1945, or in the Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations at any time between December 8, 1941, and August 16, 1945, and, if retired, to advance such officers to such grade on the retired list. Any such officer who died prior to the effective date of this act, or prior to appointment hereunder, may be so appointed posthumously: *Provided*, That no increase of basic or retired pay or allowances shall result from such appointment or the passage of this act.

BESTOWAL OF RANK ON CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER OF THE COAST GUARD

The bill (H. R. 7722) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance, between the chief medical officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I would like to have an explanation of the measure.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, at the present time there is, of course, a Chief of the Public Health Service, with six deputies heading various branches of the medical and engineering activities carried on by the Public Health Service. The chief deputy is designated by statute as entitled to the rank of major general. The others are permitted to have the rank either of brigadier general or major general. They are designated by the head of the Public Health Service. All six of the deputies have the rank by designation of the Chief of the Public Health Service of major general. The only one who has not that rank at the present time is the chief medical officer of the Coast Guard. He is the only such officer who now holds the rank of brigadier general. All the others hold the rank of major general.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Are all these medical officers now in the military service?

Mr. LEHMAN. This officer is subject to military discipline and the Coast Guard is part of the Armed Forces though assigned to the Treasury Department. I believe that he has been commissioned from civil life. The chief medical officer of the Army is an Army officer. The chief medical officer of the Navy is a naval officer, whereas the chief medical officer of the Coast Guard is a member of the commissioned corps of the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Are they uniformed officers?

Mr. LEHMAN. Public health officers of either service may be in uniform.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. How many persons are to be involved in this action? Does it mean increased emoluments, and is it necessary to give the advanced rank merely so that the persons involved may be in line with Army requirements, even though their positions pertain to medical service? Just what is the reason?

Mr. LEHMAN. I cannot say whether the rank of officers in the Public Health Service should be that of major, colonel, brigadier general, or major general. The fact remains that of the six deputies, five of them have the grade equivalent to that of major generals. Only one does not. So far as pay or other emoluments are concerned, the bill would therefore affect only one individual, namely, the Public Health Service officer assigned as chief medical officer of the Coast Guard. I believe that officer is doing just as important work as are the chief medical officer, the chief dental officer, and the other deputies in the Public Health Service.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. What was the report of the committee? I will be frank with the Senator from New York. I believe there are too many generals in the Army, too many generals all the way down the line, who have been advanced because they want to go up the line, whether they have earned their positions or not. I desire to be very careful about this one.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is my recollection that last year we passed a bill giving the Chief Dental Officer the same rank, sought by this bill, namely, the equivalent of the rank of major general. The Chief of the Bureau of Medical Services and the Chief Sanitary Engineer officer and two others have that rank. I believe such rank is justified in the Public Health Service, because those officers deal with large numbers of people. They are responsible for a very considerable personnel, and, of course, they come into contact with representatives of many other countries and also with all departments of the Government. The bill would affect only one person.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I was merely going to say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that the bill affects one individual, the Chief of the Medical Service of the Coast Guard. It is the feeling of Dr. Scheele, the Surgeon General, that responsibilities of that gentleman are fully equal to those of the others who now have the higher rank. The bill would apply to one individual.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming answer a question?

Mr. HUNT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It will affect persons holding these offices in the future, will it not?

Mr. HUNT. Just the one person who may hold this particular position in the future. His successor, of course, would hold it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Would it not be mandatory in effect?

Mr. HUNT. I would not say it would be mandatory, but it would make such an appointment possible, of course, and we know that if the position is available, the person who fills it will desire the rank that goes with it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. From this time on everyone who holds one of the positions would be made a major general?

Mr. HUNT. That is now the case in five divisions. The bill would make it the case in the sixth.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I understand.

Mr. HUNT. It seems to be a case of equalizing the rank of men doing comparable work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to know why these officers should have military rank at all. They are not in the military service, as I understand.

Mr. HUNT. It is the law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Perhaps we had better change the law. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The bill will go to the calendar.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the Senator from Nevada to agree that the bill will be placed on the calendar if the calendar is to be called tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill would automatically go to the calendar, the Chair will state to the Senator from New York.

The clerk will state the next bill.

MARTIN A. DEKKING

The bill (H. R. 5442) for the relief of Martin A. Dekking was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Martin A. Dekking. The bill also provides for the payment of the required visa fee and head tax, and for the appropriate quota deduction.

Mr. Dekking is a native of the Netherlands, and is approximately 26 years old. He entered the United States on January 29, 1949.

The pertinent facts in the case are contained in a letter from the Attorney General. The bill has been reported favorably by the House committee and has been unanimously passed by the House. It was reported today by the Senate committee.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator from Texas for his explanation.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMMIGRATION BILLS REPORTED BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee of the Judiciary if, as I have been informed by my colleague, the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, there are a number of bills relating to immigration that may be reported. I have been informed generally about the bills. We have that much information. If the Senator will indicate those bills en bloc, we would be perfectly willing that they be considered in that manner, in order to save time.

Mr. McCARRAN. There were about 12 or 13 bills considered today by the committee and reported favorably to the Senate. They were bills on immigration matters. I have 10 bills here besides the one which was just considered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. They were all reported unanimously.

MILAGROS AUJERO

The bill (H. R. 1913) for the relief of Milagros Aujero was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. HEE SHEE WONG ACHUCK

The bill (H. R. 2840) for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHANN KOMMA

The bill (H. R. 4634) for the relief of Johann Komma was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ILKUSABURO IMAMURA GLASSCOCK

The bill (H. R. 5624) for the relief of Ilkusaburo Imamura Glasscock was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GISELA HELEN SNOWDY

The bill (H. R. 7713) for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAYMOND SCOTT HILL

The bill (H. R. 6915) for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BOZIE LINCOLN DONALSON

The bill (H. R. 6969) for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I find that with reference to the bill just passed, I do not have a report before me. I should like to hold the bill up until I can inquire as to the number of bills that were approved by the committee today at noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which House bill 6969 was passed, is reconsidered, and the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER subsequently said: There is one bill that has been passed over. Has the Senator from Nevada had an opportunity to examine the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Chair kindly give me the number?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H. R. 6969.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HILDEGARD HOBMEIER

The bill (H. R. 8163) for the relief of Hildegard Hobmeier was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNALYN EARLEY

The bill (H. R. 7665) for the relief of Annalyn Earley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIA GRAZIA MARANTO

The bill (H. R. 7645) for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. H. R. 6558 has not been called. It has been reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk advises the Chair that the bill is not at the desk at this time.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT DUTIES ON TUNGSTEN

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this morning the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] made a motion to request the House to return the papers in connection with H. R. 5248. That bill was passed yesterday. Had the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] been on the floor, he would have objected to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 4, 1952.

Ordered, That the bill of the House and the accompanying papers (H. R. 5248) to suspend certain import duties on tungsten, be returned to the Senate, in compliance with the request of the Senate for the return thereof.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. What was the calendar number?

Mr. McFARLAND. We do not have the calendar number now, because the bill did not appear on today's calendar. It is the so-called tungsten bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. In what position does that leave the bill that would place tungsten on the free list? That is, remove the tariff.

Mr. McFARLAND. The bill will be on the calendar. Unless it is passed, nothing will happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Nevada that the bill would come up on a call of the calendar.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, if the calendar were called again, the bill would be subject to being called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is subject to being called whenever there is another call of the calendar, if the calendar call proceeds from the beginning of the calander.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada wishes to register an objection now, and make it a matter of record with both the majority and minority leaders.

It is well known that when the Government purchases material for the stockpile for national defense, no tariff is paid; therefore this bill is unnecessary.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand from the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that he does not desire to make a motion to bring the bill up. If no motion is made to proceed to consider the bill, it would not be passed unless it were passed on a call of the calendar.

Mr. MALONE. It is subject to being called up every time the calendar is called. More and more Senators are leaving the Senate and more and more bills are being passed haphazard and with little consideration of the subject matter of such legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill would come up on a call of the calendar only if the call started from the beginning of the calendar. If the call started at the point where the previous call left off, the bill would not be called.

Mr. MALONE. It came up last night, Mr. President, by request of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In that instance the call proceeded from the very beginning of the calendar.

Mr. MALONE. It came up following the call of the calendar by special request—following an understanding between the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and the junior Senator from Nevada that it would not be considered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think I can explain the action which was taken. I gave notice that when an objection was made to a bill, if the objector were to withdraw his objection, the bill could be taken up and passed. I also requested other Senators than the one who made the original objection to register any objection they might have with the minority leader or myself, and they would be protected. I did not know of the objection of the distingushed junior Senator from Nevada to the bill, or it would not have been called up. Inasmuch as it was called up by unanimous consent, certainly nothing will be done in connection with the bill without notice to the distinguished Senator from Nevada. He will be given an opportunity to be present on the floor and take such action as he deems necessary.

Mr. MALONE. With that understanding, I am satisfied.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there are a few other bills with respect to which I wish to give notice. First, let me say that I wish to give notice that tomorrow we may move to take up Calendar No. 2003, House Joint Resolution 218, and Calendar No. 2005, Senate Joint Resolution 167, or any of the bills to which objection was made today on the call of the calendar.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. There was some confusion in the Chamber and I did not hear what the majority leader had to say.

Mr. McFARLAND. I gave notice that we may move tomorrow to bring up two measures to which objection was made, namely, Calendar No. 2003, House Joint Resolution 218, and Calendar No. 2005, Senate Joint Resolution 167.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Was that announcement made today or yesterday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I was just giving the notice. I stated that we might make a motion to proceed to the consideration of either or both of those measures tomorrow, not today. I feel that I should give notice. Certain Senators wished to have them brought up today, but I replied that the policy was to give notice.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. With respect to Calendar No. 2005, Senate Joint

Resolution 167, does not the Senator realize that there have been no committee hearings? None of us knows what is in the joint resolution.

Mr. McFARLAND. Quite a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle are very anxious that the joint resolution should pass.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Without any consideration by a committee?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think that, by and large, the majority of Senators understand the purpose of the joint resolution. I do not think it is necessary to have consideration by a committee. However, if the Senate wishes to do so it can vote the joint resolution down.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to make a further brief observation. I merely wish to reflect the sentiments of certain Senators who have spoken to me with reference to the calendar call today. Many Senators understood that this was to be the last calendar call. Obviously that is a matter which is in the jurisdiction of the majority leader. However, I may say that it has been indicated to me that if there is to be another call of the calendar certain Senators wish to be advised about it today. If there is to be a call of the calendar tomorrow they will insist upon a tight quorum call being not only requested but assured on the floor. I think I should make that statement in deference to Senators who have requested me to take certain action.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is perfectly all right. I am sorry I did not consult the Senator from Kansas. I told the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] that we might have a further call of the calendar, because some small House bills might come over. The call of the calendar today has been as much to accommodate Senators on the other side of the aisle as Senators on this side. That is the reason I am giving notice. We are not trying to take advantage of anyone. I think Senators should have full opportunity to be present when there is a call of the calendar.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I hope the majority leader will understand that I was merely reflecting the sentiments which had been expressed to me. The Senator from Kansas always tries to be present when there is a call of the calendar; and I feel constrained to keep faith with Senators who have spoken to me on the subject.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand. The Senator from Kansas has been very cooperative.

MARIA GRAZIA MARANTO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Arizona that there is one more bill on the desk which has been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7645) for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EQUALITY OF GRADE, ETC., BETWEEN CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER OF THE COAST GUARD AND COMPARABLE OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some time ago I objected to a bill which would have granted increased rank, pay, and allowances to the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard. I wanted to obtain an explanation of the bill. My understanding is that all the health officers in the services have a certain rank pursuant to statute. Am I correctly advised in that regard?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. As I understand, this is the only Chief Medical Officer who has not been given an advanced rank.

Mr. HUNT. And a comparable level of responsibility.

Mr. McCARRAN. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 7722) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army, which was read twice by its title.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BURLEY TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1978, House bill 8170, which is one of the bills with respect to which I have previously given notice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8170) relating to burley-tobacco farm-acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill. Does the Senator wish an explanation at this time?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. No. I apologize.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this is a measure which was on the calendar yesterday, and it was passed over without prejudice. At that time it was stated that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and the two Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS and Mr. UNDERWOOD] were considering the subject.

I will say to the Senator from Kansas, as well as to other Members of this body, that this measure is approved by the Department of Agriculture. It is unanimously approved by the Committee on Agriculture of the House and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. It passed the House without objection. It affects the acreage allotments of burley tobacco only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think this is the most disorderly and improper way to enact legislation I have seen in the 20 years I have been in the Senate. We are crowding through a great many bills in the last minutes of the last session of the Eighty-second Congress. Many of the bills we know nothing about; few of them have been properly considered by committees.

The Judiciary Committee works for weeks on some of the bills which today we are passing in a few minutes. It is just not right. I do not like to object. When a Senator wishes to have a bill passed in which he is personally interested, another Senator dislikes to object. I withdrew my objection to a bill a few minutes ago. However, I will say that there was never a more disorderly way of enacting legislation. Some day we will enact legislation for which we will be sorry later, if we proceed with this kind of program.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to say to my good friend from Nevada that the bills which are being called up all were the subject of notice to Members. Notice was given that they would be taken up, and they are on the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not speaking about bills which the Senator from Arizona is now bringing up, notice as to which has been given. I am speaking about some bills which were passed in the last half hour. I will be frank to say that some of them came from my own committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada could have objected to the consideration of any of the bills.

AMENDMENT OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1514, S. 2592.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2592) to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit

the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the nature of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. The bill would permit—and I will say that its provisions are not mandatory—granting by airlines of reduced rates to ministers. The same privilege is granted to ministers by the railroads. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the majority leader for bringing up the bill. I think it is a very fine bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, am I to understand that the bill would do no more than to allow airlines, if they desired, to grant a reduced rate to ministers of religion?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. What rate could airlines give? Could they carry ministers of religion free?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if I may explain the bill, it would give airlines the same right which railroads have had for a hundred years. It would permit airlines to sell tickets to ministers of religion at half fare.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I want to know. It provides that ministers of religion could be carried for half fare?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. There are no compulsory features about it?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. If the airlines wanted to do it today they could not do it. Legislation is required to give them the right to sell half-fare tickets to ministers of religion.

Mr. FERGUSON. If one airline, flying to New York City, for example, allowed the half-fare privilege, would all the other airlines be forced to allow the same privilege?

Mr. CAPEHART. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would not be considered unfair competition?

Mr. CAPEHART. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is purely a permissive provision?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. It grants no other right than the one which railroads have been enjoying for a hundred years.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF LAWS RELATING TO PATENTS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1908, H. R. 7794.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7794) to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 9, line 9, to strike out the word "or" and insert the word "on"; on page 29, in subsection 282 (1), to strike out the word "or" between the words "infringement" and "absence"; to strike out the comma at the end of the line after the word "infringement" and add the words "or unenforceability"; and on the same page, in the first line of section 284, to strike out the words "Upon adjudging a patent valid and infringed," and insert in lieu thereof the words "Upon finding for the claimant".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada tell us the purpose of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill would codify the patent laws of the United States. It is under the able guidance of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not a patent lawyer, but I know patents are a very technical subject. Does the bill change the law in any way or only codify the present patent laws.

Mr. McCARRAN. It codifies the present patent laws. It passed the House, and it was approved by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as I recall, it was approved by the Judiciary Committee unanimously.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator from New Jersey is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

This legislation is another step in codification of the United States Code and will enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents." This legislation has been in the process of study and consideration for a number of years. It has passed the House and has reached the Senate after lengthy hearings on the House side. The bill has the general approval of all parties concerned and represents a step forward in the codification of our laws, for it brings together in one package all of the laws relating to patents that were contained in the revised statutes of 1874 down to the present time. The bill is divided into three categories, the first being entitled the "Patent Office" and deals with its functions; part 2 is titled the "Patentability of Inventions and Grant of Powers," and part 3 is titled "Patents and Protection of Patent Rights." Into these three categories the existing laws relating to patents have been codified. In view of decisions of the Supreme Court and others as well as trial by practice and error there have been some changes in the law of patents as it now exists and some new terminology used. All these matters, as stated before, have been carefully gone over in hearings and the bill as it is now presented to the Senate represents, in the opinion of the committee, legislation of merit. The committee therefore recommends that this legislation be speedily passed.

The Senate amendments are primarily technical. The addition of the words "or unenforceability"—this is the subject matter of the committee amendment No. 3—will place in the code this word which has been used in numerous court decisions under the section in question.

The change in language proposed in committee amendment No. 4 is for the purpose of avoiding a possible construction that judgment must be entered by a court even in a case where a patent is found unenforceable. This will preserve the present rule of law in this regard.

The question as to whether part I of H. R. 7794 should have been properly codified in title 35 rather than title 5 dealing with executive agencies was discussed in the House Codification Committee and brought up in the study of the bill in the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

Inasmuch as title 5 has not been codified and the Patent Office is the proper agency for handling both patents and trade-marks, it is considered that part I is properly in H. R. 7794 at this time.

If it is desired to transfer the Patent Office to title 5 which deals with executive agencies, that matter could be properly taken care of when title 5 is offered for codification. It would seem that to leave the setting up of the Patent Office out of title 35 at this time would be to leave a portion of the patent law uncodified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FRED P. HINES—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to reconsider the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Fred P. Hines, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair) laid before the Senate the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Fred P. Hines, and the message from the President vetoing the bill.

(For the veto message see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 30, 1951).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Fred P. Hines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from North Dakota will withdraw his motion. A great many conference committees are meeting at this time. A record vote will be required on the question before the Senate, and in view of the fact that many Senators

are meeting in conferences I hope the Senator from North Dakota will withdraw his motion. I would prefer if we proceeded to the consideration of the veto message tomorrow, when many more Senators will be on the floor.

Mr. LANGER. There are more Senators on the floor today than there will be tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. But we have important conferences going on.

Mr. LANGER. There will be conferences going on tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was passed by Congress, vetoed by the President, and is now reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with the recommendation that it do pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to say to my good friend from North Dakota that with so many Senators in conference I hope he will withdraw his motion, with the understanding that the bill will be the first order of business tomorrow.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, after discussing the matter with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I withdraw my motion for the present, with the understanding that the matter will be taken up as the first order of business tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withdraws his motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am told that the conferences are about over. If the Senator from North Dakota wishes to have the veto message brought up now, I would as soon have it taken up now as tomorrow.

Mr. LANGER. Very well, Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to reconsider the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Fred P. Hines, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to know what the bill relates to.

Mr. LANGER. Let me state that I have just moved that the Senate proceed to reconsider the bill, which has been vetoed by the President.

Mr. CORDON. I understand that, but I should like to know what the bill provides.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will yield to me, I shall be glad to make a brief statement about the bill.

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the bill would provide for payment of the sum of $778.78 to Fred P. Hines, of Minot, N. Dak., which sum represents the amount necessary to pay private medical and hospital expenses incurred by him incident to an emergency operation when his physical condition was such that he could not be moved to a Veterans' Administration hospital.

An identical bill of the Eighty-first Congress, S. 2618, passed the Senate on July 26, 1950.

Mr. Hines was admitted as a patient at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Fargo, N. Dak., from September 22, 1941, to May 14, 1942, during which time it was discovered that he was suffering from cancer. Following several extensive surgical procedures, he was discharged from that hospital on the above-mentioned date. The claimant was admitted to the same hospital again on February 7, 1948, for treatment for abdominal complaints. The survey conducted revealed no recurrence of cancer but it did reveal a hernia at the site of the previous abdominal operations. He was treated with an abdominal belt and was discharged from the hospital on March 4, 1948, his symptoms having disappeared.

Mr. President, the bill was before the Judiciary Committee, and was reported favorably by that committee, and was passed by the Senate, but was vetoed by the President.

Thereafter, the bill was again referred to the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee made a further study of the bill, in view of the President's veto message; and again the Judiciary Committee reported the bill favorably, with a recommendation that the bill be passed over the veto.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota, that the Senate proceed to reconsider the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Fred P. Hines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this question must be decided by a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to take only a few minutes of the time of the Senate to explain the reason why I shall vote to sustain the veto.

I notice from the report that Mr. Hines has a non-service-connected disability.

Personally, I feel—and I have taken this position throughout my service in the Senate—that we should do everything possible to rehabilitate the veterans of any war. On the other hand, in this case the report indicates that this man has a non-service-connected disability.

Under those circumstances, I believe it is my duty to vote to sustain the President's veto. I do not wish to discuss the case in detail, for I do not know very much about it.

On the other hand, if we set a precedent of this kind, it can be applied in many other cases. Although the sum of money involved in this case is relatively small, yet if the Senate were to override the President's veto, by taking such action the Senate would set a precedent which would have to be followed in the future.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader says that Mr. Hines' disability was non-service-connected. However, the fact remains that twice Mr. Hines was taken to the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fargo, N. Dak., and twice he was taken care of at that hospital. The doctors at the hospital claimed that Mr. Hines had cancer.

When Mr. Hines returned to the hospital the third time, the doctors kept him there 1 day, but then said they could do nothing for him; and they sent him—a man of 75 years of age—home to die.

When he reached Minot, N. Dak., he went to a private doctor, who proceeded to treat him. At the end of 1 month, Mr. Hines was strong enough to be able to submit to an operation.

He survived the operation. He has been in the hospital now for 5 years; he is in the hospital today. He is receiving a pension of $90 a month—not enough to keep body and soul together.

It was not his fault that the Veterans' Administration hospital would not keep him.

The bill was vetoed solely on the ground that there is some sort of regulation on the part of the Veterans' Administration that a veteran cannot go to a private hospital unles he obtains the consent of the Veterans' Administration.

I say that when the Veterans' Administration says to a man, "We can't cure you; go on home to die," and when the veteran then is treated by a private physician, at least the Government should pay his hospital expenses—which in this case amount to $778.78.

Those are the facts.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that under the law it is the duty of the Veterans' Administration to admit veterans to the veterans' hospitals if the illness is due to a service-connected disability. If the sickness is not service-connected, then the veteran may still be admitted if there is a bed available.

The fact that a veteran may receive treatment for non-service-connected disability certainly should not obligate the Government to pay his hospital bills in the future.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Mr. Hines stayed in the hospital, the first time, for several months. On the second occasion, again he stayed in the hospital for several months.

When he returned to the hospital the third time, the doctors there told him, "You are going to die anyway." They kept him at the hospital for 24 hours and then sent him home to die.

Certainly, merely because the Veterans' Administration did not do its duty, this man should not be penalized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not thoroughly familiar with this case. Did Mr. Hines die?

Mr. LANGER. No. He has been in the hospital for 5 years, now, after the Veterans' Administration said it could not do anything for him.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to observe that when this

bill was initially before the Senate, it came to the floor with the unanimous approval of the Judiciary Committee, and the bill also had the approval of the Republican calendar committee. After a searching examination into all the facts, all of us felt that this measure was a good and a meritorious one, and should be passed.

I hope the bill will be passed at this time, the President's objections to the contrary notwithstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in behalf of the bill. I think Mr. Hines is well deserving of the small benefit this bill would accord him.

Both the House committee and the Senate committee have thoroughly gone over his case and over this bill. If there were anything wrong with the bill, those committees would have found it.

I think the Senate should override the President's veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, a yea-and-nay vote is required on this question, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator, from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness in their respective families.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. MCCARTHY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 44, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Kem	Stennis
Dworshak	Kerr	Taft
Ecton	Kilgore	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Watkins
Frear	Malone	Welker
George	Martin	Williams
Hendrickson	McCarran	Young
Hennings	McClellan	

NAYS—16

Benton	Hunt	Moody
Chavez	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Long	Pastore
Ellender	Maybank	Smathers
Green	McFarland	
Holland	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—36

Anderson	Fulbright	Millikin
Brewster	Gillette	Murray
Bricker	Hayden	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Kefauver	Russell
Carlson	Knowland	Seaton
Case	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Duff	McCarthy	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Underwood
Flanders	McMahon	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. More than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF POSTMASTER GENERAL TO LEASE QUARTERS FOR POST OFFICE PURPOSES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1795, House bill 6839, to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post office purposes.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, as I understand, this is a bill which was called on the calendar, and an agreement has been reached whereby there is no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the objection to this bill was registered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

In reply to what the majority leader has said, I may say that in the committee we added to the words "Public Works Committee" the words "Post Office and Civil Service." We have agreed that both committees should supervise, instead of only one committee. The language is: "approved by the Committees on Public Works and Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Public Works and Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate."

Mr. MCFARLAND. As I understand the bill would permit a lease and an option to buy and would, in the end, save the Government a great deal of money. The only difficulty in regard to this proposed legislation in the past has been a dispute as to the jurisdiction of the two committees mentioned. I understand that the differences have been ironed out, and I personally feel that the bill is a good one.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is good legislation, and the dignity of both committees is protected.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, are we considering this bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am going to object to the consideration of the bill. In fairness, I think I should say that there is some feeling around the Senate Chamber that after bills have been objected to on the calendar there has been some maneuvering to get action on them.

I have assured some of the Senators on our side that before any bill is taken up, either tonight or tomorrow, unless advance notice has been given, there will be a quorum call. I say that so that the distinguished majority leader may be aware of it, and also that we may have a statement in advance of what bills are going to be brought up, so that opportunity will be afforded to study them. There may be no necessity for objection; but, other than regular appropriation bills or the military or public works bills which are on the vital program of the Senate—if matters of a miscellaneous character are going to be brought up without advance notice, the Senator from New Hampshire, in justice to the people he represents, will demand a quorum.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho objects.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE IN CONSIDERING BILLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the minority leader whether his statement applies to the situation which I am about to state.

Early in the afternoon objection was raised by me to a bill by which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]

sought to get some property for a New Mexico town. The Senator has now agreed to accept an amendment whereby the town will pay the full appraised fair market value for the property, because it will be used in a private sense, in that it will make home sites available to persons who want to come to the town.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the distinguished Senator that so long as we are on notice, so long as we have some advance notice, I shall not object to the consideration of such a bill tomorrow or after a quorum call at this time, but I do not want things to run wild.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator to withhold his comment.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on line 5, to be called up when the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] calls up the bill, which is H. R. 757. The amendment is as follows:

Upon payment by said town of the appraised fair market value of the property.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent is required to have the bill taken up, unless the Senator moves to take it up.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I move to take it up, and I ask that the Senate vote on it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Idaho. I have tried to conform to the suggestion, though it is not always possible to do so, of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. BRIDGES], namely, to give notice of bills that we expect to call up. That is a courtesy which I have tried to extend. Usually I try to reach an agreement with the distinguished minority leader if I intend to depart from that practice.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Idaho will not resist taking up the bill. It is a very important bill and will save the Government a large amount of money. It is a bill on which the only controversy has been between two committees. If it had not been for that controversy, the bill would have been passed on the calendar a long time ago. The Senator from New Mexico is the only Senator who objected to it.

I hope that the Senator from Idaho will withhold his objection. If he does not, I hope the Senator from South Carolina will not insist on his motion. I shall move to take up the bill tomorrow, but I hope the Senator from South Carolina will not insist on his motion to take it up tonight, because I wish to keep faith with the practice we have established and have tried to follow.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I objected to the bill because during the past few hours there have been put through a score or more bills about which many Senators knew nothing. We had no notice about their being called after the calendar was completed. Many committees have been polled. We are considering bills which have never been considered by any committee. We have been asked to sign bills by clerks who have come to us and asked us to do so.

All Senators desire to be courteous to their colleagues, but I do not think this is the way to legislate. If committees have not considered bills, we should not consider them on the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senate distinctly understood that the only bills which were to be considered, as to which notice was not given, were bills on the calendar considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall not yield until I have made my explanation. I should like to have the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, I want the Senate to know that, in my humble judgment, not a single bill has been slipped through; no bill has been passed that should not have beeen passed. The bills which have been taken up and considered have been bills not objected to. I have conformed to our practice of extending every courtesy to the minority by conferring with them about bills before making motions to take them up.

The measure now being discussed is important, but I myself would have to resist the motion of the Senator from South Carolina, if he insists on it, because I did not give the notice——

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator kindly wait? I hope the distinguished Senator from Idaho will withdraw his objection, because this bill has been on the calendar a long time. The Senate is fully informed in regard to the contents of the bill. I believe it to be an important measure, and that it can be disposed of this afternoon.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. With that explanation, I am willing to withdraw my objection, but I certainly shall object to the consideration of any bills already objected to on the Consent Calendar, because I think all Senators with bills caught in log jams in the committees are entitled to equitable treatment.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator very kindly for withdrawing his objection.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I, too, thank the Senator from Idaho. I wish to say to the Senate that I meant to withdraw my motion to take up the bill tonight, and to let the bill go over until tomorrow. I desired to say that with all deference to the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina is agreed to, and without objection the bill——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not like to step in the way, but the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] desired to have a bill considered at the same time. If we are to endeavor to be consistent, we shall really be consistent. I think the Senator should let the bill go over until tomorrow. There will be no objection to it then. Let us treat everybody in the same way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall have to object as a matter of principle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair had already announced that there was no objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order to clear the atmosphere, I think the Senator from Oregon has offered a proper amendment to the bill in which I am interested, and I am willing to accept it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to see the matter straightened out. Things ought to be either black or white. There should not be a mixture that is gray. Either it is proper for the Senator from Oregon to have his bill taken up, or it is proper for the Senator from South Carolina have his taken up, or it is not. If we are going to draw the line on one, we certainly should draw it on both. I am perfectly willing to have both bills come up tomorrow, or I am willing to allow them to be acted on now, and then apply the rule after those two have been acted upon. I have no objection to either bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why cannot we act on them now?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, are we now acting on bills that have been reported by a mere poll of some members of committees?

Mr. McFARLAND. No. We are acting in conformity with the suggestion I made after the call of the calendar for the consideration of certain bills. I made an announcement that if objectors withdrew their objections, and there were no other objection, we would take up such bills and pass them by unanimous consent.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. There may be two or three Senators who desire to object to a bill. One Senator may object, and then later withdraw his objection, but another Senator who has objection to the bill may be in conference and, therefore, would not know that the objection was being withdrawn and the bill taken up immediately.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say that I have tried to follow a rule that would obviate such a situation. I stated to the Senate that if any other Senators were opposed to a bill which had been objected to, they should register their opposition with the majority leader or the minority leader, and those bills would not be taken up. I made that announcement a few days ago, in order that the Senate might have notice of it.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I am willing to have both these bills considered. I do not think there will be a better attendance of the Senate tomorrow than there is now.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wish to say that the bill in which I am interested is an old bill. The Senator from New Mex-

ico communicated with the city officials of the city in his State that is involved, and discovered that they are willing to pay the value of the property. My objection to the bill was that they were not paying full value for the property. I am perfectly willing to have the bill brought up tomorrow. However, I do not believe any other Senator has objected.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, at this point, in the interest of sound legislative procedure, I think it would be wise, except for the two bills to which reference has been made, that from here on in throughout the remainder of the session the Senate should not consider, on the call of the calendar, any bills which have been previously objected to.

In my judgment, it is in the interest of sound legislative procedure to follow such a course. I believe my distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] feels the same way. So tomorrow I shall feel constrained to follow that course.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have given notice with respect to certain bills. I see no objection to taking up the two bills to which reference has been made.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am willing to take them up now.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF POSTMASTER GENERAL TO LEASE QUARTERS FOR POST OFFICE PURPOSES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 6839, Calendar 1795?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6839) to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments on page 5, line 13, after the word "on", to strike out "Public Works" and insert "Post Office and Civil Service"; and in line 15, after the word "on", to strike out "Public Works" and insert "Post Office and Civil Service."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] a question. Section 4 of the bill provides as follows:

SEC. 4. Each such lease-purchase agreement shall include such provisions as the Postmaster General, in his discretion, shall deem to be in the best interest of the United States and appropriate to secure the performance of the obligations imposed upon the party or parties that shall enter into such agreement with the United States.

As I understand, these are leases which ultimately become the property of the United States Government. Are the terms of the leases to be left entirely within the discretion of the Postmaster General, without any restrictions? For example, the lease might be for 6 percent, or 8 percent of the purchase price. What are the terms with respect to depreciation, and so forth?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Under the terms of the committee amendments, the lease-purchase agreements must be referred back to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate, for our scrutiny. We are trying to throw all the safeguards possible around such agreements.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, the Postmaster General has complete discretion with relation to the terms of the leases, which ultimately become the property of the United States, subject to supervision by the two committees mentioned, but without any terms in the law as to what he shall do.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true, subject to the restrictions contained in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, what is the term in years of the leases which the Postmaster General may make under the terms of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. From 8 to 25 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill permits leases to be made from 8 to 25 years?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Whichever the Postmaster General thinks is the best under the circumstances.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the provision of the present law? For how long may a lease be made?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Ten years, as I recall.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Ten years.

Mr. FERGUSON. So we are extending the term of the leases, so that the Postmaster General may make a lease in the name of the United States for a period of 25 years.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason for that, if I may inform the Senator from Michigan, is this: The country and the Congress know that we have not had a public works bill or authorization for many years. The country is some 25 or 30 years behind. About the only way by which construction can be carried on is through private enterprise. This is a private enterprise system, by which private enterprise constructs a building, and leases it to the Post Office Department. At the end of a certain term of years, after it is amortized at a certain rate of interest, which is to be scrutinized by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate, it then becomes Government property. In other words, instead of Congress appropriating money to construct buildings, under this legislation they can be constructed by private enterprise.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does such a lease become valid before it is sent to the committees for approval?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Section 8 reads as follows:

SEC. 8. No proposed lease-purchase agreement shall be executed under this act until it has been submitted to and approved by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That means, then, that a committee meeting would be held, and a vote would be taken as to whether or not the lease-purchase agreement should be made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the vote were in the negative, or if there were not a majority of the committee voting in favor of the agreement, the agreement could not be made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the way I interpret the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am asking these questions only for the purpose of making a legislative history. I am not objecting to the bill, but I should like to make a legislative history.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nominations of three postmasters which were favorably reported this afternoon. I ask that they may be confirmed as in executive session. One is the nomination of Bernard F. Vandergriff, to be postmaster at Clinton, Tenn.; the second is the nomination of Van Drennen Hicks, to be postmaster at Oakridge, Tenn.; and the third is the nomination of Francis E. Durrett, to be postmaster at White House, Tenn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that prior to the time he entered the Chamber we made an agreement that nothing else would come up until tomorrow unless advance notice were given and a quorum call had. Would not the Senator be willing to let these nominations go over until tomorrow, in order that we may avoid violating that agreement?

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well, if the Senator objects.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no objection, but I do not like to see the agreement violated, except with respect to the consideration of the two bills which have been referred to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to put the Senate on notice that we shall report the nominations of eight or ten postmasters tomorrow. However, in each case the two Senators from the particular State will have agreed to them, and the committee will have approved them.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, I renew my request for the consideration of the nominations of three Tennessee postmasters reported earlier in the day. I believe the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is now willing that they be confirmed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection to the consideration of these three postmaster nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection, as in executive session, to the present consideration of the three postmaster nominations referred to? The Chair hears none. The nominations will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Bernard F. Vandergriff to be postmaster at Clinton, Tenn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Van Drennen Hicks to be postmaster at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Francis E. Durrett to be postmaster at White House, Tenn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of these three postmaster nominations.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO TOWN OF HOPE, N. MEX.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The bill (H. R. 7317) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex., was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5, to strike out "$1,950" and insert in lieu thereof "the appraised fair-market value of the property."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED THIS DAY—GENERAL OFFICERS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Was the Executive Calendar called with reference to the nominations on page 2 of the Executive Calendar, and particularly with reference to the nominations in the Army and in the United States Air Force?

The VICE PRESIDENT. All new reports were called, and all nominations confirmed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I understood that unanimous consent had been asked for the consideration of certain treaties. However, I did not understand that the Executive Calendar in its entirety was to be called. There are Senators who are interested in some of the nominations on the Executive Calendar. It has been customary to call the Executive Calendar toward the close of the day.

I have no serious objection to some of these nominations, but I think it ought to be made crystal clear what we are doing and what we are going to do. Here are the nominations of 17 colonels advanced to the rank of general. Certainly some of us have some questions to ask, and we ought to be entitled to answers. Whether or not we are entitled to serve on various committees is something which is decided by seniority. I grant that that is the orderly procedure. But here are 17 new generals; and many generals are advanced further in their responsibility, with higher ranks. I have no serious objection if they really merit the advancement, but Members of the Senate certainly have a right to know when the Executive Calendar is to be called, especially when objections are raised by Members of the Senate, and even by some members of the Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. It so happened that I was not in the Chamber when the Executive Calendar was called. Let me say to my good friend from Kansas that I never have the calendar taken up without consulting with the minority leader and ascertaining if there is any objection. I was not in the Chamber. I do not know whether that was done in this instance. However, the Senator can move to reconsider the action of the Senate. I shall not complain if he so moves, because if the rule was not followed it should have been followed. I always consult with the minority leader and clear the Executive Calendar with him, and then I give notice that we are to take up nominations.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I will say to the distinguished majority leader that I shall not ask for reconsideration. I do not want any special arrangement or privilege. I do think, in view of the fact that we are advancing 17 colonels, worthy as they may be, to general officer rank, and a score of other generals—probably not that many, but almost that many—to advanced positions, certainly there should be some yardstick used, and they should not be considered for promotion at the tail end of the session. I point out that fact. I have had some Senators ask me about it. I do not know why it was done. I did make objection by way of inquiring as to some of the nominations a few weeks ago, because I wanted to have some information as to what the officers had done to merit their advancement. I think it is only fair that we should know something about these people.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. With the permission of the Senator from Kansas, in view of the comments he has made, I believe what the equitable action of the Senate should be is perfectly clear. As a Member of the Armed Services Committee I do not like to see promotions in the armed services go through the Senate if any Senator has any reservations about them and has not had an opportunity to express them.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the action by which the nominations were confirmed, and that they be placed on the Executive Calendar for action tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would advise Senators that the difficulty presented is that the President was ordered notified immediately. The Chair is informed that the President has been notified.

Mr. WELKER. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent was requested that the nominations be considered before the treaties were considered, and unanimous consent was granted that that be done. Accordingly they were confirmed. Following their confirmation, the treaties were ratified.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I was the acting minority leader for and on behalf of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] when the nominations were confirmed. When the Executive Calendar was called the acting majority leader—and as I recall, it was the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]—came to me, as is always done in such instances, and told me what was about to be done. I sought to ascertain on this side of the aisle whether there was any objection to the procedure.

If there was any misunderstanding it was due to the fact that we are drawing near the end of the session, and if any embarrassment has been occasioned, I accept the blame as the acting minority leader.

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

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to say to the acting minority leader, in view of the statement he has made, that he is completely right. I was not aware that there had been the inquiry mentioned on this side of the aisle. We were clearly on notice. Under the circumstances I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from Oregon. Acting as the minority leader has been an extremely confusing job for a new Member of the Senate. We were trying to expedite matters so that we could adjourn. I regret very much that I had any part in hurrying the promotions.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say to the distinguished acting minority leader that perhaps some Senators on this side of the aisle and some Senators on the other side of the aisle were not in the Chamber because they were on responsible assignments as members of committees.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. I did not know that final action had been taken on the Executive Calendar as it related to the general officer nominations. I

consider the question raised by the Senator from Kansas to be both understandable and certainly very legitimate. If he will permit me to do so I think I can satisfy his very natural concern.

The Senator from Kansas, who is not a member of the Armed Services Committee, has raised a question concerning why the committee has at this late date in the session recommended the advancement of so many officers to general rank. It was a little more than a year ago, I will say to the Senator from Kansas, that the Senate Armed Services Committee placed a limitation on the number of general and flag officers to be appointed in each of the services. In each of the services the committee's limitation is far lower than the statutory authority which the services have to recommend and appoint officers to general and flag rank. The RECORD ought to show, as the Senator from Kansas will be interested in knowing, that the committee limitation for the Army of the United States is 496 general officers. The committee limitation with reference to admirals in the Navy is 280. The committee limitation with reference to the Marine Corps is 60 officers of general rank. The committee's limitation with reference to the Air Force is the numerical limitation of 333 officers of general rank. What will provide satisfaction to my friend from Kansas is to be advised, for it is a fact, that even though a number of officers have been confirmed this afternoon and the President has been advised that they are to become general officers, the total of the general officers and flag officers in each of the four respective services remains—and it will never exceed, until the committee reaches another policy decision—the number limitations which were imposed by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate on the four services more than a year ago.

I would add one word further, if I may. In the last several years the armed services of our Nation have expanded rapidly, as the Senator from Kansas knows full well. The limitation on the number of general officers set by the Senate Armed Services Committee is now an over-all total of 1,169. I think the Senator would like to consider in his mind and for future consideration that we have had authority to create 1,169 flag or general officers for a total personnel strength today of something in excess of 3,500,000 men.

I trust that this brief explanation has satisfied in part what I can appreciate is a serious concern on the part of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield, I wish to say I appreciate very much the explanation given by the Senator from Washington, who is a member of the Armed Services Committee. I am sure the explanation will satisfy some of those who have lodged some questions about these advancements.

I wish to ask the able Senator from Washington whether it is true that a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee or the Armed Services Committee as a whole is still holding open, for further consideration or determination, the matter of the number of advancements in the armed services, including nominations of the sort included in the Executive Calendar today.

I have been informed that such a study is in progress, and that it probably will be a good many months—perhaps not until the next session—before something is offered by way of an equitable readjustment of this situation. Am I correctly informed?

Mr. CAIN. My best answer to the Senator from Kansas is that the Senate Armed Services Committee has a subcommittee, the chairman of which is the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. That subcommittee is charged with making a continuing study of this problem and the question of how many general and flag officers there should be for the Armed Forces of the United States.

As I have said previously, that subcommittee recommended to the full committee, and the recommendation was approved more than a year ago, that until further notice there should be established a total over-all ceiling, on all of the four services, of 1,169 general and flag officers—the ceiling to which I have previously referred.

I wish to repeat that regardless of the number of general and flag officers who have been appointed and confirmed at this session of the Congress, the total is still considerably below the ceiling imposed by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield further, let me say that I appreciate that information.

To keep the RECORD absolutely straight in regard to this situation, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that the reason why I raised this question was that certain Senators, not only Senators on this side of the aisle, but also some Senators on the other side of the aisle, whom I shall not mention by name, specifically requested me to notify them of the call of the calendar because of their interest in some of these matters.

I understand that the absence of a quorum was suggested but that, following that suggestion, the order for the call of the roll was vacated.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think it unfortunate that some of our colleagues who have a serious interest in this question were not, by force of circumstances, on the floor when the Executive Calendar was called.

I am extremely grateful to the Senator from Kansas for asking these questions, for perhaps in speaking for the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the chairman of the subcommittee which concerns itself with promotion matters, I have in part—and reasonably well, I hope—explained to the satisfaction of the Senator from Kansas and other Senators who may read the RECORD tomorrow that although we have a considerable number of flag and general officers now on active duty, yet the sum total of those general and flag officers continues to be below the ceiling on the general flag officer strength which was set more than a year ago by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I appreciate the statement the Senator from Washington has made.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. WELKER. I simply wish to say to the Senator from Washington and, through him, to the Senator from Kansas, that I have made inquiry as to the so-called brief quorum call and to the so-called early rescinding of the order for the call of the roll on that occasion. I find that the order for the call of the roll was not rescinded early in the call of the roll; in fact, it was rescinded late in the call of the roll.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that my sole concern during the last few minutes has been to provide as best I could some factual information, in response to a totally logical question raised by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in regard to the discussion which has just been had, I wish to say that if any Senator has any objection to any nomination on the Executive Calendar, I hope he will register his objection with either the majority leader or the minority leader, so that we shall know of the objection. I want to be as fair as possible and to give all possible notice.

However, on the last day of the session we shall have to move to consider the nominations then on the Executive Calendar, regardless of whether there is objection, for otherwise it will not be possible to confirm those nominations. I shall try as best I can to conform to the practice Senators observe of extending courtesies to each other.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 525. An act for the relief of Jacob Gitlin;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Teh-Jen Lee;

S. 1159. An act for the relief of Stevan Durovic, Marko Durovic, Olga Wickerhauser Durovic, and Stevan M. Durovic;

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Michiko Yamamori Wilder and her minor child;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro;

S. 1740. An act for the relief of Tom Tateki Iriye;

S. 1816. An act for the relief of Shizu Hasegawa Crockett;

S. 1867. An act for the relief of Margherita Gentile;

S. 1896. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anni Franchina;

S. 1916. An act for the relief of Olga Madsen, a minor;

S. 2125. An act for the relief of Margit Stolz Bohm and Klaus Seigfried Bohm;

S. 2185. An act for the relief of Annemarie E. Peterson and Wilhelm Ernst Geisel;

S. 2303. An act for the relief of Miki Takano;

S. 2311. An act for the relief of Marie-Antoinette Kerssenbrock;

S. 2332. An act for the relief of Fumiko Ito Stewart;

S. 2473. An act for the relief of Luciano Pellegrini;

S. 2498. An act for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi);

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Deborah Jayne Engelman;

S. 2584. An act to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.;

S. 2577. An act for the relief of Mikio Abe;

S. 2662. An act for the relief of Sadako Ishiguro;

S. 2681. An act for the relief of Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone;

S. 2869. An act for the relief of Yuriko Nishimoto;

S. 3162. An act for the relief of Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara;

S. 3193. An act for the relief of Robert Royce Farkas;

S. 3248. An act for the relief of Mekaru Tatsubo;

S. 3277. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 3280. An act for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar;

S. 3281. An act for the relief of Chiu But Yue;

S. 3284. An act for the relief of Beverly Jane Ruffin; and

S. 3343. An act for the relief of Hannah Crumet.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and Mr. HILL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 89) to print proceedings at the presentation of the bronze replica of the Declaration of Independence.

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. 103. An act to change the name of Medicine Creek Reservoir in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska to "Harry Strunk Lake";

S. 556. An act authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes;

S. 658. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 1020. An act to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity;

S. 1271. An act to permit employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board;

S. 1310. An act to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines;

S. 2042. An act to extend certain privileges to representatives of member States on the Council of the Organization of American States;

S. 2043. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior;

S. 2128. An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes;

S. 2149. An act to confer Federal jurisdiction to prosecute certain common-law crimes of violence when such crimes are committed on an American airplane in flight over the high seas or over waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 2199. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and to abolish the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement;

S. 2646. An act to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation;

S. 2690. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make unlawful certain practices of ticket agents engaged in selling air transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 2909. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial, in the State of Arizona," approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 630);

S. 2938. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3051. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, certain property at Fort Worth, Tex.;

S. 3052. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes;

S. 3195. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims;

S. 3276. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation"; and

S. 3337. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of the Netherlands.

PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 457 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. FREAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and Mr. MARTIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION TO SENATOR BRIDGES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that my work with my good friend, the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], has been very pleasant. He has been most cooperative. He has always informed me of any intention on the part of the minority, and I have tried to inform him of any intention on the part of the majority or the majority leader.

Perhaps once in a while we may slip; but we constantly do the best we can to protect individual Senators here on the floor of the Senate; and we expect to continue to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to give notice of the consideration of two more bills which the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] would like to call up. They are H. R. 7126 and H. R. 5954, both dealing with the transfer of land.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. One of the bills, Mr. President, pertains to the Federal Government giving to the State of Colorado a quarter of an acre of land to be used for highways, and the other bill pertains to the vacation of some Federal ground, a small tract in Camden, N. J.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there is another small bill which I may wish to move to have the Senate take up tomorrow. I wish to give notice of it at this time. I do not know whether I shall move to have the Senate take up the bill; but I wish to give notice now, so that if I shall decide to make that motion, the Senate will be on notice.

This measure is Senate bill 2137, Calendar 740. The bill is similar to an-

other bill regarding public works and the leasing of property. As in the other situation, the bill involves a dispute between the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Committee on Public Works.

I do not know whether the differences will be settled. If they are not settled, I have no intention of moving to have the Senate take up the bill. However, I simply wish to call attention to this matter.

I hope I shall not have to move to have the Senate consider any measures about which I have not given notice; but if that necessity should arise, I shall certainly consult first with the minority leader and tell him why I shall have to depart from this rule.

I make this statement, Mr. President, because if there is one thing that I want when the Senate adjourns, it is to have Senators on both sides of the aisle feel that I have tried to be fair.

APPROPRIATION FOR POST OFFICE, COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I merely want to give notice that, tomorrow, I shall ask to take up House bill 7778, which is a bill unanimously passed by the House. It has come to the Senate. It is a most important bill in connection with a post office at Council Bluffs, Iowa, where unfortunately the public mails are being handled in a rat-infested ancient warren that should have been condemned and torn down years ago, and which was not even built for a public post office. It is very vital that the bill be passed. It has been delayed for a good many years, so I shall ask to have that bill taken up tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may say that I hope the Senator will discuss the matter with the distinguished minority leader, and he and I will confer about it. Perhaps we will agree to take it up. Has the Senator spoken to me about it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is why I wanted to discuss it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has the Senator previously spoken to me about taking it up?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Not about taking it up. A day or two ago I spoke to the Senator about that and another bill. I did not emphasize the other one so much, because it was a bill of a different kind.

Mr. McFARLAND. Had the Senator come to me, we might have had his bill taken up today.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I spoke to the Senator about it a day or two ago, but I did not emphasize it, because it was before the Public Works Committee and had not been reported. It has not yet been reported, as I think it should have been. But the other bill about which I spoke to the Senator yesterday and again today—and he was very kind about it—was one that had already been reported. It was passed this afternoon, without objection. I appreciate the kindness of the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will confer with the distinguished minority leader about the bill in which the Senator from Iowa is interested, but I do not know what our attitude will be.

SOLDIER VOTING

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that tomorrow, on behalf of myself and the distinguished majority leader and a large group of other Senators, every Senator here is invited to join in the submission of a resolution asking the Governors of the various States to cooperate in order to provide soldier voting. The House has failed to take action on the Senate bill to provide for soldier voting, and certainly at this time the men and women of the service, particularly the men who are fighting overseas, should have every right to vote, and an opportunity to vote. This resolution seems now to be the only thing that we can do. It would call upon the Governors of the various States to take such steps as they might find reasonable and proper to provide the right to vote to service men and women. I do not think there will be any objection, but I wanted to give notice that I intend to bring it up.

AMENDMENTS TO THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may say there is a bill in which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is very much interested. He is not presently on the floor, and I therefore do not ask for immediate consideration of the bill, but I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill S. 1084, which is Calendar No. 1387.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1084 to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL CONDUCIVE TO IMPROVED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES AND PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INTERESTS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am strongly in favor of the adoption of the conference report approving the Interior appropriation bill. I think the committees and the conferees have done a good job on this measure.

Particularly I consider this report and its aproval by the Senate a long step forward in providing for a harmonious working relationship between the rural electric cooperatives and the public and private power interests. This bill, by establishing a continuing fund of $1,000,000 for the Southwestern Power Administration insures the continuation of the contracts with both private power and public power sources for a cheap and dependable supply of wholesale power to serve the millions of farm customers in the southwestern area of the United States.

The passage of this measure will be a milestone in the progress of rural electrification throughout Oklahoma and the southwestern area.

Mr. President, for many years I have been an ardent and enthusiastic supporter of rural electrification. I have followed the progress of rural electrification from its inauspicious beginning 16 years ago when only 11 percent of the farms in this Nation were electrified, and I have never ceased to marvel at the astounding record of accomplishments and service of the REA to our farm families.

Sixteen years ago, 89 percent of America's farm homes were in darkness, without the advantages of labor-saving devices like washing machines, electric irons, and power tools and pumps, or the conveniences which add so greatly to the pleasures of daily living such as electric refrigerators, deep freezers, electric stoves, radios and television sets.

Sixteen years ago only 11 percent of our farms were receiving the electricity which for 40 years had been an everyday necessity in our cities and towns.

Today, Mr. President, this 11 percent has increased nationally to 84.2 percent. In my own State of Oklahoma only 72.6 percent of our farms are electrified, about 12 percent less than the national average. So there is much more work to be done if we are to expand our 51,122 miles of rural lines to approximate the achievements of the country as a whole.

America's farm families know and appreciate the value of rural electrification, for perhaps no single program of the many worth while and beneficial programs undertaken by this country has directly benefitted them more.

The farmer who now grinds his feed with electric power, waters his cattle, and irrigates his land by electrically driven pumps doesn't have to be sold on the value of rural electrification. The farmer's wife who does her family's laundry in a modern washing machine, prepares their meals on a clean, efficient electric stove, keeps their food and milk fresh and wholesome in an electric refrigerator, or fills a deep freezer with vegetables and fruits fresh from her garden does not have to be sold on the value of rural electrification.

Talk with the farmers yourself and experience the feeling of the new life that comes to them and their families when that vital line touches their farm, and share with them their joy at the realization that the years of drudgery and back-breaking labor are gone.

Yes, Mr. President, the farm families know and appreciate the value of rural electrification, but I have found that not all of our townspeople do. They have not only overlooked the many benefits REA has brought to rural areas, but are even less aware of what it has done for independent business. Some townspeople, misled perhaps by clever propaganda, have compared REA with Government dictatorship and recklessly charged it as being socialistic. I submit, Mr. President, that nothing could be further from the truth.

The local REA cooperatives are farmer-owned and farmer-operated. They are successful businesses. They are getting electricity to the farms at reasonable rates—disproving the big utility claim that it would take at least $1,000 or more prepayment per farm to assure electrical service—but are repaying with interest the money loaned by the Government to do the job.

As of December 31, 1951, the REA's owed Uncle Sam $284,420,886 on their loan accounts. On that date, however, they had repaid him $326,077,549, over $41,000,000 in advance payments. I challenge anyone to show me a single other Government lending operation where the borrowers are $41,000,000 ahead of time in their repayments. Of the amount repaid Uncle Sam, $121,608,305 represents interest. The remainder is repayment on principle. REA is a financially sound investment.

In Oklahoma, as in the other States, REA is a going business and is benefiting other businesses as well as the farm families they serve.

Let us not forget that free enterprise builds the REA lines, every mile of them. Free enterprise has built the $78,000,000 worth of lines erected in Oklahoma. And it has built them in the other States, too.

Let us see, Mr. President, what happens when the enterprising and pioneering farmers of Oklahoma invest $78,000,000 in better living. First, the work of building the power lines goes to the contractor who submits the low bid—private enterprise. Who supplies the poles, the conductor, the insulator, and the hundred other items needed to erect a power transmisison line? Private enterprise. Who pays the worker for his services? Private enterprise. And not one of these could have shared in the $78,000,000 which Oklahoma's farmers were willing to invest had it not been for REA, and as a result private enterprise in my State has benefited by that amount.

Nearly 116,000 consumers have been connected to REA lines in Oklahoma. What happens when a farm home is ready to be energized, Mr. President? Each consumer spends at least $500 for wiring, lighting, and appliances. Many spend much more, but that means about $58,000,000, or a total of more than $136,000,000 in business for Oklahoma's private enterprises. Again they have benefitted because of REA—the State is that much richer because of this investment. Does this seem unfair to private enterprise? Do not forget that this is new business—business that would not have existed without REA. It was territory that no one had sought to serve until REA filled the vital need which power monopolies were unwilling or unable to provide.

This market of more than $5,000,000 in sales of electricity per year could not be served, the private utilities said. The job was impossible.

Yet these farmer-owned cooperatives, with Government loans, did the impossible. Now each year the demand for electricity increases as farmers use more and more power in their farm work and as new consumers are connected.

The gross annual business in Oklahoma—again business which would not have existed without REA—has exceeded $5,000,000 a year and is still increasing. Most of this $5,000,000 is transformed into new payrolls for Oklahoma workers.

Can this be contrary to our system of free enterprise? Even the big utility companies that once sought to discredit the REA by hurling charges of socialism benefit to the extent of a million dollars a year through the sale of wholesale power to REA cooperatives in Oklahoma.

I am greatly concerned, however, for this ever-increasing demand makes it imperative that our REA's have dependable, independent sources of electrical energy. In my State alone $78,000,000 is invested in REA facilities, and that investment must be protected. Our REA's cannot and must not be left without a dependable source of low-cost power. They cannot and must not be left to the mercy of the utilities for whatever energy they are willing to sell after meeting the demands of their city customers.

My goal, Mr. President, is to be sure we always have adequate low-cost power to supply this vast farm market. It must be provided at a reasonable figure to encourage the greatest possible use of electricity on the farms.

These farm electrical systems must not be confined to only private utility sources for their power. Certainly when it is advantageous to them to purchase their wholesale power from private lines, properly located for supply, they should be encouraged to contract for it at the best possible rates.

But as the legally defined preferred consumers they are entitled to purchase power from the vast hydroelectric power pool generated at government built flood-control dams. This power, created with public funds, should not be turned over for the exclusive use of the private utilities and the REA's forced to buy it from them at whatever rates they cared to charge.

Under the contracts with private utilities, we in Oklahoma have established a new program of Government and business cooperation where the private utilities can now deliver this hydroelectric power over their existing lines at low rates prescribed by the Southwestern Power Administration. It is a give and take arrangement in which the private utilities buy and sell to the SPA and deliver power over their lines to the SPA account.

But often private utility lines do not and cannot serve these farm cooperatives at points on their system where the lines can be energized properly. Other lines are required as well as other sources of steam-generated power to properly service these 51,000 miles of farm electric lines.

Under the policy which has just been approved by the Congress, these necessary additional lines can be built. The Southwestern Power Administration can reach points on these farm electric systems which private lines cannot properly service.

With this policy now established by the Congress, unnecessary duplication can be avoided, an adequate supply of power for REA lines assured at low rates, and Government and private industry can work together to make the vast pool of public and private power available to the consumers of the State.

The establishment of such a policy has not been accomplished without a fight and without difficulty. I am happy to have been a part of that fight to bring to the farmers the advantages of electricity at low rates, and to insure also that these systems will not and cannot be exploited or destroyed by high costs or shortages of wholesale power.

My goal is to see every farm home in America have access to electricity at rates they can afford to pay. The goal is almost in sight, Mr. President, and I will continue to fight for the REA until it is achieved.

PURCHASE OF ST. LOUIS CARDINALS BASEBALL CLUB BY FRED M. SAIGH, JR., AND THE LATE ROBERT E. HANNEGAN

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, several months ago my attention was called to a certain transaction whereby Fred M. Saigh, Jr., and the late Robert E. Hannegan, of St. Louis, had, in purchasing the St. Louis Cardinals Baseball Club, made a substantial profit, the suggestion being that this profit accrued largely as a result of a failure on the part of the Treasury Department to enforce strictly certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

I have submitted this case to Mr. Colin F. Stam, Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, requesting an opinion as to whether or not there was laxity on the part of the Treasury Department in this case. I quote from two paragraphs of a letter which I received from Mr. Stam, which quotation sums up this case:

> The record which has been examined indicates a lack of compliance in this case with provisions of various Treasury decisions requiring that the examining officer's report set forth in every instance specific recommendations for the application or nonapplication of section 102, that each revenue agent in charge designate a qualified employee whose responsibility it would be to pass personally upon each case in which a recommendation has been made with respect to the application or nonapplication of section 102, and that special consideration be given by the Bureau on post review to determine whether field officers have complied fully with these instructions. * * * It would appear that the question of the application of section 102 to this company has not been properly developed or explored by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, this entire report, including the letter of Mr. Colin F. Stam, Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

SEPTEMBER 26, 1947.

Re Cardinals.

Mr. WALTER SMITH,
President, First National Bank in St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. SMITH: My associate and I desire to borrow $3,000,000 for purchasing the stock

of the Cardinal Baseball Co. from Mr. Sam Breadon, his family, and others.

Here are the details: The Cardinal club is owned by holders of 10,152 shares of stock, 7,833 of which is common and 2,319 preferred. Mr. Breadon is the principal holder of the stock with 7,666 shares, 6,514 of comman and 1,152 preferred. Mr. Mark S. Steinberg owns 336 shares of common and 643 shares of preferred. Mr. Breadon also controls 710 shares of common and 220 shares of preferred. The rest, or 577 shares, are owned by 120 stockholders holding from 1 to 10 shares.

The company has $1,000,000 in United States bonds; a minimum of $1,500,000 in cash; stadiums at Houston, Rochester, and Columbus valued at over $1,500,000; 15 acres of land in St. Louis, $300,000; National League franchise (conservative), $400,000, a total of $4,700,000. I have a commitment from the Lincoln-Rochester Trust Co. on the Rochester stadium for a loan of $400,000 and from the City National Bank of Houston for $400,000 on the Houston stadium. I have not tried to get a commitment on the Columbus club but I am told it is in better condition and produces better than either the Houston or Rochester club.

My associate and I will form a new corporation. The loan from your bank will be in the name of that corporation and the stock of the Cardinals will be held in that corporation. The stock will remain in your possession until the loan is paid. After the board of directors of the Cardinals resign (and that will be a condition), we will cause the accounts of the company to be transferred to the First National Bank. We will then have the Cardinal organization sell the United States bonds to take the profit within the Cardinal company; have the subsidiary companies make the $400,000 loan at Houston and at Rochester and transfer the funds to the parent organization, and then declare a dividend of sufficient amount to pay the $3,000,000 loan.

As you know, the new company will pay 38 percent or 15 percent of the dividend it receives from the Cardinals. That will cost $57,000 for every $1,000,000 we have to use. The 14 acres of land in the city of St. Louis will also be sold. Roughly, that will leave us approximately $600,000 in working capital with all liabilities paid except the $800,000 we shall owe on the Houston and Rochester clubs.

We would like to be in a position to direct Mr. Breadon to present his stock at your bank for payment at the agreed price; and than proceed to make similar offers to Mr. Steinberg and the other stockholders; however, on a different price level. We feel that Mr. Breadon has put in 27 years of his business life in the company and deserves somewhat more for that and for a block of stock that will deliver control.

It should not take us over 60 days to complete the whole transaction and we are agreeable to pay whatever interest rate you desire, plus any expenses that you may incur in handling the transaction. We want to act as quickly as humanly possible, so I shall appreciate it very much if you will give me a firm commitment at your very earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,

FRED M. SAIGH, Jr.

REPORT

The St. Louis National Baseball Club, hereinafter called the Cardinals, was as of November 15, 1947, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Missouri, with 7,833 shares of common and 2,319 shares of preferred stock issued and outstanding. Mr. Sam Breadon was the principal holder of the stock, with 6,514 shares of common and 1,152 shares of preferred, making a total of 7,666. He also controlled 710 shares of common and 220 shares of preferred. Mr. Mark C. Steinberg owned 336 shares of common and 643 shares of preferred. The stock of 16 minor-league clubs was wholly owned by the Cardinals.

Mr. Fred M. Saigh, Jr., in a letter dated September 26, 1947, addressed to the First National Bank in St. Louis, a copy of which is enclosed, presented a plan whereby through the formation of a new corporation and a loan by the bank of $3,000,000 to the newly formed corporation the latter would acquire the stock of the Cardinals. In the letter to the bank an estimate was placed on the value of the Cardinals at $4,700,000, comprised of $1,000,000 in United States bonds, a minimum of $1,500,000 in cash, stadiums at Houston, Rochester and Columbus valued at over $1,500,000, 14 acres of land in St. Louis $300,000, and National League franchise $400,000.

On November 25, 1947, Messrs. Hannegan and Saigh borrowed $60,800 on their personal note from the Manufacturer's Bank and Trust Co. of St. Louis, Mo. With these funds they formed National Sports, Inc. Mr. Hannegan received 51 percent and Mr. Saigh 49 percent of the stock. The opening journal entry on the books of National Sports, Inc., indicates capital stock of $10,000 and paid-in surplus of $400,800; the latter was presented by stock in the Cardinals.

On November 25, 1947, National Sports, Inc., borrowed $3,000,000 from the First National Bank of St. Louis, Mo. The loan was evidenced by a demand note and the bank paid out the loan solely against delivery to it of stock in the Cardinals, which it retained as security for the loan. In addition, as consideration in part for the stock, Mr. Breadon took a short-term note for $550,000 and Mr. Steinberg took a short-term note for $100,000 from National Sports, Inc. As collateral security for payment on the notes of Messrs. Breadon and Steinberg a lien was created on all shares of stock in the Cardinals held by the bank, such lien being subordinate to the lien granted the bank. Mr. Breadon also took a long-term note from National Sports, Inc., Robert E. Hannegan and Fred Saigh, Jr., for $350,000 at the rate of $50,000 per year for 7 years.

National Sports, Inc., by means of the bank loan and loans from individuals, was enabled to acquire all of the outstanding stock of the Cardinals, with the exception of 15 shares, for the sum of $4,055,142.85. The purchase of the stock was made possible by the financing as follows: Cash $60,800, proceeds from bank loan $3,000,000, short-term notes $650,000, long-term note $350,000, total $4,060,800.

The $3,000,000 bank loan was repaid to the bank as explained hereafter. In December 1947, having acquired substantially all the capital stock of the Cardinals, National Sports, Inc., received a dividend of $60 per share or $608,220, on the Cardinals stock. The full amount of $608,220 was applied by National Sports, Inc., on the $3,000,000 bank loan. On December 23, 1947, National Sports, Inc., borrowed $800,000 from the Cardinals on an unsecured note and applied the proceeds against the remaining balance of the bank loan, leaving an unpaid balance of $1,586,180.

On January 8, 1948, a corporate merger took place. The St. Louis National Baseball Club (the Cardinals) was merged into the National Sports, Inc., by the terms of the merger agreement, the latter was the surviving corporation. The name of National Sports, Inc., was then changed to "St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc." Under the merger the assets and liabilities of the former two organizations became vested in the surviving corporation.

On January 9, 1948, the balance of the loan of $1,586,180 was paid by the surviving corporation, St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc., to the First National Bank of St. Louis, Mo. On February 24, 1948, the short term notes in the amounts of $550,000 and $100,000 owing to Sam Breadon and Mark C. Steinberg, respectively, were paid by St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc. To make these large cash payments funds in the amount of $1,500,000 were made available to the parent corporation by three of the minor league clubs—Rochester, Houston, and Columbus. Each of these clubs borrowed from banks a sum of $500,000.

In connection with the merger, certificates of stock in the National Sports Inc., and the Cardinals were canceled and new certificates of stock in St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc., were issued to shareholders. Messrs. Hannegan and Saigh each received the same proportionate share in the new stock as they had in National Sports, Inc.

The dividend of $608,220 received by National Sports, Inc., in December 1947 was reported as income on the tax return of the St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc. (new name for National Sports, Inc.)

During the year 1948 the St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc., paid off the personal liability of Messrs. Hannegan and Saigh owing to the Manufacturer's National Bank & Trust Co. $60,800 plus interest of $1,202.03. The revenue agent is taking the position that the amount of $62,002.03 is taxable income in 1948 to Robert E. Hannegan to the extent of 51 percent of such amount, and to Fred Saigh, Jr., on the balance of 49 percent.

In the years 1948, 1949, and 1950 payments of $50,000, $50,000, and $250,000, respectively, plus an amount of interest each year, were made on the long-term note of $350,000 given to Sam Breadon by National Sports, Inc., Robert E. Hannegan, and Fred M. Saigh, Jr. The revenue agent is proposing deficiencies in tax for these years against Messrs. Hannegan and Saigh on the basis that such payments constitute income to them allocated 51 percent to Hannegan and 49 percent to Saigh.

On January 26, 1949, Robert E. Hannegan disposed of his entire interest in the Cardinals. He sold 1,731 shares of his stock in the St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc., to that corporation for the sum of $700,000, and he transferred 96/100 share of stock to Fred M. Saigh, Jr., and received in return 250 shares of the Locust Ninth Realty Corp. valued at $388.21. The total sales price of $700,388.21, a cost price of $25,908 and a capital gain of $674,408.21 were reported on the income-tax return of Robert E. Hannegan (deceased) and Irma P. Hannegan for 1949."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am returning the attached material which you submitted relating to the question of whether the St. Louis National Baseball Club should have been subject to the provisions of section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The material submitted is insufficient to enable the staff to pass judgment upon this question. The staff made an examination of the agent's reports and returns of this corporation covering the years 1940 to 1947, inclusive. The record which has been examined indicates a lack of compliance in this case with provisions of various Treasury decisions requiring that the examining officer's report set forth in every instance specific recommendations for the application or nonapplication of section 102, that each revenue agent in charge designate a qualified employee whose responsibility it would be to pass personally upon each case in which a recommendation has been made with respect to the application or nonapplication of section 102, and that special consideration be given by the Bureau on post

review to determine whether field officers have complied fully with these instructions.

The record discloses that there were no recommendations with respect to section 102 for some years although it indicates that the matter should have been thoroughly investigated. With respect to other years, the record shows that while there was a recommendation as to the nonapplication of section 102 by the field agent, there is no indication that such recommendation was reviewed either in the office of the internal-revenue agent in charge or in the Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The conclusion to be drawn from the brief investigation we were able to make is that while there were numerous reasons why the application of section 102 should have been thoroughly explored, neither the field nor the Commissioner's office gave the question the consideration required by Treasury regulations.

Indefinite plans for expansion which do not materialize or for which commitments have not been made have never been regarded as sufficient evidence to overcome the presumption of liability under section 102. See *Koma, Inc.*, v. *Commissioner*, decided by the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit on May 16, 1951. In that case, section 102 was held applicable where there was no definite commitment for expansion plans and where there was no evidence prior to or during the taxable year in question that the board of directors formally or informally had decided to commit funds for the construction of new facilities. See also, *World Publishing Co.* v. *United States* (169 Fed. (2d) 186), where the court applied section 102, because there was no showing as to the immediate need of funds for expansion purposes. It would appear that the question of the application of section 102 to this company has not been properly developed or explored by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

BRIDGE CANYON POWER DAM, COLORADO RIVER

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Bridge Canyon, on the Colorado River, is located at the head of Lake Mead, 117.5 miles upstream from Hoover Dam.

The capacity of this reservoir is 3,720,000 acre-feet. The power to be developed is estimated to be 750,000 kilowatts to 900,000 kilowatts.

The dam would be 673 feet above the stream bed. The crest length of the dam would be 1,950 feet.

The total cost of the Bridge Canyon Dam and power project would be $325,314,000, divided as follows: For the Bridge Canyon Dam and reservoir, $224,604; for the Bridge Canyon power plant, $92,219,000, and for the Coconino Dam and reservoir, on the Little Colorado River, for regulatory purposes, $8,491,000.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION—BRIDGE CANYON DAM

Mr. President, I submit a bill, to be referred to the proper committee, for the construction of this dam and to be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3487) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of controlling floods, improving navigation, and regulating the flow of the Colorado River, and for the generation, use, and sale of electrical energy as a means of making the project herein authorized a self-supporting and financially solvent undertaking, the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, subject to the terms of the Colorado River compact, is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain (1) a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, which dam shall be constructed to an elevation of not more than 1,877 feet above sea level; (2) complete plants (other than steam plants for the production of electrical energy), transmission lines, and incidental structures suitable for the fullest economic development of electrical energy generated from water at the works constructed hereunder for use in the operation thereof and for sale in accordance with Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1922, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto); and (3) such appurtenant dams and incidental works necessary for desilting as may be necessary in the opinion of the Secretary for the successful operation of the undertaking herein authorized.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall have the authority to acquire, by purchase, exchange, condemnation, or otherwise, all lands, rights-of-way, and other property necessary for said purposes: *Provided*, That anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding, the Secretary shall not have the authority to condemn established water rights or the water to the use of which such rights are established.

SEC. 3. The estimated cost of the construction of the said works shall be determined by the Secretary. The Secretary shall also determine (a) the parts of said estimated cost that can be properly allocated to flood control, navigation, fish and wildlife conservation, respectively, and any other purposes served by the project which may hereafter be made nonreimbursable by law, the sum so allocated, together with the expenses of operation and maintenance attributed by him to such purposes, to be nonreimbursable, and (b) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to power and probably be returned to the United States in net power revenues. Before any construction work is done or contracted for, the Secretary shall first determine that costs allocated to power shall be returned to the United States: *Provided*, That the repayment period for costs so allocated shall be such reasonable period of years, but in no event to exceed 75 years, as may be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. In the production, sale, exchange, and distribution of electric energy generated by the works herein authorized, the Secretary shall be governed by the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, and revenues derived from the sale of such energy shall be credited in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291).

SEC. 5. The works provided for by the first section of this act shall be used, first, for river regulation, improvement of navigation, and flood control and, second, for power. The title to all works herein authorized shall forever remain in the United States and the United States shall until otherwise provided by law, control, manage, and operate the same.

SEC. 6. Nothing herein shall be construed as modifying or affecting any of the provisions of the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understanding recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof.

SEC. 7. This act shall be deemed a supplement to the reclamation law, which said reclamation law shall govern the construction, operation, and management of the works herein authorized except as otherwise herein provided.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That during the existence of the present national emergency, no construction of any part of the project authorized by this act shall be undertaken, no contract for any such construction shall be entered into, and no money shall be appropriated for the construction during such emergency of any such part of the project: *Provided*, That, for the purposes of this section, the present national emergency shall be deemed to have ended when the exercise of existing Government controls over wages and prices has terminated and when the exercise of mandatory controls over the allocation for domestic use of materials necessary for the construction of such project shall have ended.

SEC. 9 (a) In aid of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the works authorized by this act, there is hereby granted to the United States, subject to the provisions of this section, (1) all the right, title, and interest of the Indians in and to such tribal and allotted lands, including sites of agency and school buildings and related structures, as may be designated from time to time by the Secretary in order to provide for the construction, operation, or maintenance of said works and any facilities incidental thereto, or for the relocation or reconstruction of highways, railroads, and other properties affected by said works; and (2) such easements, rights-of-way, or other interest in and to tribal and allotted Indian lands as may be designated from time to time by the Secretary in order to provide for the construction, operation, maintenance, relocation, or reconstruction of said works, facilities, and properties: *Provided*, That before designating any tribal lands, or any easements, rights-of-way, or other interests in tribal lands, the Secretary shall make every reasonable effort to negotiate a contract for the purchase of such lands or interests on reasonable terms from the tribe of Indians concerned, and that the Secretary shall proceed with the designation of lands or interests under this section only if he finds that reasonable efforts to negotiate with the tribe of Indians concerned have been made, but have not resulted in, and are not apt to result in, a mutually satisfactory agreement. The Secretary is authorized to provide in any such contract for the payment of compensation in the same forms through which compensation may be made pursuant to a designation under this section, and any tribe of Indians entering into such a contract is authorized to execute the conveyances or other instruments needed for its effectuation, notwithstanding any provision of law or of any tribal constitution or charter to the contrary.

(b) As lands or interests in lands are designated from time to time under this section, the Secretary shall determine the just and equitable compensation to be made therefor. Such compensation may be in money, property, or other assets, including rights to electric energy developed at any

of the generating plants herein authorized. In fixing such rights to electric energy, including the rates and other incidents thereof, the Secretary shall not be bound by section 4 of this act. Any Indian tribe or individual Indian owning lands or interests designated under this section who is dissatisfied with the determination of compensation made by the Secretary shall have a right of action against the United States to recover such additional sums of money, if any, as may be requisite under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or under any treaty or agreement made by the United States, to provide just and equitable compensation for the taking of the lands so designated. Such action may be instituted in the United States district court for the district where the lands or interests are situated or in the Court of Claims, at the election of the plaintiff. The amounts of money determined as compensation hereunder for tribal lands shall be transferred in the Treasury of the United States from funds made available for the purposes of this act to the credit of the appropriate tribe pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560). The amounts due individual allottees or their heirs or devisees shall be paid from funds made available for the purposes of this act to the superintendent of the appropriate Indian agency, or such other officer as shall be designated by the Secretary, for credit on the books of such agency to the accounts of the individuals concerned.

(c) Funds deposited to the credit of allottees, their heirs or devisees, may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary, for the acquisition of other lands and improvements, or the relocation of existing improvements or the construction of new improvements on the lands so acquired for the individuals whose lands and improvements are acquired under the provisions of this section. Lands so acquired shall be held in the same status as those from which the funds were derived, and shall be nontaxable until otherwise provided by Congress.

(d) Whenever any Indian cemetery lands are required for the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, in lieu of requiring payment therefor, to establish cemeteries on other lands that he may select and acquire for the purpose, and to remove bodies, markers, and appurtenances to the new sites. All costs incurred in connection with any such relocation shall be paid from moneys appropriated for the purposes of this act. All right, title, and interest of the Indians in the lands within any cemetery so relocated shall terminate and the grant of title under this section take effect as of the date the Secretary authorizes the relocation. Sites of the relocated cemeteries shall be held in trust by the United States for the appropriate tribe, or family, as the case may be, and shall be nontaxable.

(e) The Secretary is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to prescribe such regulations as he may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section.

(f) Nothing in this act shall be construed as, or have the effect of, subjecting Indian water rights to the laws of any State.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the construction of Bridge Canyon Power Dam has long been contemplated by the Colorado River commissions of the seven States of the Colorado River Basin—Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona, California, and Nevada.

The power from this project is badly needed at this time by the lower basin States. The State of Nevada alone can use the major part of the power to be generated by the date it can be made available.

AMERICAN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICIES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I made before the 11 Western States Republican conference on the subject American Domestic and Foreign Policies, in Seattle, Wash., October 15, 1951.

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

AMERICAN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICIES

(Address by Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, before the 11 Western States Republican Conference, Seattle, Wash., October 15, 1951)

We need a new administration with no vested rights in past mistakes—an administration which can shed from the Federal Government payroll the leeches and the hangers-on that have accumulated over the past 18 years, and can reestablish integrity in government.

It is time the American Government adopted American foreign and domestic policies, which will insure our security and continued well-being as a Nation.

PRESENT STATE OF THE UNION

What is the effect of our foreign policy? What is the effect of our domestic policy? How did we get this way? What possessed a thrifty and intelligent people to sit idly by and watch an administration filled with improvident individuals and business failures dissipate our assets and divide our markets and our wealth with the nations of the world?

Here is the present state of the Union under domestic and foreign policies, which have led us through a Second World War—and for what? For the privilege of spending untold millions, the greatest sum of money of all time, to prepare for World War III.

Wishful thinking and Alice-in-Wonderland theories

For 18 long years, people have listened to wishful thinking and Alice-in-Wonderland theories: the theory that deficit financing is sound economy, that the more we owe the greater our wealth; the theory of "reciprocal trade," the principle that the more goods we can import from foreign-sweatshop labor, the more jobs we create in America; the theory that taxes must be continually raised to siphon off any increase in wages and in business capital to prevent inflation.

National debt—National assets

Our national debt is in excess of $256,000,000,000. In 38 of the 48 States the State's per capita share of the national debt is greater than the assessed value of its property.

The administration and the Congress of the United States, in a few short years, have dissipated the wealth of the Nation which was built up over a century of time.

Discarding the Constitution of the United States

The political one-worlders are now ready for a fateful step to modify the Constitution that the United States may join an Atlantic federation of nations. In this federation, each nation being equal, the foreign nations, without the formality of submitting such proposal to the Congress of the United States, could tax us for their support by the simple expedient of basing taxation on ability to pay, just as Russia is now proposing for the United Nations.

Inflation

We condemn the spendthrift inflation achieved by removal of the metal (gold) base for our money, deficit financing, the sale of almost unbelievable amounts of Government bonds, all resulting in a disastrous flow of newly printed money into the market. It is utter idiocy to say that inflation can be stopped by fixing prices on goods and services at the consumer level without determining the cost of such goods and services.

Bonuses to foreign manufacturers—foreign gift loans—taxes

Bonuses to foreign manufacturers through their cheap labor which the Democrats like to call reciprocal trade, foreign gift-loans, and other economic sleight-of-hand tricks will work just so long as the American taxpayers are able and willing to pick up the check.

We do this by paying increased taxes, by purchasing additional Government bonds with savings or from current pay checks, and by paying higher prices for the necessities of life.

One-half of savings, insurance, and wages stolen

Inflation, caused by the administration, has stolen nearly one-half of all of the savings, insurance, and wages of the American people. The administration admits that the purchasing power of the 1939 dollar is now 53 cents.

The difference between an individual and a sovereign government is that the individual is finished with his unbusinesslike practices when his bank quits him, while a government is not finished with its impractical schemes until the money is prints has no value—or the public votes them out of office.

The foreign nation "dollar shortage" hoax

The "dollar shortage" theory as an excuse for gift loans to foreign nations is the greatest hoax ever sold to a trusting public. Any nation fixing a fictitious dollar value on its own currency—demanding more dollars for its own currency than it is worth in the markets of the world—will certainly be short of dollars.

Manipulating the exchange value of their money by foreign nations is a form of piracy.

A FORWARD-LOOKING PROGRAM

An American domestic and foreign policy, which will insure this Nation's security and continued well-being, must be adopted while this country is still solvent. Only by such a program can we continue to set an example for weaker foreign nations to follow. Such a program should include:

The domestic policy

1. Establish in this country a market for the goods of foreign nations on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, protecting our workers and investors against unfair competition of foreign low-wage producers.

There is no suggestion of a high or low tariff or import fee, but a flexible import fee would represent the difference between the wage standards of living here and abroad.

2. Make the Western Hemisphere self-sufficient for emergency: Encourage production particularly of strategic and critical materials throughout the Western Hemisphere—including South America, Canada, and Alaska; thus in time of emergency the Western Hemisphere could be made self-sufficient and the transportation lines kept open.

3. Establish a sound currency. Determine the degree and extent of the current inflation and fix the price of gold to conform, establishing the gold standard. The use of silver should be emphasized, inasmuch as approximately half the people of the world have used silver for money for the past 2,000 years.

4. Congress should regain its power as one of the three independent branches of the Government set up by the Constitution

as a check on the executive and the judicial.

Congress must resume its constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce, to regulate money, and to approve treaties and agreements with foreign nations. Many of these constitutional duties of the Congress have been taken over or modified by the executive branch during the last 18 years.

5. All rights of regulation and sovereignty not specifically given to the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States must be returned to the States.

Many such rights have been exercised by the Federal Government through congressional inertia or actual legislative acts during the past 15 years.

The foreign policy

1. Establish the free currency exchange principle for mutual trade, and stop gift loans to foreign nations. End the ruinous administration policy of showering foreign nations with gift loans out of the pockets of the American taxpayers. Accept, up to reasonable amounts, foreign nations' currency at the current rate of exchange for the purchase of goods and services in this country, and then use their own currency in purchasing goods from such countries.

2. As a condition of such relations, require a free exchange of the currencies of foreign nations between themselves, and in terms of the dollar upon the New York and London exchanges.

3. As a further condition, require that foreign nations protect the integrity of private investments in their respective countries.

4. As a further condition, establish equal access to the markets of those nations which we are committed to defend, providing that any nation may protect its own workers and investors, through tariffs or import fees, but that no third nation may fix such conditions, including quotas, money exchanges, or other subterfuge, to preclude the United States from trading with that nation upon an equal basis.

5. Extend the 128-year-old Monroe Doctrine to include the areas in Asia and Europe that it is necessary for us to currently defend for our own security and well-being.

The foreign policy of other nations

It must be recognized that the foreign policies of the nations of Europe and Asia are based upon the principle voiced by one of England's great Prime Ministers in 1849 when we said that, "We (the English) have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow."

This foreign policy was reiterated by another great Prime Minister of that Commonwealth, Mr. Churchill, in 1945, when he answered President Roosevelt's suggestion that England relinquish her claim to Hong Kong, with a statement which was heard around the world: "I did not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

We also must acknowledge and protect our "permanent interests." This is a sound principle, which we have not been following.

DISCLAIMER

We oppose sweatshop labor competition (so-called reciprocal trade), inflated currency, ruinous taxation, and foreign domination of our domestic and foreign policies.

Sweatshop labor competition

We oppose the administration's bonuses to foreign manufacturers, so-called reciprocal trade, which puts the sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia in direct competition with the workers and investors of this Nation, threatening the American high standard of living.

Inflated currency

We oppose the administration's inflated currency policies, which started in 1934 with the cutting loose of our money system from the metal (gold) base, and is aggravated by the sale of additional Government bonds to cover continuous deficit financing, resulting from the unnecessary sending of billions of dollars to foreign nations and the vast amount otherwise wasted by the administration.

Fifty billion dollars was supposed to have been spent on the military between VJ-day and the outbreak in Korea—and nothing to show for this huge sum.

The administration and the Congress of the United States should treat the taxpayers' money in the same manner that the cashier of a bank treats depositors' money—as a trust to be fully accounted for to the people as stockholders in the greatest organization on earth.

Ruinous taxation

We oppose the policy of the administration of raising taxes to siphon off raises in wages and investment profits, supposedly to prevent inflation, on the theory that the Government can spend the private citizen's money without causing inflation, but that if it is spent by the man who earns it for the comforts of life, it will upset the economy and cause inflation. We favor taxation for the necessary revenue only.

Foreign domination

We warn against the domination of our economy and our foreign policy by the Fabian-Marxist system into which we are falling. This one-economic-world philosophy had led to gift-loans of billions of our taxpayers' dollars to foreign nations to make up their balance of trade deficits each year, and threatens to level our standard of living with those of other nations of the world.

We have inadvertently adopted the Socialist policy between nations which Marx enunciated more than 100 years ago when he said, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

CONCLUSION

This Nation desperately needs a liberal dose of common horse sense and old-time religion.

We need an administration which will reestablish the integrity of government and encourage integrity between individuals and between nations, and assure respect for American citizens at home and abroad.

Mr. MALONE: Mr. President, the 11 Western States' Republican Conference then, on October 16, adopted the foreign trade and the gold standard resolutions.

THE GOLD STANDARD—GOLD AND SILVER PRODUCTION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada recommended before the Seattle conference the 11 Western States' Republican Conference, last year, on October 15, 1951, and again before the Nevada Republican State convention on May 9, in Tonopah, that "we return to the gold standard and abolish the present-day managed currency system."

DEFICIT FINANCING AND INFLATION

Since the removal of the gold base for the currency of this Nation the administration has resorted to what has been popularized as deficit financing. In reality it means printing counterfeit money, and it is directly responsible for the continuous inflation, thereby causing friction between the workingmen and the investors of this Nation—the investors as represented by management.

Gold and silver were among the first metals known to man. They have been used in the arts and industry, as monetary standards, or as mere personal adornment. These continued uses through the ages have retained in gold and silver the character of preciousness. The desire for these two metals has inspired conquest and exploration. The role of gold and silver as natural standards of value and mediums of exchange has been of prime importance in the development of civilization.

Few records are available concerning the production of the common metals before the nineteenth century. Gold and silver, however, have long been valued; comprehensive and reliable production records extend back to the opening of the New World.

In 1929 the United States Bureau of Mines, then part of the Department of Commerce, summarized the recorded production of gold and silver in two separate papers, Summarized Data of Gold Production—United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Mines, Economic Paper 6, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1930—and Summarized Data of Silver Production—United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Mines, Economic Paper 8, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1930.

One-half of the world has used gold for money, and the other half silver for more than 2,000 years of recorded history—these nations have recognized the intrinsic value of these metals, whatever the nations stamp—or none at all, therefore they are the only metals that inspire confidence in a money base or standard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the tables of production to which I have just referred.

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

Total world production by major gold-producing countries, 1493–1950

[In fine ounces]

Years	World total	Percent	United States	Percent	Canada	Percent	Mexico	Percent	Colombia	Percent	U. S. S. R. (Russia)	Percent
1493 to 1600	22,968,491	100					771,618	3.36	4,115,295	17.91		
1601 to 1700	28,848,860	100					1,231,373	4.27	11,252,760	39.01		
1701 to 1800	61,205,875	100	166,250	0.19			2,932,148	4.79	15,110,849	24.69	170,399	0.28
1801 to 1900	374,266,607	100	115,275,707	30.80	6,968,582	1.86	6,847,522	1.83	12,317,544	3.27	62,448,404	16.70
1901 to 1925	477,526,621	100	93,915,934	19.67	21,179,931	4.44	18,925,887	3.96	4,703,487	.98	24,624,734	5.16
1926 to 1930	97,743,912	100	10,657,613	10.90	9,524,745	9.74	3,522,225	3.60	391,646	.40	5,686,769	5.81
1931 to 1935	129,154,880	100	13,037,628	10.09	14,977,098	11.59	3,188,960	2.46	1,413,883	1.09	15,000,264	11.61

Total world production by major gold-producing countries, 1493–1950—Continued

[In fine ounces]

Years	World total	Percent	United States	Percent	Canada	Percent	Mexico	Percent	Colombia	Percent	U. S. S. R. (Russia)	Percent
1936 to 1940	186, 353, 717	100	21, 600, 763	11. 59	23, 027, 548	12. 35	4, 248, 945	2. 28	2, 554, 385	1. 37	25, 767, 891	13. 82
1941 to 1945	153, 895, 061	100	11, 733, 566	7. 62	19, 469, 191	12. 65	3, 241, 020	2. 10	2, 978, 371	1. 93	[1]	
1946 to 1950	148, 700, 000	100	9, 863, 809	6. 63	18, 110, 399	12. 17	2, 066, 523	1. 38	1, 894, 349	1. 27	[2] 34, 000, 000	22. 86
Accumulative total 1493 through 1950	1, 680, 664, 024		276, 251, 270	16. 43	113, 257, 494	6. 73	46, 976, 221	2. 79	56, 732, 569	3. 37	167, 698, 461	9. 97

[1] Not available.
[2] Estimated.

Source: Bureau of Mines, Summarized Data of Gold Production, 1929; Bureau of the Mint, annual reports.

Years	Union of South Africa	Percent	Australia	Percent	India	Percent	British West Africa (Gold Coast, Nigeria, Sierra Leone)	Percent	Rhodesia	Percent	Total, all countries	Percent
1493 to 1600											4, 886, 913	21. 27
1601 to 1700											12, 484, 133	43. 27
1701 to 1800											18, 379, 646	30. 02
1801 to 1900	20, 660, 249		104, 859, 165	28. 02	3, 024, 488	0. 81	647, 894		240, 806	0. 13	333, 290, 361	89. 05
1901 to 1925	178, 437, 577	37. 36	62, 657, 796	13. 12	12, 642, 214	2. 65	5, 882, 428	1. 23	14, 358, 714	3. 01	437, 328, 702	91. 58
1926 to 1930	51, 578, 831	52. 76	2, 448, 519	2. 50	1, 837, 396	1. 87	983, 302	1. 00	2, 869, 365	2. 93	89, 500, 411	91. 56
1931 to 1935	54, 709, 712	42. 35	3, 892, 041	3. 01	1, 646, 067	1. 27	1, 700, 522	1. 31	3, 188, 239	2. 46	112, 754, 414	87. 30
1936 to 1940	62, 100, 190	33. 32	7, 352, 092	3. 94	1, 593, 133	. 82	3, 611, 476	1. 93	4, 057, 667	2. 17	155, 914, 090	83. 66
1941 to 1945	65, 843, 138	42. 78	4, 715, 843	3. 06	1, 150, 254	. 74	3, 440, 453	2. 23	3, 373, 938	2. 19	115, 945, 774	75. 34
1946 to 1950	58, 180, 255	39. 12	4, 387. 058	2. 95	844, 688	. 56	3, 210, 438	2. 15	2, 631, 499	1. 76	135, 189, 018	90. 91
Accumulative total 1493 through 1950	491, 509, 952	29. 24	190, 312, 514	11. 32	22, 738, 240	. 13	19, 476, 513	. 11	30, 720, 228	. 18	1, 415, 673, 462	84. 23

Total world silver production by major producing countries, 1493–1950

[In fine ounces]

Years	World total	Percent	United States	Percent	Canada	Percent	Mexico	Percent	Bolivia	Percent	Chile	Percent
1493 to 1600	748, 932, 166	100					90, 410, 000	12. 10	355, 360, 000	47. 58		
1601 to 1700	1, 271, 922, 450	100					306, 650, 000	24. 11	456, 860, 000	35. 92	20, 000	
1701 to 1800	1, 832, 768, 759	100					1, 044, 510, 000	57. 00	213, 550, 000	11. 66	6, 470, 000	0. 35
1801 to 1900	5, 098, 551, 183	100	1, 338, 153, 144	26. 25	30, 184, 476	0. 59	1, 864, 084, 854	36. 56	421, 607, 515	8. 27	235, 129, 747	4. 61
1901 to 1925	4, 901, 347, 412	100	1, 534, 422, 940	31. 31	464, 279, 982	9. 47	1, 614, 722, 340	32. 94	109, 009, 808	2. 22	47, 547, 987	. 97
1926 to 1930	1, 272, 806, 550	100	293, 353, 652	23. 04	116, 500, 658	9. 15	525, 684, 685	41. 30	28, 782, 943	2. 26	8, 274, 511	. 65
1931 to 1935	940, 774, 230	100	155, 634, 689	16. 54	88, 343, 776	9. 39	373, 202, 827	39. 66	28, 523, 866	3. 03	3, 030, 496	. 32
1936 to 1940	1, 334, 472, 289	100	328, 496, 857	24. 61	112, 717, 360	8. 44	401, 674, 239	30. 09	39, 431, 081	2. 95	7, 447, 594	. 55
1941 to 1945	1, 078, 154, 226	100	232, 506, 736	21. 56	90, 881, 335	8. 42	366, 419, 252	33. 98	36, 282, 820	3. 36	5, 149, 020	. 47
1946 to 1950	842. 100, 000	100	176, 172, 099	20. 92	83, 249, 928	9. 88	258, 223, 025	30. 66	33, 093, 304	3. 92	3, 712, 831	. 44
Accumulative total 1493 through 1950	19, 321, 829, 265	100	4, 058, 740, 117	21. 00	986, 157, 515	5. 10	6, 845, 581. 222	35. 42	1, 722, 501, 337	8. 91	316, 782, 186	1. 63

Source: Bureau of Mines, Summarized Data of Silver Production, 1929; Bureau of the Mint, annual reports.

[In fine ounces]

Years	Peru	Percent	Spain	Percent	Japan	Percent	Union of South Africa	Percent	Australia	Percent	Total all countries	Percent
1493 to 1600	94, 360, 000	12. 63			25, 000, 000	3. 35					565, 130, 000	75. 45
1601 to 1700	332, 440, 000	26. 14			75, 000, 000	5. 90					1, 170, 970, 000	92. 06
1701 to 1800	360, 220, 000	19. 65			1, 000, 000	. 05					1, 625, 750, 000	88. 70
1801 to 1900	284, 537, 367	5. 58	100, 090, 412	1. 96	30, 902, 038	. 61	2, 258, 000	0. 05	157, 611, 709	3. 09	4, 464, 559, 262	87. 56
1901 to 1925	237, 699, 456	4. 86	94, 842, 898	1. 94	101, 697, 876	2. 07	20, 437, 432	. 42	306, 950, 891	6. 26	4, 531, 611, 610	92. 45
1926 to 1930	98, 398, 506	7. 73	13, 902, 121	1. 09	26, 024, 310	2. 04	5, 108, 864	. 40	48, 935, 498	3. 80	1, 164, 965. 748	91. 52
1931 to 1935	51, 908, 302	5. 51	12, 052, 472	1. 28	33, 615, 692	3. 54	5, 833, 085	. 62	53, 339, 901	5. 66	805, 485, 106	85. 61
1936 to 1940	94, 344, 044	7. 06	2, 313, 568	. 17	52, 668, 672	3. 94	5, 782, 775	. 43	72, 916, 131	5. 46	1, 117, 792, 321	83. 76
1941 to 1945	74, 644, 096	6. 92	2, 282, 333	. 21	39, 937, 808	3. 70	6, 750, 979	. 62	56, 193, 451	5. 21	911, 047, 830	84. 50
1946 to 1950	56, 086, 939	6. 66	3, 057, 658	. 36	11, 827, 229	1. 40	5, 804, 528	. 68	49, 220, 133	5. 84	680, 447, 674	80. 80
Accumulative total 1493 through 1950	1, 686, 618, 710	8. 72	228, 541, 462	1. 18	397, 673, 625	2. 05	51, 975, 663	. 26	745, 167, 714	3. 85	17, 039, 739, 551	88. 18

WORLD PRODUCTION—GOLD—SILVER

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, these comprehensive reports presented the details of world production of gold and silver from 1493 to 1927. The production figures presented here are taken from these two reports and the annual reports of the Director of the Mint.

Table I shows world production of gold for certain periods and the cumulative total world production since 1943 through 1950. Production of 10 of the major gold producers by certain periods and total cumulative production from 1493 through 1950 is also shown.

Table II, following, shows total world production of silver for the same period 1493 through 1950 and the production of 10 major silver producers.

The United States has played an important role in the production of gold and silver. We find from table I that the United States production of gold accounted for 16.43 percent of the total world production of gold since 1493. Referring to the attached photostat of table 58, taken from the afore-mentioned report, Summarized Data of Gold Production, we find the United States produced 44.48 percent of the world total production in the period 1851–1855. Recent domestic production of gold has never recovered its record level of production of 1940, 4,862,979 fine ounces. In 1950 domestic production accounted for only 7.24 percent of total world gold production.

The production of silver in the United States has averaged about one-fifth of total world production. From table II we find that only in the 5-year period 1931–35 has the United States failed to supply 20 percent of the total world production of silver.

PRESENT STOCKS—GOLD, SILVER

The following table shows the accumulative total world production of gold

and silver and the existing monetary stocks of these two metals. Reliable figures for industrial consumption, private holdings, or loss of gold and silver through other than monetary uses are not available.

The following table shows the accumulative total world production of gold and silver and the existing monetary stocks of these two metals.

Reliable figures for industrial consumption, private holding, or loss of gold and silver through other than monetary uses are not available.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have table III printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

TABLE III.—*Comparison of gold and silver production with monetary stocks, 1950 (in fine ounces)*

	Cumulative world production since 1492	Total world monetary stocks	Percent	Balance of gold and silver lost or absorbed in other than monetary uses
Gold	1,680,664,024	1,013,063,000	60.27	649,631,024
Silver	19,321,829,265	4,563,149,000	23.61	14,758,680,265

SUMMARY—WORLD PRODUCTION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have here the General Summary of World Production of Gold, 1493 to 1927, fine ounces, from the paper Summarized Data of Gold Production; also table 46, General Summary of World Production of Silver, 1493 to 1927, fine ounces, from the paper Summarized Data of Silver Production.

Production figures for gold and silver from 1928 to 1950 for each producing country may be found in the annual reports of the Director of the Mint.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing gold production from 1493 to 1927, and a table showing silver production for the same period.

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

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*

Period	World total		North America		United States[1]		Canada		Mexico		Central America and West Indies		South America	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600	22,968,491	100.00	771,618	3.36					771,618	3.36			8,204,871	35.72
1601–1700	28,848,860	100.00	1,231,373	4.27					1,231,373	4.27			17,811,509	61.74
1701–1800	61,205,875	100.00	3,048,398	4.98	116,250	0.19			2,932,148	4.79			48,965,579	80.00
1801–1810	5,850,759	100.00	701,818	12.00	135,000	2.31			566,818	9.69			4,385,361	74.95
1811–1820	3,814,652	100.00	749,013	12.56	135,000	3.54			344,013	9.02			2,510,972	65.82
1821–1830	4,685,182	100.00	463,791	9.90	150,000	3.20			313,791	6.70			2,353,434	50.23
1831–1840	6,567,781	100.00	595,782	9.07	318,000	4.84			277,723	4.23			2,748,887	41.85
1841–1850	17,117,313	100.00	5,811,506	33.95	5,170,420	30.21			641,086	3.74			2,572,058	15.03
1801–1850	38,035,687	100.00	8,051,910	21.17	5,908,420	15.53			2,143,490	5.64			14,570,712	38.30
1851–1855	32,089,321	100.00	14,593,740	45.49	14,270,625	44.48			323,115	1.01			1,205,652	3.76
1856–1860	32,470,734	100.00	12,822,343	39.49	12,384,000	38.14	220,039	0.68	218,304	.67			1,168,680	3.60
1851–1860	64,560,055	100.00	27,416,083	42.47	26,654,625	41.29	220,039	.34	541,419	.84			2,374,332	3.68
1861–1865	29,697,616	100.00	11,856,794	39.93	10,716,271	36.09	859,365	2.89	281,158	.95			1,237,803	4.17
1866–1870	31,401,761	100.00	13,131,953	41.82	12,225,570	38.93	618,634	1.97	287,749	.92			1,270,970	4.05
1861–1870	61,099,377	100.00	24,988,747	40.89	22,941,841	37.54	1,477,999	2.42	568,907	.93			2,508,773	4.11
1871	6,391,308		2,274,443		2,104,312		105,187		64,944				302,602	
1872	5,798,460		1,896,727		1,741,500		90,283		64,944				313,694	
1873	5,503,951		1,880,790		1,741,500		74,346		64,944				331,364	
1874	5,359,925		1,782,922		1,620,122		97,856		64,944				365,906	
1875	5,340,709		1,814,253		1,619,009		130,300		64,944				395,081	
1871–1875	28,394,353	100.00	9,649,135	33.98	8,826,443	31.09	497,972	1.75	324,720	1.14			1,708,647	6.02
1851–1875	154,053,785	100.00	62,053,965	40.28	58,422,909	37.92	2,196,010	1.43	1,435,046	.93			6,591,752	4.28
1876	5,429,572		2,077,209		1,931,575		97,729		47,905				363,422	
1877	6,001,368		2,411,192		2,268,662		94,304		48,226				444,673	
1878	5,987,207		2,599,755		2,477,109		74,420		48,226				437,176	
1879	5,415,952		2,006,174		1,881,787		76,547		47,840				443,937	
1880	5,349,158		1,852,461		1,741,500		63,121		47,840				469,305	
1876–1880	28,183,257	100.00	10,946,791	38.84	10,300,633	36.55	406,121	1.44	240,037	.85			2,158,513	7.66
1871–1880	56,577,610	100.00	20,595,926	36.40	19,127,076	33.80	904,093	1.60	564,757	1.00			3,867,160	6.83
1881	5,064,313		1,783,675		1,678,612		63,524		41,539				437,248	
1882	4,885,626		1,677,775		1,572,187		60,288		45,300				435,996	
1883	4,746,390		1,551,336		1,451,250		53,853		46,233				484,384	
1884	5,014,923		1,598,380		1,489,950		51,202		57,228				550,776	
1885	5,102,414		1,636,162		1,538,373		55,575		41,925		289		496,607	
1881–1885	24,813,666	100.00	8,247,328	33.24	7,730,372	31.15	284,442	1.15	232,225	.94	289	0	2,414,011	9.73
1886	4,944,835		1,791,489		1,686,788		70,782		29,707		4,212		440,144	
1887	5,255,917		1,707,185		1,603,049		57,003		39,867		7,266		453,773	
1888	5,508,562		1,712,633		1,604,478		53,788		47,101		7,266		435,858	
1889	6,048,352		1,698,558		1,594,775		62,662		33,855		7,266		454,452	
1890	5,814,182		1,713,815		1,588,877		80,570		37,102		7,266		479,818	
1886–1890	27,571,848	100.00	8,623,680	31.28	8,077,967	29.30	324,805	1.18	187,632	.68	33,276	.12	2,264,045	8.21
1881–1890	52,385,514	100.00	16,871,008	32.21	15,803,339	30.19	609,247	1.16	419,857	.80	33,565	.06	4,678,056	8.93
1891	6,300,223		1,706,147		1,604,840		45,011		48,387		7,909		509,075	
1892	7,060,290		1,703,537		1,597,098		43,905		54,625		7,909		562,499	
1893	7,543,737		1,855,229		1,739,323		44,853		63,144		7,909		546,840	
1894	8,657,113		2,201,672		1,910,813		50,411		217,688		22,760		548,717	
1895	9,518,192		2,660,210		2,254,760		92,440		290,250		22,760		550,584	
1891–1895	39,079,555	100.00	10,126,795	25.91	9,106,834	23.30	276,620	.71	674,094	1.72	69,247	.18	2,717,715	6.95

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	World total		North America		United States [1]		Canada		Mexico		Central America and West Indies		South America	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1896	9,716,749		3,036,851		2,568,132		136,274		314,437		18,008		503,649	
1897	11,396,952		3,454,864		2,774,935		294,582		362,812		22,535		500,007	
1898	13,920,747		4,222,672		3,118,398		669,445		411,187		23,642		539,966	
1899	15,073,419		4,908,315		3,437,210		1,031,563		411,187		28,355		547,534	
1900	12,420,942		5,638,180		3,829,897		1,348,720		435,375		24,188		550,827	
1895–1900	62,528,809	100.00	21,260,882	34.00	15,728,572	25.15	3,480,584	5.57	1,934,998	3.09	116,728	.19	2,641,983	4.23
1891–1900	101,608,364	100.00	31,387,677	30.90	24,835,406	24.45	3,757,204	3.70	2,609,092	2.57	185,975	.18	5,539,698	5.27
1876–1900	182,177,135	100.00	59,205,476	32.50	50,944,378	27.97	4,772,572	2.62	3,268,986	1.79	219,540	.12	12,196,267	6.69
1851–1900	336,230,920	100.00	121,259,441	36.06	109,367,287	32.52	6,968,582	2.07	4,704,032	1.40	219,540	.07	18,788,019	5.59
1801–1900	374,266,607	100.00	129,311,351	34.55	115,275,707	30.80	6,968,582	1.86	6,847,522	1.83	219,540	.06	33,358,731	8.91
1901	12,692,227		5,501,217		3,805,500		1,167,216		497,527		30,974		580,922	
1902	14,494,382		5,490,159		3,870,000		1,032,161		491,156		96,842		623,502	
1903	15,934,268		5,078,358		3,560,000		911,118		516,524		90,716		531,248	
1904	16,902,209		5,359,223		3,892,480		796,374		609,781		60,588		499,708	
1905	18,488,085		5,824,913		4,265,742		706,778		779,181		73,212		518,108	
1901–1905	78,511,171	100.00	27,253,870	34.71	19,393,722	24.69	4,613,647	5.88	2,894,169	3.69	352,332	.45	2,753,488	3.51
1906	19,533,892		6,136,037		4,565,333		581,657		896,615		92,432		517,122	
1907	20,039,853		5,782,878		4,371,639		405,517		903,699		102,023		571,206	
1908	21,483,983		6,264,933		4,560,548		476,112		1,082,210		146,063		570,139	
1909	22,093,602		6,544,217		4,809,694		453,865		1,153,400		127,258		561,749	
1910	22,146,716		6,573,606		4,649,496		493,707		1,205,051		225,352		566,669	
1906–1910	105,298,046	100.00	31,301,671	29.73	22,956,710	21.81	2,410,858	2.29	5,240,975	4.98	693,128	0.65	2,786,885	2.65
1901–1910	183,809,217	100.00	58,555,541	31.85	42,350,432	23.03	7,024,505	3.82	8,135,144	4.43	1,045,460	.57	5,540,373	3.01
1911	22,466,812		6,516,944		4,677,508		472,241		1,203,573		163,622		624,105	
1912	22,670,332		6,442,054		4,498,388		611,885		1,185,187		146,594		648,426	
1914	22,306,558		6,134,279		4,265,530		802,973		934,065		131,711		595,080	
1914	21,319,747		5,640,374		4,519,662		773,178		231,628		115,906		640,509	
1915	22,718,154		6,202,754		4,823,672		918,056		317,305		143,721		729,861	
1911–1915	111,481,603	100.00	30,936,405	27.75	22,784,760	20.44	3,578,333	3.21	3,871,758	3.47	701,554	.63	3,237,981	2.90
1916	22,035,302		5,878,507		4,405,779		930,495		372,040		170,193		750,228	
1917	20,297,144		5,306,719		3,981,482		738,831		435,375		151,031		673,603	
1918	18,568,278		4,936,431		3,258,375		699,681		813,895		164,480		684,000	
1919	17,667,308		4,562,265		2,877,509		766,764		758,354		159,638		643,244	
1920	16,335,420		4,064,933		2,414,410		766,913		738,485		145,125		638,584	
1916–1920	94,903,452	100.00	24,748,855	26.08	16,937,555	17.85	3,902,684	4.11	3,118,149	3.29	790,467	.83	3,389,659	3.57
1911–1920	206,385,055	100.00	55,685,260	26.98	39,722,315	19.25	7,481,017	3.62	6,989,907	3.39	1,492,021	.72	6,627,640	3.21
1921	16,003,616		4,093,201		2,361,301		926,329		684,634		120,937		690,513	
1922	15,467,223		4,421,859		2,289,235		1,263,364		748,323		120,937		719,500	
1923	17,802,109		4,528,509		2,426,490		1,223,601		781,663		96,755		734,812	
1924	19,033,459		4,856,016		2,446,328		1,525,380		797,223		87,085		568,230	
1925	19,025,942		4,941,398		2,319,833		1,735,735		788,993		96,837		500,360	
1921–1925	87,332,349	100.00	22,840,983	26.15	11,843,187	13.56	6,674,409	7.64	3,800,836	4.35	522,551	.60	3,213,415	3.68
1901–1925	477,526,621	100.00	137,081,784	28.71	93,915,934	19.67	21,179,931	4.44	18,925,887	3.96	3,060,032	.64	15,381,428	3.22
1926	19,349,118	100.00	4,852,580	25.08	2,238,616	11.57	1,754,228	9.07	772,661	3.99	87,075	.45	508,195	2.63
1927	19,397,757	100.00	4,759,535	24.54	2,117,253	10.92	1,844,544	9.51	725,175	3.74	72,563	.37	491,787	2.54

Period	Argentina		Bolivia		Brazil		Chile		Colombia		Ecuador		British Guiana	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600			1,800,442	7.84			1,543,236	6.72	4,115,295	17.91				
1601–1700			3,343,677	11.59	482,261	1.67	1,125,276	3.90	11,252,760	39.01				
1701–1800			2,314,853	3.78	27,006,623	44.12	2,764,964	4.52	15,110,849	24.69				
1801–1810			321,507	5.49	1,205,653	20.61	999,888	17.09	1,607,537	27.47				
1811–1820			192,904	5.06	565,853	14.83	643,015	16.86	964,522	25.28				
1821–1830			128,603	2.74	707,316	15.10	385,809	8.23	1,028,824	21.96				
1831–1840			192,904	2.94	964,522	14.69	385,809	5.87	1,060,974	16.15				
1841–1850			192,904	1.13	771,618	4.51	321,507	1.88	1,093,125	6.38				
1801–1850			1,028,822	2.70	4,214,962	11.08	2,736,028	7.19	5,754,982	15.13				
1851–1855			160,754	.50	353,658	1.10	64,301	.20	562,638	1.76				
1856–1860			160,754	.50	340,798	1.05	48,226	.15	562,638	1.73				
1851–1860			321,508	.50	694,456	1.08	112,527	.17	1,125,276	1.74				
1861–1865			160,754	.54	385,809	1.30	64,301	.22	562,638	1.89				
1866–1870			160,754	.51	281,319	.90	64,301	.20	562,638	1.80				
1861–1870			321,508	.53	667,128	1.09	128,602	.21	1,125,276	1.84				
1871			64,301		55,299		12,860		112,528					
1872			64,301		55,299		12,860		112,528					
1873			64,301		55,299		12,860		112,528					
1874			64,301		55,299		12,860		112,528					
1875			64,301		55,299		12,860		112,528					
1871–1875			321,505	1.13	276,495	.97	64,300	.23	562,640	1.99				
1851–1875			964,521	.63	1,638,079	1.06	305,429	.20	2,813,192	1.82				

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Argentina		Bolivia		Brazil		Chile		Colombia		Ecuador		British Guiana	
	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent
1876	3,794		21,734		49,512		8,702		128,603					
1877	3,794		21,734		49,512		8,702		193,515					
1878	3,794		21,734		49,512		8,703		193,515					
1879	3,794		21,734		48,548		6,237		193,515					
1880	3,794		21,734		43,243		6,237		193,515					
1876–1880	18,970	0.07	108,670	0.39	240,327	0.85	38,581	0.14	902,663	3.19				
1871–1880	18,970	.03	430,175	.76	516,822	.91	102,881	.18	1,465,303	2.59				
1881	3,794		3,504		35,880		6,237		193,515					
1882	3,794		3,504		35,880		7,877		186,539					
1883	3,794		3,504		30,608		7,877		186,539				(6)	
1884	3,794		3,504		30,608		16,075		186,539				257	
1885	3,794		3,504		38,709		16,075		120,951				932	
1881–1885	18,970	0.08	17,520	0.07	171,685	0.69	54,141	0.22	874,083	3.52			1,189	0.01
1886	965		3,504		48,290		16,075		120,951				6,527	
1887	1,447		4,598		31,636		76,487		145,128				11,896	
1888	1,511		2,894		21,541		94,941		145,128				14,468	
1889	3,955		2,894		21,541		69,510		165,930				27,103	
1890	3,955		3,247		21,541		69,510		174,128				54,431	
1886–1890	11,833	.04	17,137	.06	144,549	.52	326,523	1.18	751,265	2.74			114,425	.41
1881–1890	30,803	.06	34,657	.07	316,234	.60	380,664	.73	1,625,348	3.09	(6)		115,614	.22
1891	3,955		3,247		41,507		69,510		167,955		2,540		87,064	
1892	3,967		3,241		107,368		29,209		167,958		2,515		116,047	
1893	6,782		3,241		107,368		22,466		139,939		2,515		124,198	
1894	4,596		3,241		57,566		22,466		139,939		3,309		111,751	
1895	15,238		3,241		46,498		68,092		139,939		6,429		107,059	
1891–1895	34,538	.09	16,211	.04	360,307	.92	211,743	.54	755,730	1.93	17,308	0.04	546,119	1.40
1896	15,238		12,110		48,426		29,559		106,428		6,429		107,059	
1897	6,661		16,617		58,251		16,482		107,740		6,429		100,945	
1898	6,661		16,204		76,613		43,229		104,426		1,911		99,105	
1899	6,661		7,249		103,983		62,819		89,231		2,317		98,712	
1900	2,112		5,786		134,260		78,735		54,804		5,208		98,487	
1896–1900	37,333	.06	57,966	.09	421,533	.67	230,824	.37	465,629	.75	22,294	.04	504,308	.81
1891–1900	71,871	.07	74,177	.07	781,840	.77	442,567	.44	1,221,359	1.20	39,602	.04	1,050,427	1.03
1876–1900	121,644	.07	217,504	.12	1,338,401	.73	861,812	.47	3,749,370	2.06	39,602	.02	1,166,041	.64
1851–1900	121,644	.04	1,182,025	.35	2,976,480	.89	1,167,241	.35	6,562,562	1.95	39,602	.01	1,166,041	.35
1801–1900	121,644	.03	2,210,847	.59	7,191,442	1.92	3,903,269	1.05	12,317,544	3.27	39,602	.01	1,166,041	.31
1901	1,451		5,786		134,260		51,626		135,513		5,321		85,701	
1902	1,451		48		101,584		32,262		122,031		9,675		87,491	
1903	1,451		142		110,314		30,812		131,795		13,272		77,948	
1904	445		1,059		98,854		30,812		95,513		6,430		77,828	
1905	265		912		98,906		45,886		125,001		9,117		81,789	
1901–1905	5,063	.01	7,947	.01	543,918	.70	191,398	.24	609,853	.78	43,815	.06	410,757	.52
1906	268		838		116,243		35,667		105,982		14,233		77,770	
1907	4,985		228		97,750		61,085		157,491		12,923		63,099	
1908	7,801		1,141		106,259		38,195		165,797		16,945		68,116	
1909	9,186		1,369		108,983		40,767		153,826		13,273		57,697	
1910	8,372		1,061		94,557		40,767		163,022		12,054		57,697	
1906–1910	30,612	.03	4,637	.00	523,792	.50	216,481	.21	746,118	.70	69,428	.07	324,379	.31
1901–1910	35,675	.02	12,584	.01	1,067,710	.57	407,879	.22	1,355,971	.74	113,243	.06	735,136	.40
1911	13,979		1,061		185,496		35,752		153,241		13,389		43,149	
1912	5,193		2,508		172,728		35,398		143,757		19,665		42,560	
1913	128		3,007		109,072		36,874		143,757		19,665		65,475	
1914			5,789		103,513		34,622		226,327		16,779		54,495	
1915			5,735		117,286		33,662		263,796		26,397		44,693	
1911–1915	19,300	.02	18,100	.02	688,095	.62	176,308	.16	930,878	.82	95,895	.09	250,372	.22
1916	740		198		139,804		29,852		298,662		27,090		31,962	
1917	223		242		143,093		37,041		241,875		42,947		25,107	
1918	193		242		135,450		37,007		290,250		38,700		24,546	
1919	193		242		96,750		37,007		290,251		38,700		16,216	
1920	4,837		242		125,775		43,538		280,575		36,281		9,675	
1916–1920	6,186	.01	1,166	.00	640,872	.68	184,445	.19	1,401,613	1.48	183,718	.19	107,506	.11
1911–1920	25,486	.01	19,266	.01	1,328,967	.65	360,753	.17	2,332,491	1.13	279,613	.14	357,878	.17
1921	3,628		290		134,482		45,139		290,250		36,259		12,828	
1922	3,628		407		146,668		79,828		275,737		42,456		10,877	
1923	3,870		407		144,675		64,397		275,738		42,456		8,170	
1924	2,903		964		144,675		67,725		96,750		38,700		6,337	
1925	2,661		386		108,506		61,216		76,550		43,537		9,107	
1921–1925	16,690	.02	2,454	.00	679,006	.78	318,305	.36	1,015,025	1.17	203,408	.23	47,319	.05
1901–1925	77,851	.02	34,304	.01	3,075,683	.64	1,086,937	.23	4,703,487	.98	596,264	.12	1,140,333	.24
1926	2,419	.01	332	.00	102,108	.53	59,132	.31	71,658	.37	62,486	.32	6,516	.03
1927	967	.00	241	.00	100,000	.53	60,000	.31	72,563	.37	64,242	.33	5,714	.03

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Dutch Guiana		French Guiana		Peru		Uruguay		Venezuela		Europe		Austria-Hungary [10]	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600					745,898	3.25					4,758,310	20.72	4,758,310	20.72
1601–1700					1,607,535	5.57					3,215,074	11.14	3,215,074	11.14
1701–1800					1,768,290	2.89					3,480,118	5.69	3,395,118	5.55
1801–1810					250,776	4.29					327,647	5.60	308,647	5.28
1811–1820					144,678	3.79					358,507	9.40	321,507	8.43
1821–1830					102,882	2.20					757,911	16.18	364,911	7.79
1831–1840					144,678	2.20					1,343,450	20.46	522,450	7.96
1841–1850					192,904	1.13					3,246,939	18.97	626,939	3.66
1801–1850					835,918	2.20					6,034,454	15.87	2,144,454	5.64
1851–1855					64,301	.20					1,724,338	5.37	285,338	.89
1856–1860					56,264	.17					1,796,776	5.53	250,776	.77
1851–1860					120,565	.19					3,521,114	5.45	536,114	.83
1861–1865					64,301	.22			[6]		1,109,860	3.74	271,674	.91
1866–1870					57,871	.18			144,087	0.46	1,316,728	4.19	265,244	.84
1861–1870			[6]		122,172	.20			144,087	.24	2,426,588	3.97	536,918	.88
1871			20,094		11,574				25,946		264,666		44,850	
1872			24,370		11,574				32,762		271,549		44,850	
1873			33,180		11,574				41,622		251,147		44,850	
1874			53,627		11,574				55,717		222,751		44,850	
1875			58,997		11,574				79,522		222,511		44,850	
1871–1875			190,268	0.67	57,870	.20			235,569	.83	1,232,624	4.34	224,250	.79
1851–1875	[6]		190,268	.12	300,607	.20			379,656	.25	7,180,326	4.67	1,297,282	.85
1876	965		54,881		8,681				86,550		258,072		61,202	
1877	5,691		52,020		8,681				101,024		292,774		57,871	
1878	7,909		55,203		8,681				88,125		337,426		58,643	
1879	13,214		70,056		8,681				78,158		399,123		51,377	
1880	21,863		60,186		8,681				110,052		366,105		52,952	
1876–1880	49,642	0.18	292,346	1.04	43,405	.15			463,909	1.65	1,653,500	5.87	282,045	1.00
1871–1880	49,642	.09	482,614	.85	101,275	.18			699,478	1.24	2,886,124	5.10	506,295	.90
1881	15,657		62,790		5,819				110,052		333,043		60,025	
1882	15,014		52,116		5,755				125,517		303,486		50,798	
1883	23,888		60,894		5,787				161,493		296,901		52,663	
1884	24,306		62,790		5,787		[6]		226,116		332,384		53,306	
1885	23,984		53,209		7,266		2,067		226,116		434,444		57,035	
1881–1885	102,849	.41	291,799	1.18	30,414	.12	2,067	0.01	849,294	3.42	1,700,258	6.85	273,827	1.10
1886	22,891		51,345		5,466		2,733		161,397		372,021		57,035	
1887	22,891		57,389		5,080		2,055		95,166		438,074		60,347	
1888	15,657		65,330		5,080		827		68,481		453,724		58,514	
1889	21,863		44,882		4,501		3,376		88,897		480,121		70,667	
1890	21,477		42,921		3,344		4,501		80,763		443,297		67,645	
1886–1890	104,779	.38	261,867	.95	23,471	.09	13,492	.05	494,704	1.79	2,187,237	7.93	314,208	1.14
1881–1890	207,628	.40	553,666	1.06	53,885	.10	15,559	.03	1,343,998	2.57	3,887,495	7.42	588,035	1.12
1891	26,235		48,290		3,537		6,848		48,387		482,783		167,709	
1892	34,530		48,288		3,531		6,850		38,995		532,987		72,659	
1893	34,240		56,715		3,531		6,850		38,995		536,161		81,047	
1894	31,482		126,026		3,599		745		43,997		492,243		87,423	
1895	25,426		90,263		3,086		1,316		43,997		541,795		96,218	
1891–1895	151,913	.39	369,582	.95	17,284	.04	22,609	.06	214,371	.55	2,585,969	6.62	405,056	1.04
1896	23,309		101,945		5,639		1,625		45,882		440,784		104,137	
1897	29,127		74,299		30,380		1,925		51,151		491,587		108,147	
1898	27,532		79,547		30,380		1,664		52,694		424,937		89,954	
1899	23,196		81,691		41,634		1,331		28,710		365,890		94,037	
1900	22,439		76,468		52,498		1,492		15,538		348,053		103,615	
1896–1900	125,603	.20	413,950	.66	160,531	.26	8,037	.01	193,975	.31	2,071,251	3.31	499,890	.80
1891–1900	277,516	.27	783,532	.77	177,815	.18	30,646	.03	408,346	.40	4,657,220	4.58	904,946	.89
1876–1900	534,786	.29	1,629,544	.89	275,105	.15	46,205	.03	2,216,253	1.22	10,198,215	5.60	1,775,026	.97
1851–1900	534,786	.16	1,819,812	.54	575,712	.17	46,205	.01	2,595,909	.77	17,378,541	5.17	3,072,308	.91
1801–1900	534,786	.14	1,819,812	.51	1,411,630	.38	46,205	.01	2,595,909	.69	23,412,995	6.26	5,216,762	1.39
1901	19,621		96,750		27,825		1,530		15,538		372,916		103,363	
1902	15,577		117,077		112,525		2,796		20,985		392,111		105,037	
1903	18,183		101,658		28,669		2,491		14,513		404,531		108,609	
1904	21,362		87,384		64,300		1,209		14,512		419,711		102,423	
1905	30,597		89,955		24,968		2,419		8,293		401,483		118,875	
1901–1905	105,340	.13	492,824	.63	258,287	.33	10,445	.01	73,841	.09	1,990,752	2.54	538,307	.69

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Dutch Guiana		French Guiana		Peru		Uruguay		Venezuela		Europe		Austria-Hungary [10]	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1906	33,338		89,923		40,102		1,535		1,223		399,878		126,519	
1907	30,961		114,202		24,890		2,510		1,032		466,504		120,209	
1908	32,071		103,307		24,890		4,433		1,184		593,652		119,454	
1909	30,041		103,708		24,890		4,433		13,576		501,986		93,946	
1910	38,344		107,835		22,055		4,433		16,472		563,126		105,101	
1906–1910	164,755	0.16	518,975	0.49	136,827	0.13	17,344	0.02	33,537	0.03	2,525,146	2.40	565,229	0.54
1901–1910	270,095	.15	1,011,799	.55	395,114	.21	27,789	.02	107,378	.06	4,515,898	2.46	1,103,536	.60
1911	25,320		107,835		23,813		3,422		17,648		475,604		105,705	
1912	19,702		147,571		23,813		5,369		30,162		407,425		98,840	
1913	22,757		147,571		23,813		1,444		21,517		457,447		105,425	
1914	24,351		94,805		49,445		739		29,644		314,344		9,711	
1915	21,723		94,805		53,691		573		67,500		371,408		67,360	
1911–1915	113,853	.10	592,587	.53	174,575	.16	11,547	.01	166,471	.15	2,026,228	1.81	387,041	.35
1916	21,198		77,400		61,310		581		61,431		287,713		48,375	
1917	21,527		69,587		60,667		484		30,810		211,652		7,256	
1918	18,851		57,741		57,645		484		22,891		151,045		8,708	
1919	15,932		53,212		65,232		484		29,025		143,363			
1920	12,506		43,538		62,757		21		18,839		52,544			
1916–1920	90,014	.10	301,478	.32	307,611	.32	2,054	.00	162,996	.17	846,317	.89	64,339	.07
1911–1920	203,867	.10	894,065	.43	482,186	.23	13,601	.01	329,467	.16	2,872,545	1.39	451,380	.22
1921	11,285		48,375		77,385		339		30,253		73,010		161	
1922	11,992		48,772		81,436		338		17,361		112,796		546	
1923	12,731		44,624		120,372		11		17,361		139,877		739	
1924	10,352		63,496		118,955		12		17,361		327,251		1,961	
1925	9,902		40,220		117,733				30,542		254,695		1,865	
1921–1925	56,262	.07	245,487	.28	515,881	.59	700	.00	112,878	.13	907,629	1.04	5,272	.01
1901–1925	530,224	.11	2,151,351	.45	1,393,181	.29	42,090	.01	549,723	.12	6,296,072	1.74	1,560,188	.33
1926	7,526	.04	45,235	.23	120,241	.63			30,542	.16	244,712	1.26	1,318	.01
1927	7,684	.04	48,354	.25	92,656	.48			39,366	.20	261,570	1.35	129	.00

Period	Czechoslovakia		France		Germany		Great Britain		Greece		Italy		Norway	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600														
1601–1700														
1701–1800														
1801–1810														
1811–1820														
1821–1820														
1831–1840														
1841–1850														
1801–1850														
1851–1855														
1856–1860														
1851–1860							[9]							
1861–1865							13,186	0.05						
1866–1870							3,484	.01						
1861–1870					[9]		16,670	.03						
1871					2,646									
1872					10,529									
1873					10,127									
1874					8,346		385							
1875					8,912		579							
1871–1875					40,560	0.14	964	.00						
1851–1875					40,560	.03	17,634	.01			[9]			
1876					6,015		293				5,144			
1877					9,902		143				3,504			
1878					10,063		702				3,504			
1879					12,474		447				3,504			
1880					11,253		10				3,504			
1876–1880					49,707	.17	1,595	.01			19,160	.07		
1871–1880					90,267	.16	2,559	.01			19,160	.03		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Czechoslovakia		France		Germany		Great Britain		Greece		Italy		Norway	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1881					11,253		4				3,504			
1882					12,089		226				3,504			
1883					14,693		66				9,967			
1884					17,844						6,269			
1885					44,304		3				6,269			
1881–1885					100,183	0.40	299	0.00			29,513	0.12		
1886					34,241						6,269			
1887					72,371		64				6,269			
1888			(6)		57,614		7,073				4,758			
1889			12,860		62,951		3,119				4,823			
1890			5,948		59,640		129				6,784			
1886–1890			18,808	0.07	286,817	1.04	10,385	.04			28,903	.10		
1881–1890			18,808	.04	387,000	.74	10,684	.02			58,416	.11		
1891			6,559		75,844		3,247				4,565			
1892			6,274		100,987		2,477				4,421			
1893			8,964		74,106		2,046				5,660			
1894					103,566		3,183				5,660			
1895					107,542		5,176				6,063			
1891–1895			21,797	.06	462,045	1.18	16,129	.04			26,369	.07		
1896					55,104		1,188				6,782			
1897					66,424		1,698				9,404			
1898					3,561		321				8,027		32	
1899			64		3,589		2,844				3,633		484	
1900			32		3,192		13,360				1,704		129	
1896–1900			96	.00	131,870	.21	19,411	.03			29,550	.05	645	.00
1891–1900			21,893	.02	593,915	.58	33,540	.03			55,919	.06	645	.00
1876–1900			40,701	.02	1,030,622	.57	47,819	.03			133,495	.07	645	.00
1851–1900			40,701	.01	1,071,182	.32	65,453	.02			133,495	.04	645	.00
1801–1900			40,701	.01	1,071,182	.29	65,453	.02			133,495	.04	645	.00
1901					2,893		5,626				257		129	
1902					3,023		3,737				257		97	
1903			225		3,412		4,547				1,291		129	
1904					3,130		17,405				2,128		354	
1905			7,813		3,227		5,450				2,128			
1901–1905			8,038	.01	15,685	.02	36,765	.05			6,061	.01	709	.00
1906			24,305		3,890		1,414				1,993			
1907			40,413		3,220		1,414				1,914			
1908			55,505		3,134		772				2,251			
1909			67,754		3,348		1,041				1,168			
1910			82,580		3,042		1,914				1,430		66	
1906–1910			270,557	.26	16,634	.02	6,555	.01			8,756	.01	66	.00
1901–1910			278,595	.15	32,319	.02	43,320	.02			14,817	.01	775	.00
1911			87,659		3,779		1,914				2,165			
1912			87,659		3,779		1,344				534			
1913			102,912		6,558		864				832			
1914			67,725		5,000		979				1,555			
1915			67,725		5,000		932				111			
1911–1915			413,680	.37	24,116	.02	6,033	.01			5,197	.00		
1916			48,375		5,000		276				97			
1917			33,862		4,774		242				34			
1918			24,187		6,247				316		1,103			
1919	6,076		7,298		3,890				225		739			
1920	8,761		900		4,437		32		514		725			
1916–1920	14,837	0.02	114,622	.12	24,348	.03	550	.00	1,055	0.00	2,698	.00		
1911–1920	14,837	.01	528,302	.26	48,464	.02	6,583	.00	1,055	.00	7,895	.00		
1921	11,413		96		4,180				482		77			
1922	8,294		16,075		5,433				418		720			
1923	3,344		16,943		6,430				418		1,221			
1924	9,002		19,804		6,430				386		1,543			
1925	7,587		33,950		5,851						1,929			
1921–1925	39,640	.05	86,868	.10	28,324	.03			1,704	.00	5,490	.01		
1901–1925	54,477	.01	893,765	.19	109,107	.02	49,903	.01	2,759	.00	28,202	.01	775	.00
1926	7,716	.04	42,010	.22	5,208	.03					1,704	.01		
1927	7,500	.04	45,010	.23	5,000	.03			482	.00	2,154	.01		

See footpotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Portugal		Rumania		Russia (European)[4]		Serbia		Spain		Sweden		Turkey		Yugoslavia	
	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent
1493–1600																
1601–1700					[5]											
1701–1800					85,000	0.14										
1801–1810					19,000	.32										
1811–1820					37,000	.97										
1821–1830					393,000	8.39										
1831–1840					821,000	12.50										
1841–1850					2,620,000	15.31										
1801–1850					3,890,000	10.23										
1851–1855					1,439,000	4.48										
1856–1860					1,546,000	4.76										
1851–1860					2,985,000	4.62										
1861–1865					825,000	2.78										
1866–1870					1,048,000	3.34										
1861–1870					1,873,000	3.06					[5]					
1871					217,000						170					
1872					216,000						170					
1873					196,000						170					
1874					169,000						170					
1875					168,000						170					
1871–1875					966,000	3.41					850	0.00				
1851–1875					5,824,000	3.78					850	.00				
1876					185,000						193		225			
1877					221,000						129		225			
1878					264,000						289		225			
1879					331,000						96		225			
1880					298,000						161		225			
1876–1880					1,299,000	4.62					868	.00	1,125	0.00		
1871–1880					2,265,000	4.00					1,718	.00	1,125	.00		
1881					258,000						32		225			
1882					236,000						547		322			
1883					218,000						1,190		322			
1884					254,000						643		322			
1885					325,000						1,511		322			
1881–1885					1,291,000	5.20					3,923	.02	1,513	.01		
1886					272,000						2,154		322			
1887					296,000						2,701		322			
1888					323,000						2,443		322			
1889					3.3,000						2,379		322			
1890					300,000						2,829		322			
1886–1890					1,514,000	5.48					12,506	.05	1,610	.01		
1881–1890					2,805,000	5.35					16,429	.03	3,123	.01		
1891					321,000						3,537		322			
1892					343,000						2,830		339			
1893					361,000						2,999		339			
1894					289,000						3,024		387			
1895					324,000						2,540		256			
1891–1895	[5]				1,638,000	4.19	[5]				14,930	.04	1,643	.00		
1896	896				268,000		643				3,681		353			
1897	501				300,000		643				4,083		687			
1898	227				318,000		[5]		96		4,044		675			
1899	54				257,000		[5]		96		3,414		675			
1900	83				222,000		[5]		418		2,845		675			
1896–1900	1,761	0.00			1,365,000	2.18	1,286	0.00	610	0.00	18,067	.03	3,065	.01		
1891–1900	1,761	.00			3,003,000	2.97	1,286	.00	610	.00	32,997	.03	4,708	.00		
1876–1900	1,761	.00			7,107,000	3.90	1,286	.00	610	.00	50,294	.03	8,956	.01		
1851–1900	1,761	.00			12,931,000	3.85	1,286	.00	610	.00	51,144	.02	8,956	.00		
1801–1900	1,761	.00			16,821,000	4.50	1,286	.00	610	.00	51,144	.01	8,956	.00		
1901	63				256,000		965		418		2,017		1,185			
1902	63				274,000		900		494		3,023		1,480			
1903	63				283,000		354		262		1,640		999			
1904	193				288,000		2,733				1,945		1,400			
1905	129				259,000		2,797				1,775		289			
1901–1905	511	.00			1,360,000	1.73	7,749	.01	1,174	.00	10,400	.01	5,353	.01		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Portugal		Rumania		Russia (European)		Serbia		Spain		Sweden		Turkey		Yugoslavia	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1906	932				237,000		2,893				643		289			
1907	322				295,000		2,893				903		216			
1908	1,833				407,000		2,893				702		108			
1909	802				326,000		7,273		140		491		23			
1910	133				359,000		9,742				95		23			
1906–1910	4,022	0.00			1,624,000	1.54	25,694	0.02	140	0.00	2,834	0.00	659	0.00		
1901–1910	4,533	.00			2,984,000	1.63	33,443	.02	1,314	.00	13,234	.01	6,012	.00		
1911	115				260,000		14,149				95		23			
1912	113				202,000		12,149				984		23			
1913	113				224,000		15,867				853		23			
1914	113				221,000		5,611				2,627		23			
1915	32				229,000						1,225		23			
1911–1915	486	.00			1,136,000	1.01	47,776	.04			5,784	.01	115	.00		
1916					185,000						590					
1917					165,000						484					
1918					110,000						484					
1919			23,551		101,102						482					
1920			22,730		11,000				5		225				3,215	
1916–1920			46,281	.05	572,102	.60			5	.00	2,265	.00			3,215	0.00
1911–1920	486	.00	46,281	.02	1,708,102	.84	47,776	.02	5	.00	8,049	.00	115	.00	3,215	.00
1921			41,409		11,000				141		64				3,987	
1922			42,984		29,000				904		32		1,446		6,944	
1923			48,225		54,000				904		67		1,446		6,140	
1924			42,149		236,000				967		265		932		7,812	
1925			40,027		154,000				967				932		7,587	
1921–1925			214,794	.24	484,000	.55			3,883	.00	428	.00	4,756	.01	32,470	.04
1901–1925	5,019	.00	261,075	.05	5,176,102	1.09	81,219	.02	5,202	.00	21,711	.00	10,883	.00	35,685	.01
1926			55,652	.29	104,000	.53			967	.00	14,789	.08	964	.00	10,384	.05
1927			66,165	.34	106,000	.56			967	.00	14,789	.08	964	.00	12,410	.06

Period	Asia		British India		China		Chosen		British East Indies		Dutch East Indies		Indochina		Japan	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600																
1601–1700																
1701–1800	85,399	0.14														
1801–1810	34,049	.58														
1811–1820	64,275	1.68														
1821–1830	692,086	14.77														
1831–1840	1,445,627	22.01														
1841–1850	4,618,740	26.98														
1801–1850	6,854,777	18.02														
1851–1855	2,536,439	7.90														
1856–1860	2,725,226	8.39														
1851–1860	5,261,665	8.15														
1861–1865	3,046,592	10.26														
1866–1870	3,782,649	12.05														
1861–1870	6,829,241	11.18														
1871	1,046,910															
1872	999,587															
1873	870,408															
1874	899,080															
1875	883,233															
1871–1875	4,699,218	16.55														
1851–1875	16,790,124	10.90													(6)	
1876	903,421														7,159	
1877	1,108,979														12,860	
1878	1,104,721														14,307	
1879	1,072,766														22,570	
1880	1,105,766														22,570	
1876–1880	5,295,653	18.79													79,466	0.28
1871–1880	9,994,871	17.67													79,466	.14

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Asia		British India		China		Chosen		British East Indies		Dutch East Indies		Indochina		Japan	
	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent
1881	943,570		(6)												22,570	
1882	949,628		390		(6)										30,608	
1883	997,020		750		259,039										9,356	
1884	1,115,824		1,135		300,995										9,517	
1885	1,140,753		6,527		224,959										8,520	
1881–1885	5,146,795	20.74	8,802	0.04	784,993	3.16	(6)				(6)				80,571	0.32
1886	993,293		20,384		176,572		55,171				4,790				15,518	
1887	1,242,028		15,465		459,563		67,163				5,723				18,133	
1888	1,265,922		32,729		435,385		66,456				4,373				19,483	
1889	1,414,137		72,693		435,385		47,519								25,078	
1890	1,252,302		96,742		257,945		36,266				1,993				24,563	
1886–1890	6,167,682	22.37	238,013	.86	1,764,850	6.40	272,575	0.99			16,879	0.06			103,075	.37
1881–1890	11,314,477	21.60	246,815	.47	2,549,843	4.87	272,575	.52			16,879	.03			183,646	.35
1891	1,344,858		120,694		321,797		26,878				3,022				24,595	
1892	1,482,366		160,523		407,608		29,330				3,151				24,754	
1893	1,558,376		184,483		333,444		28,440		(6)		4,373				23,414	
1894	1,543,591		187,835		413,937		22,600		13,471		3,601				23,694	
1895	1,546,858		225,244		170,328		33,824		15,111		3,569				25,015	
1891–1895	7,476,049	19.13	878,779	2.25	1,647,114	4.21	141,072	.36	28,582	0.07	17,716	.05			121,472	.31
1896	1,549,565		296,565		389,836		34,915		21,217		2,311				30,927	
1897	1,593,130		350,585		296,463		49,350		33,206		5,630				33,385	
1898	1,678,814		376,431		260,871		56,511		25,625		5,689				37,336	
1899	1,648,842		418,869		269,662		70,579		20,562		5,689				45,653	
1900	1,803,227		456,444		269,662		217,687		27,643		21,043				58,127	
1896–1900	8,273,578	13.23	1,898,894	3.04	1,486,494	2.38	429,042	.69	128,253	.20	40,362	.06			205,428	.33
1891–1900	15,749,627	15.50	2,777,673	2.73	3,133,608	3.09	570,114	.56	156,835	.15	58,078	.06			326,900	.32
1876–1900	32,359,757	17.76	3,024,488	1.66	5,683,451	3.12	842,689	.47	156,835	.09	74,957	.04			590,012	.32
1851–1900	49,149,881	14.62	3,024,488	.90	5,683,451	1.68	842,689	.25	156,835	.05	74,957	.02			590,012	.18
1801–1900	56,004,658	14.96	3,024,488	.81	5,683,451	1.52	842,689	.22	156,835	.04	74,957	.02			590,012	.16
1901	2,012,782		454,527		439,801		145,125		41,685		24,042				58,127	
1902	2,055,289		463,824		422,401		145,125		49,686		22,930				95,597	
1903	2,276,233		552,873		354,334		145,125		65,055		68,189				139,861	
1904	2,166,792		567,094		217,688		145,125		71,851		68,427		(6)		142,634	
1905	2,079,511		578,089		217,688		125,436		67,299		68,426		2,122		148,625	
1901–1905	10,590,607	13.49	2,616,407	3.33	1,651,912	2.10	705,936	.90	295,576	.38	252,014	.32	2,122	0.00	584,844	.74
1906	1,936,854		584,744		217,688		110,438		70,079		60,706		1,415		132,979	
1907	2,186,165		502,307		217,688		105,013		75,525		100,614		1,540		134,146	
1908	2,443,332		512,702		418,312		147,423		67,770		125,596		3,174		160,680	
1909	2,720,430		501,097		452,406		96,440		69,510		103,832		3,174		174,966	
1910	2,759,116		518,502		176,960		212,808		69,988		163,852		2,655		188,839	
1906–1910	12,045,897	11.44	2,619,352	2.49	1,483,054	1.41	672,122	.64	352,872	.34	554,600	.53	11,958	.01	791,610	.75
1901–1910	22,636,504	12.32	5,235,749	2.85	3,134,966	1.71	1,378,058	.75	648,448	.35	806,614	.44	14,080	.01	1,376,454	.75
1911	2,630,186		534,744		160,344		139,774		64,791		163,852		3,600		199,239	
1912	2,249,101		534,822		176,999		137,993		65,402		163,852		3,600		216,092	
1913	2,495,475		589,109		176,999		173,306		79,063		163,852		3,600		174,846	
1914	2,608,042		550,432		176,999		160,115		75,020		154,761		3,213		226,364	
1915	2,467,157		557,399		135,677		180,897		60,005		106,963		2,112		260,551	
1911–1915	12,449,961	11.17	2,766,506	2.48	827,018	.74	792,085	.71	344,281	.31	753,280	.68	16,125	.01	1,077,092	.97
1916	2,352,700		542,115		149,996		199,421		56,862		125,160		3,173		250,854	
1917	2,071,363		523,069		174,155		162,724		55,988		98,622		2,419		226,380	
1918	1,768,894		485,236		174,150		159,637		53,864		88,836		2,419		246,998	
1919	1,691,916		507,260		159,637		135,450		69,419		92,592		1,835		233,405	
1920	1,219,041		499,068		125,000		76,000		58,231		90,920		160		248,181	
1916–1920	9,103,914	9.59	2,556,748	2.69	782,938	.83	733,232	.77	294,364	.31	496,130	.52	10,006	.01	1,205,818	1.27
1911–1920	21,553,875	10.44	5,323,254	2.58	1,609,956	.78	1,525,317	.74	638,645	.31	1,249,410	.61	26,131	.01	2,282,910	1.11
1921	1,171,052		432,723		100,000		130,893		54,665		94,168		160		237,106	
1922	1,267,457		438,015		100,000		127,892		45,127		104,294		4,822		233,809	
1923	1,341,688		422,307		89,500		121,433		39,225		115,547		6,205		247,276	
1924	1,857,635		396,349		107,300		134,128		40,005		124,388		349		244,500	
1925	2,071,594		393,807		107,300		146,825		39,043		132,715		349		317,231	
1921–1925	7,709,426	8.83	2,083,201	2.38	504,100	.58	661,177	.76	218,065	.25	571,112	.65	11,885	.01	1,279,922	1.47
1901–1925	51,899,805	10.87	12,642,214	2.65	5,249,022	1.10	3,564,546	.75	1,505,158	.32	2,627,136	.55	52,096	.01	4,939,286	1.03
1926	2,130,627	11.01	383,970	1.98	110,000	.57	190,620	.99	34,068	.18	115,354	.60	321	.00	307,862	1.59
1927	2,169,223	11.18	384,268	1.98	100,000	.52	190,000	.98	30,299	.16	113,071	.58	321	.00	308,000	1.59

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Philippine Islands		Asiatic Russia [9]		Taiwan		Siam		Africa		Ethiopia (Abyssinia)		Belgian Congo		British West Africa [4]	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493-1600									8,153,428	35.50						
1601-1700			(6)						6,430,148	22.29						
1701-1800			85,399	0.14					5,465,626	8.93						
1801-1810			34,049	.58					385,809	6.60						
1811-1820			64,275	1.68					385,809	10.12						
1821-1830			692,086	14.77					385,809	8.23						
1831-1840			1,445,627	22.01					385,809	5.87						
1841-1850			4,618,740	26.98					482,261	2.82						
1801-1850			6,854,777	18.02					2,025,497	5.33						
1851-1855			2,536,439	7.90					241,131	.75						
1856-1860			2,725,226	8.39					241,131	.84						
1851-1860			5,261,665	8.15					482,262	.75						
1861-1865			3,046,592	10.26					241,131	.81					(6)	
1866-1870			3,782,649	12.05					241,131	.76					141,588	0.45
1861-1870			6,829,241	11.18					[7] 482,262	.79					[7] 141,588	.23
1871			1,046,910						96,452						32,312	
1872			999,587						96,452						25,616	
1873			870,408						96,452						18,241	
1874			899,080						96,452						32,062	
1875			883,233						96,452						27,605	
1871-1875			4,699,218	16.55					482,260	1.70					135,836	.48
1851-1875			16,790,124	10.90					[7] 1,446,784	.94					[7] 277,424	.18
1876			896,262						96,452						34,238	
1877			1,096,119						96,452						28,363	
1878			1,090,414						96,452						28,823	
1879			1,050,196						96,452						27,098	
1880			1,083,196						96,452						29,642	
1876-1880			5,216,187	18.51					482,260	1.71					148,164	.53
1871-1880			9,915,405	17.53					964,520	1.70					284,000	.50
1881			921,000						96,452						22,610	
1882			918,630						96,452						26,066	
1883			727,875						103,236						14,565	
1884			804,177						40,188						18,385	
1885			900,747						66,970						24,994	
1881-1885			4,272,429	17.22					403,298	1.63					106,620	.43
1886			720,558						69,542						20,799	
1887			675,981						92,851						22,546	
1888			707,496						258,779						24,030	
1889			833,462						400,491						40,841	
1890			834,793						482,957						34,138	
1886-1890			3,772,290	13.69					1,304,620	4.73					142,354	.52
1881-1890			8,044,719	15.36					1,707,918	3.26					248,974	.48
1891			847,872						738,398						41,444	
1892			857,000						1,126,459						48,951	
1893			984,222						1,320,695						21,972	
1894			878,453						1,850,711						21,472	
1895			1,073,767						2,051,627						25,415	
1891-1895			4,641,314	11.88					7,087,890	18.14					159,254	.41
1896			773,794						2,068,227						23,940	
1897			824,511				(6)		2,809,660						23,555	
1898			913,940				2,411		3,916,714		(6)				17,733	
1899			815,417				2,411		3,765,657		31,154				14,250	
1900			752,621						525,149		31,154				12,024	
1896-1900			4,080,283	6.52			4,822	0.01	13,085,407	20.93	62,308	0.10			91,502	.15
1891-1900			8,721,597	8.59			4,822	.00	20,173,297	19.85	62,308	.06			250,756	.25
1876-1900			21,982,503	12.06			4,822	.00	22,363,475	12.28	62,308	.03			647,894	.36
1851-1900			38,772,627	11.54			4,822	.00	[7] 23,810,259	7.08	(7)				(7)	
1801-1900			45,627,404	12.19			4,822	.00	[7] 25,835,756	6.90	(7)				(7)	
1901			849,475		(6)				505,310		31,154				5,208	
1902			816,116		39,610				1,986,947		31,154				22,795	
1903			908,678		39,610		2,508		3,328,360		31,154		140		59,961	
1904			911,857		39,610		2,506		4,211,031		32,408		129		90,987	
1905			819,384		50,091		2,351		5,507,378		3,665		4,501		153,906	
1901-1905			4,305,510	5.49	168,921	0.22	7,365	.01	15,539,026	19.79	129,535	.16	4,770	0.01	332,857	.42

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Philippine Islands		Asiatic Russia		Taiwan		Siam		Africa		Ethiopia (Abyssinia)		Belgian Congo		British West Africa [2]	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1906	(6)		706,142		50,091		2,572		6,558,317		3,665		8,006		210,041	
1907	3,130		995,854		42,310		8,038		7,372,189		3,665		15,789		273,898	
1908	13,763		950,027		28,035		15,850		8,064,717		514		6,623		281,257	
1909	11,978		1,240,443		50,734		15,850		8,330,213		514		21,252		230,494	
1910	7,471		1,362,163		53,145		2,733		8,517,059		21,187		23,695		183,691	
1906–1910	36,342	0.03	5,254,629	4.99	224,315	0.21	45,043	0.04	38,842,495	36.88	29,545	0.03	74,365	0.07	1,179,381	1.12
1901–1910	36,342	.02	9,560,139	5.20	393,236	.21	52,408	.03	54,381,521	29.59	159,080	.09	79,135	.04	1,512,238	.82
1911	9,448		1,295,333		56,328		2,733		9,308,563		11,703		29,354		253,977	
1912	22,331		871,875		53,402		2,733		10,286,432		11,703		26,685		352,461	
1913	34,204		1,058,357		39,406		2,733		10,054,966		24,052		44,334		384,836	
1914	53,179		1,161,867		46,092		(6)		9,815,326		(6)		49,787		406,576	
1915	63,898		1,044,362		55,293				10,577,174		(6)		49,787		401,733	
1911–1915	183,000	.16	5,431,794	4.88	250,521	.22	8,199	.01	50,042,461	44.90	47,458	.04	199,947	.18	1,799,583	1.61
1916	73,249		903,437		48,433		(6)		10,808,137		(6)		112,012		380,232	
1917	69,953		705,750		52,303		(6)		10,369,796		(6)		102,734		368,168	
1918	62,404		470,500		24,850		(6)		9,537,354		9,675		117,733		314,860	
1919	41,119		431,013		20,186		(6)		9,324,676		17,284		108,442		225,226	
1920	61,756		46,225		13,500		(6)		9,264,540		14,104		96,804		230,948	
1916–1920	308,481	.33	2,556,925	2.69	159,272	.17			49,304,503	51.96	41,063	.04	537,725	.57	1,519,434	1.60
1911–1920	491,541	.24	7,988,719	3.86	409,793	.20	8,199	.00	99,346,964	48.14	88,521	.04	737,672	.36	3,319,017	1.61
1921	60,705		32,177		28,455		(6)		9,072,549		30,000		65,715		203,606	
1922	73,840		117,700		21,958		(6)		8,033,879		20,000		68,351		213,395	
1923	81,564		196,673		21,958		(6)		10,167,967		20,000		91,306		200,565	
1924	79,893		722,070		8,653		(6)		10,624,361		20,000		118,119		223,910	
1925	94,135		831,154		9,035		(6)		10,582,495		20,000		122,781		199,697	
1921–1925	390,137	.45	1,899,774	2.18	90,059	.10			48,481,251	55.51	110,000	.13	466,272	.53	1,051,173	1.20
1901–1925	918,020	.19	19,448,632	4.07	893,088	.19	60,607	.01	202,209,736	42.34	357,601	.08	1,283,079	.27	5,882,428	1.23
1926	91,242	.47	888,155	4.58	9,035	.05	(6)		10,960,833	56.65	20,000	.10	132,201	.68	199,666	1.03
1927	79,314	.41	954,950	4.91	9,000	.05	(6)		11,071,619	57.07	21,605	.11	125,417	.65	171,607	.88

Period	Egypt		French West Africa [3]		German East Africa		Madagascar		Portuguese East Africa		Rhodesia		Sudan		Tanganyika	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600																
1601–1700																
1701–1800																
1801–1810																
1811–1820																
1821–1830																
1831–1840																
1841–1850																
1801–1850																
1851–1855																
1856–1860																
1851–1860																
1861–1865																
1866–1870																
1861–1870																
1871																
1872																
1873																
1874																
1875																
1871–1875																
1851–1875																
1876																
1877																
1878																
1879																
1880																
1876–1880																
1871–1880																

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Egypt		French West Africa [3]		German East Africa		Madagascar		Portuguese East Africa		Rhodesia		Sudan		Tanganyika	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1881																
1882																
1883																
1884																
1885																
1881–1885																
1886																
1887																
1888							[6]									
1889							8,391									
1890							8,391									
1886–1890							16,782	0.06								
1881–1890							16,782	.03								
1891							8,391									
1892							8,391									
1893							8,391									
1894							23,341									
1895							8,391									
1891–1895			[6]				56,905	.15								
1896			9,183				8,391				[6]					
1897			4,950				19,322				18,085					
1898			6,848				3,150				65,472					
1899			6,000				11,050		[6]		65,298					
1900			6,334				33,468		1,318		91,951					
1896–1900			33,315	0.05			75,381	.12	1,318	0.00	240,806	0.39				
1891–1900			33,315	.03			132,286	.13	1,318	.00	240,806	.24				
1876–1900			33,315	.02			149,068	.08	1,318	.00	240,806	.13				
1851–1900			[7]				[7]		[7]		[7]					
1801–1900			[7]				[7]		[7]		[7]					
1901	[6]		6,334				30,800		1,500		172,071					
1902	2,705		4,758				38,838		1,993		165,705					
1903	3,482		5,505				55,139		2,000		198,081					
1904	5,750		5,433		129		72,436		2,000		228,206					
1905	10,138		6,382		129		67,517		2,139		349,254					
1901–1905	22,075	0.03	28,412	.04	258	0.00	264,730	.34	9,632	.01	1,113,317	1.42				
1906	5,216		6,302		386		62,147		2,283		467,086					
1907	4,916		4,180		386		82,306		2,560		525,343					
1908	1,843		4,276		225		101,243		3,440		596,428		[6]			
1909	2,900		6,044		2,829		118,861		3,858		624,303		4,501			
1910	4,452		418		9,902		104,008		6,302		609,964		4,147			
1906–1910	19,327	.02	21,220	.02	13,728	.01	468,565	.45	18,443	.02	2,823,124	2.68	8,648	0.01		
1901–1910	41,402	.02	49,632	.03	13,986	.01	733,295	.40	28,075	.02	3,936,441	2.14	8,648	.00		
1911	5,068		1,768		12,057		91,630		2,990		628,521		[6]			
1912	4,958		2,540		6,237		68,160		2,411		688,226		[6]			
1913	4,602		2,979		12,249		60,769		5,699		690,541		14,868			
1914	6,136		2,100				56,553		15,263		854,481		19,156			
1915	7,010		2,100				66,823		12,922		915,029		19,167			
1911–1915	27,774	.02	11,487	.01	30,543	.03	343,935	.31	39,285	.04	3,776,798	3.39	53,191	.05		
1916	6,289		1,514				46,682		11,218		930,358		18,351			
1917	3,183		1,500				26,742		12,026		834,232					
1918	2,856		1,500				23,887		11,997		631,358		3,666			
1919	1,948		3,990				22,505		9,675		593,446		7,883			
1920	128		4,838				16,686		7,256		553,067		3,569			
1916–1920	14,404	.02	13,342	.01			136,502	.14	52,172	.06	3,542,461	3.73	33,469	.04		
1911–1920	42,178	.02	24,829	.01	30,543	.01	480,437	.23	91,457	.04	7,319,259	3.55	86,660	.04		
1921			8,584				14,660		6,015		586,908		4,157		321	
1922	225		11,188				18,582		11,734		655,296		8,126		376	
1923	482		17,489				16,686		10,513		649,082		8,318		1,326	
1924	934		13,117				10,802		5,321		628,974		8,088		7,863	
1925	354		9,774				13,503		12,292		582,754		8,466		8,898	
1921–1925	1,995	.00	60,152	.07			74,233	.08	45,875	.05	3,103,014	3.55	37,155	.04	18,784	0.02
1901–1925	85,575	.02	134,613	.03	44,529	.01	1,287,965	.27	165,407	.03	14,358,714	3.01	132,463	.03	18,784	.00
1926	643	.00	9,966	.05			9,870	.05	9,127	.05	594,208	3.07	8,714	.05	7,202	.04
1927	64	.00	6,848	.04			10,352	.05	9,521	.05	581,788	3.00	7,166	.04	8,179	.04

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	British South Africa [4]		Transvaal		Union of South Africa [5]		Other Africa		Australasia		New Zealand		Australia		Various	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600															1,080,264	4.70
1601–1700															160,756	.56
1701–1800															160,755	.26
1801–1810															16,075	.27
1811–1820															16,076	.42
1821–1830															32,151	.69
1831–1840															48,226	.74
1841–1850															385,809	2.25
1801–1850															498,337	1.31
1851–1855									11,225,383	34.98			11,225,383	34.98	562,638	1.75
1856–1860									13,293,602	40.95	32,977	0.10	13,260,625	40.85	422,976	1.30
1851–1860									24,518,985	37.97	32,977	.05	24,486,008	37.92	985,614	1.53
1861–1865									12,205,436	41.09	2,105,041	7.09	10,100,395	34.00		
1866–1870							99,543	0.31	11,658,330	37.13	2,961,404	9.43	8,696,926	27.70		
1861–1870	(6)						[7] 99,543	.16	23,863,766	39.06	5,066,445	8.29	18,797,321	30.77		
1871	10						64,130		2,406,235		671,627		1,734,608			
1872	14						70,822		2,220,451		409,740		1,810,711			
1873	920						77,291		2,073,790		464,910		1,608,880			
1874	14,838						49,552		1,992,814		346,277		1,646,537			
1875	11,806						57,041		1,929,179		326,896		1,602,283			
1871–1875	27,588	0.10					318,836	1.12	10,622,469	37.41	2,219,450	7.82	8,403,019	29.59		
1851–1875	[7] 27,588	.02					[7] 418,379	.27	59,005,220	38.29	7,318,872	4.75	51,686,348	33.54	985,614	.64
1876	13,536						48,678		1,730,996		296,255		1,434,741			
1877	3,238						64,851		1,647,298		341,950		1,305,348			
1878	2,273						65,356		1,411,677		285,647		1,126,030			
1879	1,546						67,808		1,397,500		264,467		1,133,033			
1880	11,984						54,826		1,459,069		280,828		1,178,241			
1876–1880	32,577	.11					301,519	1.07	7,646,540	27.13	1,469,147	5.21	6,177,393	21.92		
1871–1880	60,165	.11					620,355	1.09	18,269,009	32.30	3,688,597	6.52	14,580,412	25.78		
1881	1,875						71,967		1,470,325		248,916		1,221,409			
1882	3,599						66,787		1,422,289		231,108		1,191,181			
1883	21,215		(6)				67,456		1,313,513		228,504		1,085,009			
1884	5,491		2,376				13,936		1,368,371		211,550		1,156,821			
1885	24,860		1,414				15,702		1,327,478		218,381		1,109,097			
1881–1885	57,040	.23	3,790	0.02			235,848	.95	6,901,976	27.81	1,138,459	4.59	5,763,517	23.22		
1886	24,083		8,171				16,489		1,278,346		208,913		1,069,433			
1887	15,764		39,880				14,661		1,322,006		187,559		1,134,447			
1888	7,000		227,749						1,381,646		185,121		1,196,525			
1889	350		350,909						1,600,593		186,954		1,413,639			
1890	276		440,152						1,441,993		177,738		1,264,255			
1886–1890	47,473	.17	1,066,861	3.87			31,150	.11	7,024,584	25.48	946,285	3.43	6,078,299	22.05		
1881–1890	104,513	.20	1,070,651	2.04			266,998	.51	13,926,560	26.58	2,084,744	3.98	11,841,816	22.60		
1891	124		688,439						1,518,962		251,996		1,266,966			
1892	59		1,069,058						1,652,442		238,079		1,414,363			
1893	114		1,290,218						1,726,436		226,811		1,499,625			
1894	898		1,805,000						2,020,179		199,380		1,820,799			
1895	378		2,017,443						2,167,118		264,142		1,902,976			
1891–1895	1,573	.00	6,870,158	17.58					9,085,137	23.25	1,180,408	3.02	7,904,729	20.23		
1896	1,203		2,025,510						2,117,673		237,350		1,880,323			
1897	230		2,743,518						2,547,704		230,782		2,316,922			
1898	144		3,823,367						3,137,644		254,416		2,883,228			
1899	192		3,637,713						3,837,181		356,222		3,480,959			
1900	139		348,761						3,555,506		339,395		3,216,111			
1896–1900	1,908	.00	12,578,869	20.12					15,195,708	24.30	1,418,165	2.27	13,777,543	22.03		
1891–1900	3,481	.00	19,449,027	19.14					24,280,845	23.90	2,598,573	2.56	21,682,272	21.34		
1876–1900	140,571	.08	20,519,678	11.27			568,517	.31	45,853,945	25.17	6,152,454	3.38	39,701,481	21.79		
1851–1900	(7)		(7)				(7)		104,859,165	31.19	13,471,336	4.01	91,387,829	27.18	985,614	.29
1801–1900	(7)		(7)				(7)		104,859,165	28.02	13,471,336	3.60	91,387,829	24.42	1,483,951	.40
1901					258,243				3,719,080		412,875		3,306,205			
1902					1,718,999				3,946,374		458,933		3,487,441			
1903					2,972,898				4,315,538		479,489		3,836,049			
1904					3,773,553				4,245,744		467,691		3,777,853			
1905					4,909,747				4,156,692		492,954		3,663,738			
1901–1905					13,633,440	17.36			20,383,428	25.96	2,312,142	2.94	18,071,286	23.02		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	British South Africa [4]		Transvaal		Union of South Africa [5]		Other Africa		Australasia		New Zealand		Australia		Various	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1906					5,793,185				3,985,684		534,603		3,451,081			
1907					6,460,146				3,660,911		477,310		3,183,601			
1908					7,068,868				3,547,210		471,973		3,075,237			
1909					7,314,657				3,435,007		473,455		2,962,552			
1910					7,549,293				3,167,140		446,445		2,720,695			
1906–1910					34,186,149	32.45			17,795,952	16.90	2,402,786	2.28	15,393,166	14.62		
1901–1910					47,819,589	26.02			38,179,380	20.77	4,714,928	2.57	33,464,452	18.20		
1911					8,271,495				2,911,410		427,379		2,484,031			
1912					9,123,051				2,636,894		310,962		2,325,932			
1913					8,810,037				2,569,311		343,595		2,225,716			
1914					8,405,274				2,301,152		227,954		2,073,198			
1915					9,102,603				2,369,800		422,825		1,946,975			
1911–1915					43,712,460	39.22			12,788,567	11.47	1,732,715	1.55	11,055,852	9.92		
1916					9,301,481				1,958,017		282,317		1,675,700			
1917					9,021,211				1,664,011		199,803		1,464,208			
1918					8,419,822				1,490,554		208,654		1,281,900			
1919					8,333,698		579		1,301,844		222,063		1,079,781			
1920					8,336,561		579		1,095,778		124,375		971,403			
1916–1920					43,412,773	45.75	1,158	.00	7,510,204	7.91	1,037,212	1.09	6,472,992	6.82		
1911–1920					87,125,233	42.23	1,158	.00	20,298,771	9.84	2,769,927	1.34	17,528,844	8.50		
1921					8,133,583		19,000		903,291		135,720		767,571			
1922					7,026,542		64		911,732		144,117		767,615			
1923					9,152,200				889,256		164,408		724,848			
1924					9,577,233				799,966		122,341		677,625			
1925					9,603,197		779		675,400		111,202		564,198			
1921–1925					43,492,755	49.82	19,843	.02	4,179,645	4.79	677,788	.78	3,501,857	4.01		
1901–1925					178,437,577	37.36	21,001	.00	62,657,796	13.12	8,162,643	1.71	54,495,153	11.41		
1926					9,968,457	51.53	779	.00	652,171	3.37	125,777	.65	526,394	2.72		
1927					10,127,433	52.20	1,639	.01	644,023	3.32	129,519	.67	514,504	2.65		

[1] Does not include the Philippine Islands or Puerto Rico. Philippine Islands is shown under Asia. Puerto Rico is included in West Indies.
[2] Includes Ashanti (Gold Coast) and Nigeria.
[3] Includes Senegal, French Guinea, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, and French Sudan.
[4] Cape Colony and Natal.
[5] Includes Bechuanaland and Swaziland.
[6] Previous production data not available.
[7] Africa's total for this period contains some undistributed production.
[8] No data available.
[9] Segregation of Russian production into European and Asiatic was estimated by the author from the best sources available.
[10] Austria since 1919 only.

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*

Period	World total		North America		United States		Mexico		Canada	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600	746,932,166	100.00	90,410,000	12.10			90,410,000	12.10		
1601–1700	1,271,922,450	100.00	306,650,000	24.11			306,650,000	24.11		
1701–1800	1,832,768,759	100.00	1,044,510,000	57.00			1,044,510,000	57.00		
1801–1810	286,614,899	100.00	178,050,000	62.12			178,050,000	62.12		
1811–1820	173,378,899	100.00	100,310,000	57.86			100,310,000	57.86		
1821–1830	153,553,520	100.00	85,140,000	55.44			85,140,000	55.44		
1831–1840	197,348,711	100.00	106,539,132	53.98	119,132	0.06	106,420,000	53.92		
1841–1850	253,365,466	100.00	135,436,468	53.46	306,468	.12	135,130,000	53.34		
1801–1850	1,064,261,495	100.00	605,475,600	56.89	425,600	.04	605,050,000	56.85		
1851–1855	154,988,259	100.00	75,123,500	48.47	193,500	.12	74,930,000	48.35		
1856–1860	145,582,525	100.00	72,299,400	49.66	309,400	.21	71,990,000	49.45		
1851–1860	300,570,784	100.00	147,422,900	49.05	502,900	.17	146,920,000	48.88		
1861–1865	178,863,296	100.00	104,850,600	58.62	28,810,600	16.11	76,040,000	42.51		
1866–1870	221,785,770	100.00	133,023,200	59.98	49,113,200	22.14	83,740,000	37.76	170,000	0.08
1861–1870	400,649,066	100.00	237,873,800	59.36	77,923,800	19.45	159,780,000	39.87	170,000	.04
1871–1875	334,264,202	100.00	219,813,300	65.76	121,083,300	36.22	96,740,000	28.94	1,990,000	.60
1851–1875	1,035,484,052	100.00	605,110,000	58.44	199,510,000	19.27	403,440,000	38.96	2,160,000	.21
1876	66,932,201		46,744,687		29,996,200		17,567,487		181,000	
1877	74,174,990		51,799,782		30,777,800		20,897,982		124,000	
1878	78,291,041		56,742,282		35,022,300		20,897,982		822,000	
1879	78,876,244		51,084,537		31,565,500		19,466,278		52,759	
1880	77,902,694		49,837,737		30,318,700		19,466,278		52,759	
1876–1880	376,177,170	100.00	257,209,025	68.37	157,680,500	41.91	98,296,007	26.13	1,232,518	.33
1871–1880	710,441,372	100.00	477,022,325	67.14	278,763,800	39.24	195,036,007	27.45	3,222,518	.45

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	World total		North America		United States		Mexico		Canada	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1881	84,487,883		54,727,250		33,264,733		21,409,758		52,759	
1882	88,274,154		58,875,467		36,204,404		22,618,304		52,759	
1883	89,956,458		58,776,572		35,740,244		22,874,610		161,718	
1884	82,307,566		59,000,019		37,751,594		21,086,707		161,718	
1885	91,997,703		64,921,286		39,917,654		24,841,914		161,718	
1881–1885	437,023,764	100.00	296,300,594	67.81	182,878,629	41.85	112,831,293	25.82	590,672	0.14
1886	95,484,904		66,690,962		39,453,494		25,528,750		161,718	
1887	97,148,513		72,237,766		41,276,891		29,064,271		349,414	
1888	110,030,745		79,644,236		45,793,138		32,006,064		297,844	
1889	126,564,054		88,720,584		50,010,029		36,779,967		383,398	
1890	134,429,165		95,414,818		54,511,583		38,955,318		400,727	
1886–1890	563,657,381	100.00	402,708,366	71.44	231,045,135	40.99	162,334,370	28.80	1,593,101	.28
1881–1890	1,000,681,145	100.00	699,008,960	69.85	413,923,764	41.36	275,165,663	27.50	2,183,773	.22
1891	138,283,427		95,058,137		58,342,087		34,854,619		314,241	
1892	154,377,339		104,897,229		63,499,992		39,504,867		345,495	
1893	166,594,198		106,157,933		59,999,956		44,362,519		248,583	
1894	164,829,094		98,932,943		49,500,000		47,038,381		847,687	
1895	167,744,560		106,012,216		55,726,945		46,962,738		1,775,658	
1891–1895	791,828,618	100.00	511,058,458	64.54	287,068,980	36.25	212,723,124	26.86	3,531,664	.45
1896	157,321,170		108,567,801		58,834,800		45,718,982		3,205,343	
1897	160,765,331		114,133,518		53,860,000		53,903,180		5,558,446	
1898	169,537,121		116,344,745		54,438,000		56,738,000		4,452,333	
1899	168,806,306		114,700,404		54,764,500		55,612,090		3,411,644	
1900	173,688,775		120,546,848		57,647,000		57,437,808		4,448,755	
1896–1900	830,118,703	100.00	574,293,316	69.18	279,544,300	33.68	269,410,060	32.45	21,076,521	2.54
1891–1900	1,621,947,321	100.00	1,085,351,774	66.92	566,613,280	34.93	482,133,184	29.73	24,608,185	1.52
1876–1900	2,998,805,636	100.00	2,041,569,759	68.09	1,138,217,544	37.97	855,594,854	28.53	28,024,476	.93
1851–1900	4,034,289,688	100.00	2,646,679,759	65.60	1,337,727,544	33.15	1,259,034,854	31.21	30,184,476	.75
1801–1900	5,098,551,183	100.00	3,252,155,359	63.79	1,338,153,144	26.25	1,864,084,854	36.56	30,184,476	.59
1901	173,100,586		118,992,912		55,214,000		57,656,549		5,242,697	
1902	162,936,273		120,871,228		55,500,000		60,176,604		4,223,304	
1903	167,814,265		130,065,596		54,300,000		70,499,942		3,149,591	
1904	164,274,497		122,724,661		57,682,800		60,808,978		3,577,526	
1905	172,393,042		128,498,206		56,101,600		65,040,865		5,994,292	
1901–1905	840,518,663	100.00	621,152,603	73.90	278,798,400	33.17	314,182,938	37.38	22,187,410	2.64
1906	165,998,018		121,981,992		56,517,900		55,225,268		8,568,665	
1907	184,784,361		132,334,499		56,514,600		61,147,203		12,779,800	
1908	204,103,994		149,670,569		52,439,500		73,664,027		22,106,233	
1909	213,391,989		185,484,677		54,718,500		73,942,432		27,529,473	
1910	221,428,092		163,404,443		57,136,100		71,372,194		32,869,264	
1906–1910	989,706,454	100.00	725,876,180	73.35	277,326,600	28.03	335,351,124	33.89	103,853,435	10.49
1901–1910	1,830,225,117	100.00	1,347,028,783	73.60	556,125,000	30.39	649,534,062	35.48	126,040,845	6.89
1911	227,128,987		173,380,952		60,396,017		79,032,440		32,740,748	
1912	225,899,157		172,871,384		63,759,679		74,640,300		31,625,451	
1913	227,519,787		171,154,827		66,790,650		70,703,828		31,524,708	
1914	177,246,560		131,153,131		72,444,800		27,546,752		28,406,711	
1915	189,454,264		144,062,534		74,945,927		39,570,151		26,625,960	
1911–1915	1,047,248,755	100.00	792,622,828	75.68	338,337,073	32.31	291,493,471	27.83	150,923,578	14.41
1916	174,632,240		125,297,757		74,397,157		22,838,400		25,459,700	
1917	179,890,233		131,327,181		71,736,381		35,000,000		22,221,300	
1918	203,428,269		154,606,941		67,805,962		62,517,000		21,383,979	
1919	179,931,884		141,398,917		56,674,036		65,904,224		16,020,657	
1920	173,345,280		137,495,249		55,339,455		66,662,253		12,793,541	
1916–1920	911,227,906	100.00	690,126,045	75.74	325,952,991	35.77	252,921,877	27.76	97,879,177	10.74
1911–1920	1,958,476,661	100.00	1,482,748,873	75.71	664,290,064	33.92	544,415,348	27.80	248,802,755	12.70
1921	171,580,712		132,626,523		53,026,250		64,465,347		13,134,926	
1922	209,828,662		157,870,392		56,212,054		81,076,899		18,581,439	
1923	246,275,858		184,409,599		73,295,810		90,859,083		17,754,706	
1924	239,680,209		179,275,449		65,366,840		91,486,136		19,736,323	
1925	245,280,193		181,922,310		66,106,922		92,885,465		20,228,988	
1921–1925	1,112,645,634	100.00	836,104,273	75.15	314,007,876	28.22	420,772,930	37.82	89,436,382	8.04
1901–1925	4,901,347,412	100.00	3,665,881,929	74.79	1,534,422,940	31.31	1,614,722,340	32.94	464,279,982	9.47
1926	253,806,386	100.00	186,835,161	73.61	62,672,953	24.69	98,291,166	38.73	22,371,924	8.81
1927	251,396,555	100.00	190,735,273	75.87	60,394,199	24.03	104,573,919	41.60	22,613,134	8.99

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Central America		South America		Argentina		Bolivia		Brazil		Chile		Colombia		Ecuador	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600			453,820,000	60.76			355,360,000	47.58					4,100,000	0.55		
1601–1700			800,570,000	62.94			456,860,000	35.92	50,000	0.00	20,000	0.00	11,200,000	.88		
1701–1800			598,040,000	32.07			213,550,000	11.66	2,700,000	.15	6,470,000	.35	15,100,000	.82		
1801–1810			83,640,000	29.19			31,030,000	10.83	120,000	.04	2,250,000	.79	1,600,000	.56		
1811–1820			48,416,000	27.92			15,850,000	9.14	56,000	.03	3,220,000	1.86	1,000,000	.58		
1821–1830			39,751,000	25.89			13,600,000	8.86	71,000	.05	6,430,000	4.19	1,000,000	.65		
1831–1840			60,256,000	30.54			19,610,000	9.94	96,000	.05	10,610,000	5.38	1,000,000	.51		
1841–1850			72,617,000	28.66			21,220,000	8.38	77,000	.03	15,500,000	6.12	1,100,000	.43		
1801–1850			304,680,000	28.63			101,310,000	9.52	420,000	.04	38,010,000	3.57	5,700,000	.54		
1851–1855			48,655,000	31.39			11,770,000	7.59	35,000	.02	23,910,000	15.43	560,000	.36		
1856–1860			38,824,000	26.67			11,770,000	8.08	34,000	.02	15,850,000	10.91	560,000	.38		
1851–1860			87,479,000	29.10			23,540,000	7.83	69,000	.02	39,760,000	13.23	1,120,000	.37		
1861–1865			29,578,000	22.13			11,560,000	6.46	38,000	.02	15,360,000	8.60	560,000	.31		
1866–1870			44,138,000	19.90			14,470,000	6.52	28,000	.01	17,830,000	8.05	560,000	.25		
1861–1870			83,716,000	20.90			26,030,000	6.50	66,000	.02	33,190,000	8.28	1,120,000	.28		
1871–1875			68,657,000	20.54			35,770,000	10.69	27,000	.01	20,610,000	6.17	1,000,000	.30		
1851–1875			230,852,000	23.15			85,340,000	8.22	162,000	.02	93,560,000	9.04	3,240,000	.31		
1876			9,136,136		325,000		2,649,976		5,000		3,519,446		773,450			
1877			9,136,148		325,012		2,166,754		5,000		4,002,668		773,450			
1878			9,136,148		325,012		2,815,663		5,000		3,353,759		773,450			
1879			15,407,520		325,012		8,509,562		5,000		3,931,232		773,450			
1880			15,406,520		325,012		8,509,562		4,000		3,931,232		773,450			
1876–1880			58,222,472	15.48	1,625,048	0.43	24,651,517	6.55	24,000	.01	18,738,337	4.98	3,867,250	1.03		
1871–1880			126,879,472	17.86	1,625,048	.23	60,421,517	8.50	51,000	.01	39,348,337	5.54	4,867,250	.69		
1881			15,042,756		325,012		8,509,562		3,500		3,931,232		773,450			
1882			15,020,597		325,012		8,509,562		3,500		4,118,703		587,812			
1883			19,958,355		369,734		12,377,553		3,000		5,144,119		587,941			
1884			15,316,785		369,734		7,735,983		3,000		5,144,119		587,941			
1885			16,708,815		369,734		7,735,983		3,900		6,751,656		309,451			
1881–1885			82,047,308	18.76	1,759,226	.40	44,868,643	10.27	16,900	.00	25,089,829	5.74	2,846,595	.65		
1886	1,547,000		17,942,429		46,426		7,735,983		4,533		6,751,656		309,451			
1887	1,547,190		14,054,838		23,213		4,419,698		4,000		6,414,587		773,579			
1888	1,547,190		16,910,821		328,773		7,409,460		4,000		5,975,248		773,579			
1889	1,547,190		15,602,961		471,973		8,471,913		4,000		3,976,918		473,420			
1890	1,547,190		15,283,768		471,973		9,680,974		4,000		2,369,510		642,082			
1886–1890	7,735,760	1.37	79,794,817	14.15	1,342,358	.24	37,718,028	6.69	20,533	.00	25,487,919	4.52	2,972,111	.53		
1881–1890	7,735,760	.77	161,842,125	16.17	3,101,584	.31	82,586,671	8.26	37,433	.00	50,577,748	5.05	5,818,706	.58		
1891	1,547,190		17,122,216		479,625		11,981,488		4,100		1,083,930		1,314,033		7,716	
1892	1,546,875		17,671,835		479,531		10,715,358		10,700		3,240,007		1,313,761		7,734	
1893	1,546,875		21,079,291		708,005		13,631,449		10,700		3,128,709		1,687,950		7,734	
1894	1,546,875		30,988,678		1,200,066		21,999,966		5,700		2,850,503		1,687,950		7,734	
1895	1,546,875		32,223,300		328,170		21,999,966		4,600		5,031,907		1,687,950		7,734	
1891–1895	7,734,690	.98	119,085,320	15.04	3,195,397	.40	80,328,227	10.16	35,800	.00	15,335,056	1.94	7,691,644	.97	38,652	0.00
1896	808,676		17,205,562		328,170		6,374,240		4,800		3,236,536		3,407,004		7,734	
1897	811,892		19,519,509		383,479		8,204,568		5,800		2,591,998		5,047,328		7,734	
1898	716,412		26,938,742		383,479		10,997,705		7,700		4,754,636		5,483,718		7,734	
1899	912,170		25,475,759		383,479		10,843,977		10,400		4,162,718		3,521,563		7,734	
1900	1,013,285		24,353,150		37,898		10,970,610		13,400		4,162,718		1,864,165		7,734	
1896–1900	4,262,435	.51	113,472,722	13.67	1,516,505	.18	47,391,100	5.71	42,100	.01	18,908,606	2.28	19,323,778	2.33	38,670	.00
1891–1900	11,997,125	.74	232,558,042	14.34	4,711,902	.29	127,719,327	7.88	77,900	.00	34,243,662	2.11	27,015,422	1.67	77,322	.00
1876–1900	19,732,885	.66	452,622,639	15.09	9,438,534	.31	234,957,515	7.85	139,333	.00	103,559,747	3.45	36,701,378	1.22	77,322	.00
1851–1900	19,732,885	.49	692,474,639	17.16	9,438,534	.23	320,297,515	7.93	301,333	.01	197,119,747	4.89	39,941,378	.99	77,322	.00
1801–1900	19,732,885	.39	997,154,639	19.56	9,438,534	.19	421,607,515	8.27	721,333	.01	235,129,747	4.61	45,641,378	.90	77,322	.00
1901	879,666		27,763,442		45,166		12,992,695		13,400		9,255,130		1,881,649		7,734	
1902	971,320		16,806,226		37,720		8,969,596		10,100		1,737,300		1,776,604		7,736	
1903	2,116,063		9,971,554		92,592		6,083,333		11,000		868,067		1,128,799		39,996	
1904	655,357		8,652,937		66,153		3,752,953		9,900		868,067		946,066			
1905	1,361,449		10,490,864		150,149		3,096,998		9,900		397,853		679,245			
1901–1905	5,983,855	.71	73,685,023	8.77	391,780	.05	34,895,575	4.15	54,300	.01	13,126,417	1.56	6,412,363	.76	55,466	.01
1906	1,670,159		12,141,067		14,440		3,540,450		11,600		392,608		763,335		13,592	
1907	1,892,896		16,050,270		25,178		4,794,474		9,800		602,400		1,048,719		2,456	
1908	1,460,809		17,647,143		127,108		5,040,180		10,600		1,400,830		1,375,039		22,642	
1909	2,294,272		16,690,799		265,106		5,035,260		10,900		1,154,482		431,204		22,642	
1910	2,026,885		13,772,824		263,255		4,652,169		9,400		1,123,970		866,093		22,642	
1906–1910	9,345,021	.94	76,302,103	7.71	695,087	.07	23,062,533	2.33	52,300		4,674,290	.47	4,484,390	.45	83,974	.01
1901–1910	15,328,876	.84	149,987,126	8.20	1,086,867	.06	57,958,108	3.17	106,600	.01	17,800,707	.97	10,896,753	.60	139,440	.01

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Central America		South America		Argentina		Bolivia		Brazil		Chile		Colombia		Ecuador	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1911	1,211,747	-------	14,880,920	-------	203,111	-------	4,112,241	-------	47,222	-------	889,807	-------	817,431	-------	22,642	-------
1912	2,845,954	-------	14,887,709	-------	81,996	-------	3,986,394	-------	40,610	-------	970,283	-------	587,683	-------	22,642	-------
1913	2,135,641	-------	15,623,042	-------	35,271	-------	3,986,394	-------	28,364	-------	940,510	-------	587,683	-------	22,642	-------
1914	2,754,868	-------	12,871,284	-------	30,000	-------	2,300,000	-------	76,685	-------	882,412	-------	351,271	-------	16,726	-------
1915	2,920,496	-------	13,129,735	-------	25,000	-------	2,475,884	-------	21,523	-------	811,452	-------	351,271	-------	24,655	-------
1911–1915	11,868,706	1.13	71,392,690	6.82	375,378	0.04	16,860,913	1.61	214,404	0.02	4,494,464	0.43	2,695,339	0.26	109,307	0.01
1916	2,602,500	-------	15,580,300	-------	21,300	-------	2,495,300	-------	22,000	-------	1,906,800	-------	309,400	-------	30,000	-------
1917	2,369,500	-------	15,451,300	-------	29,000	-------	2,435,000	-------	25,000	-------	1,716,600	-------	325,000	-------	45,000	-------
1918	2,900,000	-------	14,712,065	-------	25,000	-------	2,435,000	-------	25,000	-------	1,900,000	-------	494,331	-------	40,000	-------
1919	2,800,000	-------	14,753,160	-------	25,000	-------	2,435,000	-------	25,000	-------	1,900,000	-------	494,331	-------	40,000	-------
1920	2,700,000	-------	14,587,738	-------	30,000	-------	2,200,000	-------	30,000	-------	2,604,456	-------	480,000	-------	35,000	-------
1916–1920	13,372,000	1.47	75,084,563	8.24	130.300	.01	12,000,300	1.32	127,000	.01	10,027,856	1.10	2,103,062	.23	190,000	.02
1911–1920	25,240,706	1.29	146,477,253	7.48	505.678	.03	28,861,213	1.47	341,404	.02	14,522,320	.74	4,798,401	.24	299,307	.02
1921	2,000,000	-------	15,614,200	-------	25,000	-------	2,400,000	-------	33,000	-------	2,558,947	-------	500,000	-------	75,000	-------
1922	2,000,000	-------	21,395,008	-------	25,000	-------	5,373,521	-------	25,720	-------	2,709,152	-------	3,150	-------	75,000	-------
1923	2,500,000	-------	27,353,073	-------	30,000	-------	5,212,826	-------	28,613	-------	3,337,491	-------	3,150	-------	75,000	-------
1924	2,686,150	-------	27,065,296	-------	20,000	-------	4,857,608	-------	28,613	-------	3,357,688	-------	2,900	-------	70,000	-------
1925	2,700,935	-------	27,630,101	-------	18,000	-------	4,346,532	-------	1,833	-------	3,261,682	-------	2,900	-------	70,000	-------
1921–1925	11,887,085	1.07	119,057,678	10.70	118,000	.01	22,190,487	2.00	117,779	.01	15,224,960	1.37	512,100	.05	365,000	.03
1901–1925	52,456,667	1.07	415,522,057	8.48	1,710,545	.03	109,009,808	2.22	565,783	.01	47,547,987	.97	16,207,254	.33	803,747	.02
1926	3,499,118	1.38	30,463,552	12.00	15,000	.01	5,834,003	2.30	20,672	.01	2,876,911	1.13	125,953	.05	80,000	.03
1927	3,154,021	1.25	26,863,481	10.69	15,000	.01	5,402,840	2.15	20,000	.01	2,900,000	1.15	131,417	.05	87,601	.03

Period	Peru		Guianas, Uruguay, and others		Venezuela		Europe		Austria (Austria-Hungary, 1493–1918)		Czechoslovakia		France		Germany	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600	94,360,000	12.63	----------	-------	----------	-------	177,702,166	23.79	87,770,000	11.75	----------	-------	----------	-------	50,300,000	6.73
1601–1700	332,440,000	26.14	----------	-------	----------	-------	89,702,450	7.05	30,220,000	2.38	----------	-------	----------	-------	26,500,000	2.09
1701–1800	360,220,000	19.65	----------	-------	----------	-------	189,218,759	10.32	62,050,000	3.39	----------	-------	----------	-------	66,620,000	3.63
1801–1810	48,640,000	16.97	----------	-------	----------	-------	24,824,899	8.66	9,480,000	3.31	----------	-------	200,000	0.08	6,720,000	2.34
1811–1820	28,290,000	16.33	----------	-------	----------	-------	24,552,899	14.16	8,040,000	4.64	----------	-------	225,000	.14	7,620,000	4.39
1821–1830	18,650,000	12.14	----------	-------	----------	-------	28,562,520	18.60	6,750,000	4.38	----------	-------	397,801	.26	9,070,000	5.91
1831–1840	28,940,000	14.66	----------	-------	----------	-------	30,453,579	15.43	6,440,000	3.26	----------	-------	585,176	.30	9,580,000	4.85
1841–1850	34,720,000	13.70	----------	-------	----------	-------	45,211,998	17.84	9,840,000	3.87	----------	-------	934,397	.37	11,570,000	4.57
1801–1850	159,240,000	14.96	----------	-------	----------	-------	153,605,895	14.43	40,550,000	3.81	----------	-------	2,342,374	.22	44,560,000	4.18
1851–1855	12,380,000	7.99	----------	-------	----------	-------	29,354,759	18.94	5,630,000	3.63	----------	-------	1,531,147	.99	7,871,000	5.08
1856–1860	10,610,000	8.29	----------	-------	----------	-------	32,579,125	22.38	5,100,000	3.50	----------	-------	6,965,040	4.79	9,888,000	6.80
1851–1860	22,990,000	7.65	----------	-------	----------	-------	61,933,884	20.61	10,730,000	3.57	----------	-------	8,496,187	2.83	17,759,000	5.90
1861–1865	12,060,000	6.74	----------	-------	----------	-------	32,774,696	18.32	5,870,000	3.28	----------	-------	5,557,995	3.11	10,983,000	6.14
1866–1870	11,250,000	5.07	----------	-------	----------	-------	43,853,411	19.77	6,425,000	2.90	----------	-------	6,455,740	2.90	14,327,174	6.45
1861–1870	23,310,000	5.82	----------	-------	----------	-------	76,628,107	19.13	12,295,000	3.07	----------	-------	12,013,735	3.00	25,310,174	6.31
1871–1875	11,250,000	3.37	----------	-------	----------	-------	44,471,190	13.30	6,197,000	1.85	----------	-------	6,239,655	1.87	16,961,703	5.07
1851–1875	57,550,000	5.56	----------	-------	----------	-------	183,033,181	17.68	29,222,000	2.82	----------	-------	26,749,577	2.58	60,030,877	5.81
1876	1,863,264	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	9,650,282	-------	1,541,641	-------	----------	-------	905,000	-------	3,959,219	-------
1877	1,863,264	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	12,763,730	-------	1,639,688	-------	----------	-------	1,064,000	-------	4,745,835	-------
1878	1,863,264	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	11,974,390	-------	1,564,519	-------	----------	-------	977,000	-------	4,042,795	-------
1879	1,863,264	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	11,861,044	-------	1,549,023	-------	----------	-------	1,177,553	-------	4,308,424	-------
1880	1,863,264	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	12,095,060	-------	1,543,236	-------	----------	-------	1,297,958	-------	4,313,086	-------
1876–1880	9,316,320	2.48	----------	-------	----------	-------	58,344,506	15.51	7,838,107	2.08	----------	-------	5,421,511	1.44	21,369,359	5.70
1871–1880	20,566,320	2.89	----------	-------	----------	-------	102,815,696	14.48	14,035,107	1.98	----------	-------	11,661,166	1.64	38,331,062	5.40
1881	1,500,000	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	13,821,177	-------	1,008,215	-------	----------	-------	1,759,000	-------	6,011,867	-------
1882	1,476,008	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	13,554,805	-------	1,514,879	-------	----------	-------	459,466	-------	6,911,831	-------
1883	1,476,008	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	10,632,465	-------	1,565,741	-------	----------	-------	204,350	-------	4,587,911	-------
1884	1,476,008	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	7,040,837	-------	1,585,032	-------	----------	-------	189,850	-------	887,296	-------
1885	1,538,091	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	8,731,065	-------	1,695,887	-------	----------	-------	1,639,688	-------	789,847	-------
1881–1885	7,466,115	1.70	----------	-------	----------	-------	53,780,349	12.31	7,369,754	1.69	----------	-------	4,252,354	.97	19,138,751	4.40
1886	3,094,380	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	8,724,289	-------	1,695,887	-------	----------	-------	1,504,301	-------	824,667	-------
1887	2,419,761	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	9,561,099	-------	1,716,560	-------	----------	-------	1,746,235	-------	1,014,806	-------
1888	2,419,761	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	8,174,198	-------	1,675,954	-------	----------	-------	1,588,118	-------	1,030,463	-------
1889	2,204,737	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	14,192,197	-------	1,692,769	-------	----------	-------	2,602,378	-------	6,198,470	-------
1900	2,115,229	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	13,965,959	-------	1,627,246	-------	----------	-------	2,286,464	-------	5,854,200	-------
1886–1890	12,253,868	2.17	----------	-------	----------	-------	54,617,742	9.70	8,408,416	1.49	----------	-------	9,727,496	1.73	14,922,606	2.65
1881–1890	19,719,983	1.97	----------	-------	----------	-------	108,398,091	10.83	15,778,170	1.58	----------	-------	13,979,850	1.40	34,111,358	3.40

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Peru		Guianas, Uruguay, and others		Venezuela		Europe		Austria (Austria-Hungary, 1493-1918)		Czechoslovakia		France		Germany	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1891	2,251,324						14,420,787		1,672,449				2,063,210		6,000,486	
1892	1,904,744						16,268,229		1,770,553				2,979,745		6,818,316	
1893	1,904,744						16,634,222		2,897,219				3,152,609		5,753,756	
1894	3,236,759						14,715,726		2,684,524				841,113		6,203,820	
1895	3,162,973						14,336,667		2,184,265				566,346		5,818,106	
1891-1895	12,460,544	1.57					76,273,631	9.63	11,209,010	1.42			9,603,023	1.21	30,594,484	3.86
1896	3,847,078						16,760,814		1,863,921				525,628		5,890,500	
1897	3,278,602						13,005,089		1,970,332				542,913		5,498,135	
1898	5,303,770						13,217,899		1,814,294				460,946		5,571,516	
1899	6,525,245		643				13,627,516		1,895,253				466,089		6,242,053	
1900	7,295,825		800				13,412,100		1,988,774				452,151		5,411,441	
1896-1900	26,250,520	3.16	1,443	0.00			70,023,418	8.44	9,532,574	1.15			2,447,727	.29	28,613,645	3.45
1891-1900	38,711,064	2.39	1,443	.00			146,297,049	9.02	20,741,584	1.28			12,050,750	.74	59,208,129	3.66
1876-1900	67,747,367	2.26	1,443	.00			313,039,646	10.44	44,357,861	1.48			31,452,111	1.05	114,688,846	3.83
1851-1900	125,297,367	3.11	1,443	.00			496,072,827	12.30	73,579,861	1.82			58,201,688	1.44	174,719,723	4.34
1801-1900	284,537,367	5.58	1,443	.00			649,678,722	12.74	114,129,861	2.24			60,544,062	1.19	219,279,723	4.31
1901	3,566,868		800				13,768,541		1,996,706				384,263		5,521,648	
1902	4,264,528		755		1,887		14,648,571		1,881,132				747,359		5,722,641	
1903	1,746,674		1,093				15,152,509		1,624,048				747,359		5,822,452	
1904	3,008,705		1,093				15,053,563		1,987,797				298,103		5,799,133	
1905	6,156,044		675				14,798,804		1,860,169				890,555		5,820,947	
1901-1905	18,742,819	2.23	4,416	.00	1,887	0.00	73,421,988	8.74	9,349,852	1.11			3,067,639	.36	28,686,821	3.43
1906	7,404,238		804				14,299,559		1,806,322				719,453		5,696,433	
1907	9,566,118		1,125				13,792,935		1,744,233				794,973		5,088,086	
1908	9,566,118				104,626		13,569,330		1,770,457				592,042		4,971,544	
1909	9,566,118		129		204,958		13,872,455		999,184				629,848		5,332,901	
1910	6,626,930		322		208,043		14,274,211		1,540,808				713,028		5,597,026	
1906-1910	42,729,522	4.32	2,380	.00	517,627	.05	69,808,490	7.05	7,861,004	.79			3,449,344	.35	26,685,990	2.70
1901-1910	61,472,341	3.35	6,796	.00	519,514	.03	143,230,478	7.83	17,210,856	.94			6,516,983	.36	55,372,811	3.03
1911	8,351,563				436,903		13,975,470		1,538,772				429,831		4,984,677	
1912	8,351,563		724,235		122,303		14,482,949		1,846,297				429,831		4,984,677	
1913	9,971,067		51,111				14,039,083		2,104,107				520,766		4,984,677	
1914	9,214,190						13,605,830		1,572,746				279,711		5,295,227	
1915	9,419,950						14,136,136		1,772,699				70,732		5,455,981	
1911-1915	45,308,333	4.33	775,346	.07	559,206	.05	70,239,468	6.71	8,828,621	.84			1,730,871	.17	25,705,239	2.46
1916	10,787,000		8,500				13,617,040		1,500,000				115,743		5,523,497	
1917	10,864,400		8,000		3,300		11,664,333		1,500,000				147,893		5,404,540	
1918	9,781,734		8,000		3,000		12,263,456		1,750,000		554,780		40,000		5,259,861	
1919	9,821,729		8,000		4,100		6,971,600		15,432		580,918		12,000		3,472,280	
1920	9,196,282		8,500		3,500		8,356,309		13,985		680,069		321,500		3,305,020	
1916-1920	50,451,145	5.55	41,000	.00	13,900	.00	52,872,738	5.80	4,779,417	.52	1,815,767	0.20	637,136	.07	22,965,198	2.53
1911-1920	95,759,478	4.89	816,346	.04	573,106	.03	123,112,206	6.29	13,608,038	.69	1,815,767	.09	2,368,007	.12	48,670,437	2.50
1921	10,008,553		11,000		2,700		7,920,639		10,513		703,056		321,500		3,387,420	
1922	13,169,765		11,000		2,700		8,334,231		8,584		875,157		208,975		3,581,510	
1923	18,654,793		8,500		2,700		8,776,468		14,178		702,285		213,025		3,752,998	
1924	18,717,087		8,700		2,700		9,202,455		28,678		732,538		147,858		3,752,998	
1925	19,917,439		8,500		3,215		10,899,782		23,920		707,300		352,010		4,780,383	
1921-1925	80,467,637	7.23	47,700	.00	14,015	.00	45,133,575	4.05	85,873	.01	3,720,366	.33	1,243,368	.11	19,255,309	1.73
1901-1925	237,699,456	4.86	807,842	.02	1,106,635	.02	311,476,259	6.36	30,904,767	.63	5,536,133	.11	10,128,358	.21	123,298,557	2.52
1926	21,499,798	8.47	8,000	.00	3,215	.00	11,265,265	4.44	14,050	.01	765,491	.30	261,830	.10	5,358,858	2.11
1927	18,295,408	7.29	8,000	.00	3,215	.00	11,667,958	4.64	9,677	.00	750,000	.30	308,640	.12	5,500,000	2.18

Period	Greece		Italy		Norway		Poland		Rumania		Russia		Spain (including Portugal)		Sweden	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493-1600															3,632,166	0.49
1601-1700					10,970,000	0.86									1,952,450	.15
1701-1800					14,250,000	.78					31,125,000	1.70			1,173,759	.06
1801-1810					820,000	.29					6,478,000	2.26	500,000	0.17	126,899	.04
1811-1820					320,000	.18					7,321,000	4.22	200,000	.12	126,899	.07
1821-1830					286,000	.19					7,478,000	4.87	3,500,000	2.28	180,719	.12
1831-1840					2,112,143	1.07					6,626,000	3.36	3,750,000	1.90	260,260	.13
1841-1850			50,000	0.02	1,947,853	.77					6,274,000	2.48	12,540,000	4.95	355,748	.14
1801-1850			50,000	.00	5,485,996	.52					34,177,000	3.21	20,490,000	1.93	1,050,525	.10

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Greece		Italy		Norway		Poland		Rumania		Russia		Spain (including Portugal)		Sweden	
	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent
1851–1855			120,000	0.08	531,130	0.34					2,758,000	1.78	8,040,000	5.19	203,482	0.13
1856–1860			530,000	.36	1,029,949	.71					2,794,000	1.92	3,250,000	2.23	178,372	.12
1851–1860			650,000	.22	1,561,079	.52					5,552,000	1.85	11,290,000	3.76	381,854	.13
1861–1865			702,000	.39	531,130	.30					2,770,000	1.55	2,922,535	1.63	181,491	.10
1866–1870	3,250,000	1.47	1,858,000	.84	579,999	.26					2,619,000	1.18	4,248,078	1.92	190,557	.09
1861–1870	3,250,000	.81	2,560,000	.64	1,111,129	.28					5,389,000	1.35	7,170,613	1.79	372,048	.09
1871–1875	3,600,000	1.08	2,165,000	.65	582,571	.17					1,848,000	.55	3,833,783	1.15	125,356	.04
1851–1875	6,850,000	.66	5,375,000	.52	3,254,779	.31					12,789,000	1.24	22,294,396	2.15	879,258	.08
1876	650,000		535,000		128,603						359,992		1,067,405		30,000	
1877	650,000		647,000		145,450						361,857		2,970,729		41,796	
1878	650,000		697,000		128,603						367,258		3,108,977		40,767	
1879	720,000		820,000		142,621						366,229		2,395,230		48,290	
1880	800,000		899,000		142,621						366,229		2,395,230		42,182	
1876–1880	3,460,000	.92	3,598,000	.96	687,898	.18					1,821,565	.48	11,937,571	3.17	203,035	.05
1871–1880	7,060,000	.99	5,763,000	.81	1,270,469	.18					3,669,565	.52	15,771,354	2.22	328,391	.05
1881	950,000		939,000		154,709						256,949		2,395,230		37,809	
1882	530,000		883,000		189,464						250,165		2,395,230		48,226	
1883	760,000		940,699		181,491						321,186		1,746,911		50,895	
1884	720,000		1,087,949		205,347						300,931		1,746,911		58,386	
1885	720,000		1,087,949		231,485						499,944		1,746,911		74,783	
1881–1885	3,680,000	.84	4,938,597	1.13	962,496	.22					1,629,175	.37	10,031,193	2.30	270,099	.06
1886	800,000		1,087,949		231,485						408,539		1,746,911		99,056	
1887	1,000,000		1,087,949		165,480						434,742		1,887,602		187,375	
1888	1,150,000		1,125		165,480						466,925		1,655,828		149,437	
1889	1,070,000		260,678		165,480						103,268		1,655,828		137,187	
1890	1,130,000		325,044		178,083						482,936		1,655,828		134,390	
1886–1890	5,150,000	.91	2,762,745	.49	906,008	.16					1,896,410	.34	8,601,997	1.53	707,445	.13
1881–1890	8,830,000	.88	7,701,342	.77	1,868,504	.19					3,525,585	.35	18,633,190	1.86	977,544	.10
1891	1,060,000		1,193,532		182,134						445,738		1,487,904		117,607	
1892	1,150,000		1,281,045		144,478						465,377		1,487,630		1,702	
1893	1,020,000		928,512		144,478						325,260		2,013,258		143,705	
1894	1,139,041		928,512		151,207						275,808		2,044,505		92,194	
1895	1,139,041		183,655		195,525						401,646		3,529,582		38,130	
1891–1895	5,508,082	.70	4,515,256	.57	817,822	.10					1,913,799	.24	10,562,879	1.33	393,338	.05
1896	1,028,609		875,763		162,198						336,127		5,779,357		17,822	
1897	1,203,184		737,163		207,126						284,625		2,290,453		20,728	
1898	1,348,411		804,512		173,327						293,149		2,456,730		65,345	
1899	1,178,369		819,481		146,798						143,220		2,456,730		73,619	
1900	1,011,656		751,335		172,839						151,142		3,189,106		61,983	
1896–1900	5,770,229	.70	3,988,254	.48	863,288	.10					1,208,263	.15	16,172,376	1.95	239,497	.03
1891–1900	11,278,311	.70	8,503,510	.52	1,681,110	.10					3,122,062	.19	26,735,255	1.65	632,835	.04
1876–1900	23,568,311	.79	19,802,852	.66	4,237,512	.14					8,469,212	.28	57,306,016	1.91	1,813,414	.06
1851–1900	30,418,311	.75	25,177,852	.62	7,492,291	.19					21,258,212	.53	79,600,412	1.97	2,692,672	.07
1801–1900	30,418,311	.60	25,227,852	.49	12,978,287	.25					55,435,212	1.09	100,090,412	1.96	3,743,197	.07
1901	1,154,046		964,333		165,902						164,836		3,189,106		53,986	
1902	1,062,177		964,339		206,413						167,358		3,703,962		46,226	
1903	718,148		806,335		197,923						161,452		4,878,076		34,117	
1904	727,069		757,777		260,210						172,912		4,878,076		23,702	
1905	829,025		757,777		242,805						204,960		4,000,000		24,765	
1901–1905	4,490,465	.53	4,250,561	.51	1,073,258	.13					871,519	.10	20,649,220	2.46	182,796	.02
1906	829,025		672,449		175,475						166,183		4,064,532		32,375	
1907	829,025		737,843		201,516						132,122		4,097,035		29,761	
1908	829,025		674,848		226,175						132,122		4,175,674		35,723	
1909	829,025		786,620		213,122						132,122		4,767,091		29,373	
1910	881,539		468,566		229,989						140,632		4,546,430		19,823	
1906–1910	4,197,639	.42	3,340,326	.34	1,046,277	.11					703,181	.07	21,650,762	2.19	147,060	.01
1901–1910	8,688,104	.47	7,590,887	.41	2,119,535	.12					1,574,700	.09	42,299,982	2.31	329,856	.02
1911	803,750		998,576		292,075						477,140		4,270,324		19,823	
1912	803,750		447,761		247,988						200,094		5,358,448		32,202	
1913	803,750		423,888		247,988						300,000		4,437,637		58,969	
1914	591,464		510,365		440,917						300,000		4,434,417		33,511	
1915	591,464		493,856		413,867						638,403		4,567,454		24,230	
1911–1915	3,594,178	.34	2,874,446	.27	1,642,835	.16					1,915,637	.18	23,068,280	2.20	168,735	.02
1916	350,000		486,500		439,100						550,000		4,517,800		37,900	
1917	350,000		486,500		294,900						500,000		2,850,000		35,000	
1918	175,015		500,000		270,200						400,000		3,182,464		31,500	
1919	160,000		350,000		312,820						400,000		1,548,228		31,507	
1920	220,935		297,452		323,172		84,700				50,000		2,956,546		11,574	
1916–1920	1,255,950	.13	2,120,452	.23	1,640,192	.18	84,700	0.01			1,900,000	.21	15,055,038	1.65	147,481	.02
1911–1920	4,850,128	.25	4,994,898	.25	3,283,027	.17	84,700	.00			3,815,637	.19	38,123,318	1.95	316,216	.02

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Greece		Italy		Norway		Poland		Rumania		Russia		Spain (including Portugal)		Sweden	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1921	192,900	-------	199,330	-------	196,115	-------	53,401	-------	96,450	-------	40,000	-------	2,679,349	-------	13,342	-------
1922	184,123	-------	204,699	-------	205,149	-------	20,479	-------	62,821	-------	150,000	-------	2,778,210	-------	32	-------
1923	184,123	-------	385,800	-------	297,934	-------	130,950	-------	64,300	-------	192,900	-------	2,778,210	-------	578	-------
1924	160,750	-------	496,975	-------	424,380	-------	192,900	-------	72,209	-------	250,000	-------	2,879,966	-------	800	-------
1925	254,274	-------	320,761	-------	504,755	-------	212,190	-------	76,581	-------	250,000	-------	3,303,863	-------	55,200	-------
1921–1925	976,170	0.09	1,607,565	0.14	1,628,333	0.15	609,920	0.05	372,361	0.03	882,900	0.08	14,419,598	1.30	69,952	0.01
1901–1925	14,514,402	.30	14,193,350	.29	7,030,895	.14	694,620	.01	372,361	.01	6,273,237	.13	94,842,898	1.94	716,024	.01
1926	254,274	.10	519,351	.20	308,640	.12	271,700	.11	93,685	.04	250,000	.10	3,000,656	1.18	80,375	.03
1927	241,125	.10	537,098	.21	321,821	.13	300,000	.12	140,688	.06	321,500	.13	3,056,565	1.22	80,375	.03

Period	United Kingdom		Yugoslavia (Serbia, 1876–1918)		Undistributed Europe		Asia		China		Chosen		India		Indochina	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600	----------	-------	----------	-------	36,000,000	4.82	25,000,000	3.35	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1601–1700	----------	-------	----------	-------	20,000,000	1.57	75,000,000	5.90	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1701–1800	1,000,000	0.05	----------	-------	13,000,000	.71	1,000,000	.05	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1801–1810	500,000	.17	----------	-------	----------	-------	100,000	.03	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1811–1820	700,000	.40	----------	-------	----------	-------	100,000	.06	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1821–1830	900,000	.59	----------	-------	----------	-------	100,000	.07	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1831–1840	1,100,000	.56	----------	-------	----------	-------	100,000	.05	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1841–1850	1,700,000	.67	----------	-------	----------	-------	100,000	.04	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1801–1850	4,900,000	.46	----------	-------	----------	-------	500,000	.05	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1851–1855	2,670,000	1.72	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,855,000	1.20	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1856–1860	2,843,764	1.95	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,880,000	1.29	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1851–1860	5,513,764	1.83	----------	-------	----------	-------	3,735,000	1.24	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1861–1865	3,256,545	1.82	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,650,000	.92	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1866–1870	3,899,863	1.76	----------	-------	----------	-------	700,000	.32	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1861–1870	7,156,408	1.79	----------	-------	----------	-------	2,350,000	.59	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1871–1875	2,918,122	.87	----------	-------	----------	-------	725,000	.22	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1851–1875	15,588,294	1.51	----------	-------	----------	-------	6,810,000	.66	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1876	483,422	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	330,892	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1877	497,375	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	405,126	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1878	397,471	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	368,017	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1879	333,674	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	347,439	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1880	295,518	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	387,673	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1876–1880	2,007,460	.53	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,839,147	.49	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1871–1880	4,925,582	.69	----------	-------	----------	-------	2,564,147	.36	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1881	308,398	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	764,062	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1882	372,544	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	748,630	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1883	273,281	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	458,566	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1884	259,135	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	796,791	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1885	244,571	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	784,735	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1881–1885	1,457,929	.33	----------	-------	----------	-------	3,552,784	.81	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------
1886	325,494	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,080,139	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,000	-------	----------	-------
1887	320,350	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,074,449	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,000	-------	----------	-------
1888	290,868	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,408,499	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	2,000	-------	----------	-------
1889	306,139	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,433,746	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	5,000	-------	----------	-------
1890	291,768	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,414,913	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	7,000	-------	----------	-------
1886–1890	1,534,619	.27	----------	-------	----------	-------	6,411,746	1.14	----------	-------	----------	-------	16,000	0.00	----------	-------
1881–1890	2,992,548	.30	----------	-------	----------	-------	9,964,530	1.00	----------	-------	----------	-------	16,000	.00	----------	-------
1891	197,727	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,604,191	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	9,000	-------	----------	-------
1892	169,383	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,983,028	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	12,000	-------	----------	-------
1893	253,455	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	2,081,244	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	14,000	-------	----------	-------
1894	255,002	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	2,019,292	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	14,000	-------	----------	-------
1895	280,371	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	2,443,042	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	17,000	-------	----------	-------
1891–1895	1,155,938	.15	----------	-------	----------	-------	10,130,797	1.28	----------	-------	----------	-------	66,000	.01	----------	-------
1896	262,567	-------	18,322	-------	----------	-------	2,315,293	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	22,000	-------	----------	-------
1897	232,108	-------	18,322	-------	----------	-------	1,916,766	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	26,000	-------	----------	-------
1898	211,347	-------	18,322	-------	----------	-------	2,116,789	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	28,000	-------	----------	-------
1899	186,582	-------	18,322	-------	----------	-------	1,875,898	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	31,000	-------	----------	-------
1900	221,673	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	1,986,403	-------	----------	-------	----------	-------	34,000	-------	----------	-------
1896–1900	1,114,277	.13	73,288	0.01	----------	-------	10,211,149	1.23	----------	-------	----------	-------	141,000	.02	----------	-------
1891–1900	2,270,215	.14	73,288	.00	----------	-------	20,341,946	1.25	----------	-------	----------	-------	207,000	.01	----------	-------
1876–1900	7,270,223	.24	73,288	.00	----------	-------	32,145,623	1.07	----------	-------	----------	-------	223,000	.01	----------	-------
1851–1900	22,858,517	.57	73,288	.00	----------	-------	38,955,623	.97	----------	-------	----------	-------	223,000	.01	----------	-------
1801–1900	27,758,517	.54	73,288	.00	----------	-------	39,455,623	.77	----------	-------	----------	-------	223,000	.00	----------	-------

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	United Kingdom		Yugoslavia (Serbia, 1876–1918)		Undistributed Europe		Asia		China		Chosen		India		Indochina	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1901	173,297		418				2,304,160						34,000			
1902	146,289		675				2,457,196						35,000			
1903	162,593						2,566,978						41,000		296	
1904	147,241		1,543				2,775,767						43,000		519	
1905	167,479		322				2,929,456						43,000		851	
1901–1905	796,899	0.09	2,958	0.00			13,033,557	1.55					196,000	0.02	1,666	0.00
1906	137,216		96				2,860,978				6,000		44,000		771	
1907	137,216		1,125				3,534,478				6,000		38,000		1,000	
1908	135,255		26,460				4,508,379				6,000		38,000		1,758	
1909	141,943		11,226				6,395,824				6,000		27,500		739	
1910	136,370						6,881,960				6,000		49,680		862	
1906–1910	688,000	.07	38,907	.00			24,181,619	2.44			6,000	0.00	197,180	.02	5,130	.00
1901–1910	1,484,899	.08	41,865	.00			37,215,176	2.03			6,000	.00	393,180	.02	6,796	.00
1911	136,370		24,132				6,826,387				9,446		103,850		1,447	
1912	113,769		24,132				7,128,909				12,224		93,476			
1913	128,543		28,758				6,827,893				15,048		125,209			
1914	135,458		12,014				7,168,967		107,155		16,864		236,440		1,767	
1915	96,450		11,000				7,418,285		18,230		21,897		284,875		1,056	
1911–1915	610,590	.06	100,036	.01			35,370,441	3.38	125,385	0.01	75,479	.01	843,850	.08	4,270	.00
1916	86,500		10,000				8,084,143		30,000		25,000		1,257,100		1,000	
1917	75,500		20,000				10,114,919		63,400		26,500		2,068,700		1,000	
1918	79,636		20,000				10,654,938		70,000		26,000		2,240,500		1,000	
1919	68,415		20,000				8,342,325		65,000		20,000		2,165,606		1,000	
1920	76,356		15,000				8,984,225		50,000		1,200		2,870,595			
1916–1920	386,407	.04	85,000	.01			46,180,550	5.06	278,400	.03	98,700	.01	10,602,501	1.16	4,000	.00
1911–1920	996,997	.05	185,036	.01			81,550,991	4.16	403,785	.02	174,179	.01	11,446,351	.58	8,270	.00
1921	11,317		15,946				8,992,921		40,000		2,958		3,587,587			
1922	27,649		26,813				9,410,453		100,000		10,723		4,244,304			
1923	34,625		24,562				10,213,931		100,000		39,281		4,863,066			
1924	31,153		31,250				11,374,368		110,000		54,662		5,309,203		900	
1925	32,439		26,106				12,558,347		110,000		70,299		4,854,923		1,000	
1921–1925	137,183	.01	124,677	.01			52,550,020	4.72	460,000	.04	177,923	.02	22,859,083	2.04	1,900	.00
1901–1925	2,619,079	.05	351,578	.01			171,316,187	3.49	863,785	.02	358,102	.01	34,698,614	.71	16,966	.00
1926	41,345	.02	45,010	.02			12,736,425	5.02	135,000	.05	51,927	.02	5,124,962	2.02	1,220	.00
1927	46,714	.02	53,755	.02			13,541,172	5.39	100,000	.04	52,000	.02	6,024,806	2.40	10,159	.00

Period	Japan		Netherland East Indies		Philippine Islands		Taiwan		Turkey		Africa		Algeria		Belgian Congo	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600	25,000,000	3.35														
1601–1700	75,000,000	5.90														
1701–1800	1,000,000	.05														
1801–1810	100,000	.03														
1811–1820	100,000	.06														
1821–1830	100,000	.07														
1831–1840	100,000	.05														
1841–1850	100,000	.04														
1801–1850	500,000	.05														
1851–1855	75,000	.05							1,780,000	1.15						
1856–1860	100,000	.07							1,780,000	1.22						
1851–1860	175,000	.06							3,560,000	1.18						
1861–1865	150,000	.08							1,500,000	.84						
1866–1870	200,000	.09							500,000	.23						
1861–1870	350,000	.09							2,000,000	.50						
1871–1875	475,000	.14							250,000	.08						
1851–1875	1,000,000	.10							5,810,000	.56						
1876	280,892								50,000							
1877	355,126								50,000							
1878	318,017								50,000							
1879	292,172								55,267							
1880	332,406								55,267							
1876–1880	1,578,613	.42							260,534	.07						
1871–1880	2,053,613	.29							510,534	.07						

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Japan		Netherland East Indies		Philippine Islands		Taiwan		Turkey		Africa		Algeria		Belgian Congo	
	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent
1881	708,795								55,267		5,000					
1882	679,056								69,574		10,000					
1883	416,031								42,535		14,436					
1884	754,256								42,535		7,652					
1885	742,200								42,535		40,960					
1881–1885	3,300,338	0.75							252,446	0.06	78,048	0.02				
1886	1,036,604								42,535		101,757					
1887	1,030,914								42,535		13,889					
1888	1,363,964								42,535		25,000					
1889	1,386,211								42,535		39,000					
1890	1,365,378								42,535		48,000					
1886–1890	6,183,071	1.10							212,675	.04	227,646	.04				
1881–1890	9,483,409	.95							465,121	.05	305,694	.03				
1891	1,391,548								203,643		76,000					
1892	1,767,459								203,569		118,000					
1893	1,863,675								203,569		142,000					
1894	1,956,565								48,727		199,000					
1895	2,165,084								260,958		222,000					
1891–1895	9,144,331	1.15							920,466	.12	757,000	.10				
1896	2,068,068								225,225		233,000		10,000			
1897	1,748,609								142,157		312,449		10,449			
1898	1,946,648								142,141		427,846		6,846			
1899	1,702,757								142,141		409,131		6,430			
1900	1,729,603		80,659						142,141		50,011		8,359			
1896–1900	9,195,685	1.10	80,659	0.01					793,805	.10	1,432,437	.17	42,084	0.01		
1891–1900	18,340,016	1.13	80,659	.00					1,714,271	.11	2,189,437	.13	42,084	.00		
1876–1900	29,402,038	.98	80,659	.00					2,439,926	.08	2,495,131	.08	42,084	.00		
1851–1900	30,402,038	.76	80,659	.00					8,249,926	.20	2,495,131	.06	42,084	.00		
1801–1900	30,902,038	.61	80,659	.00					8,249,926	.16	2,495,131	.05	42,084	.00		
1901	1,729,603		111,377						429,180		41,485		10,353			
1902	1,819,171		121,919						480,566		127,015		997			
1903	1,887,407		179,445						458,530		374,772		3,987			
1904	1,984,674		182,889						564,685		508,677		19,419			
1905	2,664,842		182,889						37,874		640,226		10,803			
1901–1905	10,086,237	1.21	778,519	.09					1,971,135	.23	1,692,175	.20	45,559	.01		
1906	2,530,093		248,240						37,874		805,051		2,926			
1907	3,073,411		335,454		100		19,162		67,351		1,123,080		35,076			
1908	3,887,397		571,953		1,300				7,971		1,533,474		36,491			
1909	4,130,972		465,980		3,000		49,737		1,717,896		1,588,950		113,074			
1910	4,581,613		465,980		1,800		58,129		1,717,896		1,548,826		100,664			
1906–1910	18,203,486	1.84	2,087,607	.21	6,200	0.00	127,028	0.01	3,548,988	.36	6,599,381	.67	288,231	.03		
1901–1910	28,289,723	1.54	2,866,126	.16	6,200	.00	127,028	.01	5,520,123	.30	8,291,556	.45	333,790	.02		
1911	4,459,087		465,980		3,383		65,298		1,717,896		1,486,837		77,162			
1912	4,932,852		465,980		7,121		108,123		1,509,133		1,790,262		146,613			
1913	4,649,910		465,980		10,850		51,763		1,509,133		1,746,365		150,000		1,454	
1914	4,836,228		400,000		10,300		51,080		1,509,133		1,447,348		150,000		4,770	
1915	5,120,293		400,000		15,148		47,653		1,509,133		1,457,574		150,000		4,770	
1911–1915	23,998,370	2.30	2,197,940	.21	46,802	.00	323,917	.03	7,754,428	.74	7,928,386	.76	673,775	.06	10,994	0.00
1916	5,805,700		400,000		17,643		47,700		500,000		1,353,000		150,000		11,000	
1917	7,111,700		400,000		4,019		39,600		400,000		1,332,500		150,000		10,300	
1918	6,600,400		1,286,000		4,138		26,900		400,000		1,256,515		170,813		10,500	
1919	4,950,468		1,006,842		8,409		25,000		100,000		1,271,694		170,813		10,000	
1920	4,892,380		1,027,932		22,118		20,000		100,000		1,231,670		150,000		10,673	
1916–1920	29,360,648	3.22	4,120,774	.45	56,327	.01	159,200	.02	1,500,000	.16	6,445,379	.71	791,626	.09	52,473	.01
1911–1920	53,359,018	2.73	6,318,714	.32	103,129	.01	483,117	.02	9,254,428	.47	14,373,765	.73	1,465,401	.07	63,467	.00
1921	4,187,666		1,021,994		26,191		26,525		100,000		1,060,745		48,869		5,819	
1922	3,886,301		1,109,657		27,994		23,437		8,037		1,333,221		13,214		6,558	
1923	3,597,351		1,578,983		3,776		23,437		8,037		1,704,086		159,853		8,745	
1924	3,542,320		2,083,256		43,113		11,008		219,906		1,992,759		183,806		10,000	
1925	4,835,497		2,385,016		68,544		13,162		219,906		1,428,619		96,450		10,000	
1921–1925	20,049,135	1.80	8,178,906	.75	169,618	.02	97,569	.01	555,886	.05	7,519,430	.68	502,192	.05	41,122	.00
1901–1925	101,697,876	2.07	17,363,746	.35	278,947	.01	707,714	.01	15,330,437	.31	30,184,751	.62	2,301,383	.05	104,589	.00
1926	4,776,110	1.88	2,363,829	.93	44,013	.02	14,314	.01	225,050	.09	1,280,623	.51	169,141	.07	10,000	.00
1927	4,800,000	1.91	2,285,801	.91	28,356	.01	15,000	.01	225,050	.09	1,274,033	.50	118,087	.05	10,609	.00

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	German Southwest Africa		Rhodesia		Union of South Africa		Other Africa		Australasia		Australia		New Zealand		Various	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600																
1601–1700																
1701–1800																
1801–1810																
1811–1820																
1821–1830																
1831–1840																
1841–1850																
1801–1855																
1851–1855																
1856–1860																
1851–1860																
1861–1856									10,000	0.01	10,000	0.01				
1866–1870									71,159	.03	22,973	.01	48,186	0.01		
1861–1870									81,159	.02	32,973	.01	48,186	.01		
1871–1875									597,712	.18	374,538	.11	223,174	.07		
1851–1857									678,871	.07	407,511	.04	271,360	.03		
1876									70,204		57,521		12,683			
1877									70,204		36,311		33,893			
1878									70,204		47,185		23,019			
1879									175,704		155,059		20,645			
1880									175,704		155,704		20,000			
1876–1880									562,020	.15	451,780	.12	110,240	.03		
1871–1880									1,159,732	.16	826,318	.12	333,414	.04		
1881							5,000		127,638		108,753		18,885			
1882							10,000		64,655		58,961		5,694			
1883							14,436		116,064		99,238		16,826			
1884							7,652		145,482		120,568		24,914			
1885							40,960		810,842		794,218		16,624			
1881–1885							78,048	0.02	1,264,681	.29	1,181,738	.27	82,943	.02		
1886					1,000		100,757		945,328		933,220		12,108			
1887					4,000		9,889		206,472		185,663		20,809			
1888					25,000				3,867,991		3,867,588		403			
1889					39,000				6,575,566		6,551,461		24,105			
1890					48,000				8,301,707		8,269,080		32,627			
1886–1890					117,000	0.02	110,646	.02	19,897,064	3.53	19,807,012	3.51	90,052	.02		
1881–1890					117,000	.01	188,694	.02	21,161,745	2.12	20,988,750	2.10	172,995	.02		
1891					76,000				10,002,096		9,974,073		28,023			
1892					118,000				13,439,018		13,416,965		22,053			
1893					142,000				20,501,508		20,447,331		54,177			
1894					199,000				18,073,455		18,032,655		40,800			
1895					222,000				12,507,335		12,443,535		63,800			
1891–1895					757,000	.10			74,523,412	9.41	74,314,559	9.39	208,853	.02		
1896					223,000				12,238,700		12,175,800		62,900			
1897					302,000				11,878,000		11,750,900		127,100			
1898					421,000				10,491,100		10,319,900		171,200			
1899					400,000		2,701		12,737,598		12,533,631		203,967			
1900			951		38,000		2,701		13,340,263		13,062,481		277,782			
1896–1900			951	0.00	1,384,000	.16	5,402	.00	60,685,661	7.31	59,842,712	7.21	842,949	.10		
1891–1900			951	.00	2,141,000	.13	5,402	.00	135,209,073	8.34	134,157,271	8.28	1,051,802	.06		
1876–1900			951	.00	2,258,000	.07	194,096	.01	156,932,838	5.23	155,597,801	5.19	1,335,037	.04		
1851–1900			951	.00	2,258,000	.06	194,096	.00	157,611,709	3.91	156,005,312	3.87	1,606,397	.04		
1801–1900			951	.00	2,258,000	.05	194,096	.00	157,611,709	3.09	156,005,312	3.06	1,606,397	.03		
1901			3,132		28,000				10,230,046		9,658,912		571,134			
1902			3,455		122,573				8,026,037		7,351,841		674,196			
1903			20,715		350,070				9,682,856		8,770,942		911,914			
1904			70,146		416,262		2,850		14,558,892		13,464,431		1,094,461			
1905			89,278		540,145				15,035,486		13,855,742		1,179,744			
1901–1905			186,716	.02	1,457,050	.17	2,850	.00	57,533,317	6.84	53,101,868	6.31	4,431,449	.53		
1906	50,000		110,575		641,550				13,909,371		12,518,835		1,390,536			
1907	225,064		147,324		715,030		586		17,949,099		16,386,496		1,562,603			
1908	402,672		283,424		809,611		1,276		17,175,099		15,443,763		1,731,336			
1909	397,431		262,133		814,557		1,755		16,359,284		14,545,454		1,813,830			
1910	400,421		217,633		827,090		3,018		21,545,828		19,834,593		1,711,235			
1906–1910	1,475,588	0.15	1,021,089	.10	3,807,838	.39	6,635	.00	86,938,681	8.78	78,729,141	7.95	8,209,540	.83		
1901–1910	1,475,588	.08	1,207,805	.07	5,264,888	.28	9,485	.00	144,471,998	7.89	131,831,009	7.20	12,640,989	.69		

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	German Southwest Africa		Rhodesia		Union of South Africa		Other Africa		Australasia		Australia		New Zealand		Various	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1911	271,909	-------	187,641	-------	896,539	-------	53,586	-------	16,578,421	-------	15,267,378	-------	1,311,043	-------	----------	------
1912	374,989	-------	176,532	-------	1,018,842	-------	73,286	-------	14,737,944	-------	13,936,779	-------	801,165	-------	----------	------
1913	500,000	-------	142,390	-------	952,521	-------	----------	-------	18,128,577	-------	17,152,961	-------	975,616	-------	----------	------
1914	250,000	-------	150,793	-------	890,562	-------	1,223	-------	11,000,000	-------	10,400,838	-------	599,162	-------	----------	------
1915	150,000	-------	185,233	-------	965,914	-------	1,657	-------	9,250,000	-------	8,292,459	-------	957,541	-------	----------	------
1911–1915	1,546,898	0.15	842,589	0.08	4,724,378	0.46	129,752	0.01	69,694,942	6.65	65,050,415	6.21	4,644,527	0.44	----------	------
1916	----------	-------	200,700	-------	968,900	-------	22,400	-------	10,700,000	-------	9,913,500	-------	786,500	-------	----------	------
1917	----------	-------	212,000	-------	938,100	-------	22,100	-------	10,000,000	-------	9,212,848	-------	787,152	-------	----------	------
1918	----------	-------	175,722	-------	877,500	-------	21,980	-------	9,934,354	-------	9,434,354	-------	500,000	-------	----------	------
1919	----------	-------	180,591	-------	891,304	-------	18,986	-------	7,187,919	-------	6,734,358	-------	453,561	-------	6,269	------
1920	----------	-------	164,865	-------	891,304	-------	14,828	-------	2,684,910	-------	2,231,343	-------	453,567	-------	5,179	------
1916–1920	----------	-------	933,878	.10	4,567,108	.50	100,294	.01	40,507,183	4.45	37,526,403	4.12	2,980,780	.33	11,448	0.00
1911–1920	1,546,898	.08	1,776,467	.09	9,291,486	.48	230,046	.01	110,202,125	5.63	102,576,818	5.24	7,625,307	.39	11,448	.00
1921	----------	-------	161,856	-------	830,839	-------	13,362	-------	5,362,247	-------	4,908,680	-------	453,567	-------	3,437	------
1922	----------	-------	184,399	-------	1,115,676	-------	13,374	-------	11,484,904	-------	11,108,734	-------	376,170	-------	453	------
1923	----------	-------	161,492	-------	1,373,930	-------	66	-------	13,818,701	-------	13,291,210	-------	527,491	-------	----------	------
1924	----------	-------	401,277	-------	1,397,676	-------	----------	-------	10,769,882	-------	10,269,859	-------	500,023	-------	----------	------
1925	----------	-------	157,972	-------	1,162,937	-------	1,260	-------	10,841,034	-------	10,420,609	-------	420,425	-------	----------	------
1921–1925	----------	-------	1,066,996	.10	5,881,058	.53	28,062	.00	52,276,768	4.70	49,999,092	4.50	2,277,676	.20	3,890	.00
1901–1925	3,022,486	.06	4,051,268	.08	20,437,432	.42	267,593	.01	306,950,891	6.26	284,406,919	5.80	22,543,972	.46	15,338	.00
1926	----------	-------	117,763	.05	982,594	.39	1,125	.00	11,225,360	4.42	10,800,073	4.25	425,287	.17	----------	------
1927	----------	-------	131,585	.05	1,013,070	.40	682	.00	7,314,638	2.91	6,887,280	2.74	427,358	.17	----------	------

DATA FROM THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in support of the data and statement already made, I ask unanimous consent that the material I now submit be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1952.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Weshington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Some time ago I submitted a memorandum containing the pro and con arguments on the reestablishment of the convertible gold standard. I herewith am submitting several new sections that deal with the questions that you raised with me.

Sections I and II include a consideration of the problem from the gold miners' viewpoint. Section III presents the pro and con arguments on the question of the Government increasing the statutory price of gold. Section IV is identical with the first memorandum submitted on the pro and con arguments on the reestablishment of the convertible gold standard.

Sincerely yours,

MEYER JACOBSTEIN,
Senior Specialist in Money and Banking.

In this report gold is considered from two points of view: First, as a commodity, and secondly, but more importantly, as the basis of our monetary system.

The contents are presented in four separate sections as follows:

Section I, recent developments affecting the gold-mining industry.

Section II, selected information on assistance given to gold-mining companies by foreign governments.

Section III, a compilation of statements setting forth the effects of a reduction of the gold content of the dollar or changing the price of gold.

Section IV, the case for and against the return of the convertible gold standard.

Prepared by Meyer Jacobstein, senior specialist, assisted by Harry Lamar, research assistant, Senior Specialist Section, Legislative Reference Service, June 24, 1952.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AFFECTING THE GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

The subject of this discussion is gold. Gold may be considered from two points of view. First, gold as a monetary unit, and second, gold as a commodity. This second aspect has been overlooked in most discussions of this subject; therefore, we feel it important to deal first with gold as a commodity.

In an address, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the president of the General Motors Corp., once stated,[1] "I would like to say * * * gold should be considered for what it really is, namely, just another commodity."

THE TREATMENT OF GOLD AS A COMMODITY

If it be true that gold should be considered as a commodity then the owners of the domestic gold mines have a right to expect the same consideration that is enjoyed by owners of any other industry or economic group that produces commodities.

This is certainly not the case. Gold is the only commodity the marketing of which has been completely, totally taken over by the Government as a monopoly. The gold producers in the United States can only sell their gold to the Government or to parties licensed by the Government. They must sell their product at a fixed price established by the Government. This price is $35 per fine ounce, and it has remained unchanged since 1934.

Contrasted with the monopolist restrictions of the United States Government on the marketing of domestically produced gold is the relative freedom of action allowed by other governments in the export, import, or domestic sale of gold at free market prices. (See section on Government assistance to gold-mining companies.)

For example, the Union of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia allow their miners to sell approximately 40 percent of their production on the world's free markets. The Philippine Government permits 75 percent of its gold industry's output to be sold on the free world markets. Gold miners in Canada and Australia may sell all their production on the free markets, with the specification that premium sales must be made against payment in United States dollars. Canadian producers also lose their right to gold mining subsidies if they take advantage of free market sales.

These governments are all members of the International Monetary Fund and subject to the same rules that apply to the United States as to sales of gold at premium prices. As we shall see later, the actions taken by some of the major gold-producing countries as regards premium sales and subsidies to gold producers are either exceptions or outright violations of the concepts set forth by the International Monetary Fund.

Domestically, the Government provides the gold producers their only market, directly through Treasury purchases, or indirectly through issue of licenses. Domestic uses aside from monetary purposes, are limited to the arts and industrial purposes.

The domestic producer of gold is denied the right to export his commodity except in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and under authority of an export license granted by the Treasury Department. In the event that a license to export gold is obtained, the exporter must make the sale at the price established by the Government of $35 per fine ounce, even though the price in some foreign countries might be substantially higher than $35.

THE TREATMENT OF GOLD IN RELATION TO OTHER COMMODITIES

By its gold policy the Government affords the gold producer a constant but narrow market for his product. In offering this constant but narrow market at a fixed price the Government does not take into consideration increases or decreases in the cost of production. Neither does it consider the availability of higher prices for this commodity in other markets.

During World War II, we found it necessary to establish a price-control program over most commodities. Inherent in this system, however, were the provisions for raising prices when costs rose to the detriment of the producers of those commodities. In the Korean war, price control has been

[1] Commercial and Financial Chronicle, November 8, 1951, Charles E. Wilson, "Gold—Just Another Commodity," pp. 8, 41.

reintroduced. These new price controls also have specific provisions for allowing prices of commodities to rise when the costs of producing those commodities have increased. The price of gold, however, has remained unchanged since 1934, even though labor and material costs to the mine owners have increased.

The unequal treatment of gold as a commodity is also evident when we consider the manner in which other commodities are handled under the Government's price-support program. In the farm-price-support program for, say, cotton, the farmer may obtain a loan in the amount of 90 percent of the parity price of his cotton. In the event that the market changes favorably the farmer can sell the cotton, gain the higher price, and repay the loan. If he is unable to obtain a higher price, he can then turn the cotton over to the Government as payment for the loan. Further, if the farmer can sell his cotton at a favorable price in France, for example, he is not prohibited by the Government from doing so.

In the case of gold, domestic producers are barred from sale of their gold in markets where the price is higher than $35 per fine ounce. In the postwar years, 1946–51, the free gold markets of the world have continually traded in gold at prices higher than $35 per fine ounce.

The inequality of barring the export of domestically mined gold for sale in the world free markets at premium prices can be shown in another way. For example, some of the principal countries of the world allow their mine owners to sell a portion of the gold production in the free markets. Since February 1949, the Union of South Africa has allowed a part of its gold production to be sold at premium prices. At present it allows up to 40 percent of its annual gold production to be sold on the free gold markets.

It is interesting to note in connection with premium gold markets, that the Bank of France acknowledged that after purchasing gold in the United States for $35 per ounce, it had in turn sold the gold to private citizens at prices ranging from $40 to $44 per fine ounce. Further, the French Government has even minted and sold gold coins which have no legal tender status and thereby making as high as a 33-percent profit on the transaction.

EFFECTS OF GOLD POLICY ON GOLD PRODUCERS

As an industry, gold mining has always tended to flourish in times of depression and suffer in periods of great economic activity. This is due to the fact that production costs are lower in deflationary periods, and, in the United States, operation costs mainly reflect labor costs. In periods of depressions, gold miners, to protect their rich reserves, usually develop less accessible deposits, where operating and production costs are higher. Likewise in periods of increased economic activity, they tend to work the richer deposits in order to compensate for loss of profits resulting from the increased costs of production. Mining profits, therefore, should be more or less stable from year to year.

In face of rising costs and a fixed price, the mining industry in the United States in recent years has not been able to shift its operation to absorb these higher costs resulting from inflation.

There are those who contend that the United States Government arbitrarily set the price of gold at $35 per fine ounce. Further, it is contended that this price, high in relation to the then existing statutory price, allowed the gold producers to reap windfall profits; therefore, it is contended that the domestic gold mining industry has no right to complain that the current gold price is too low in relation to present costs.

That the President by proclamation on January 31, 1934, set the official price of gold at $35 per fine ounce is, of course, true. It is not true, however, that the price of $35 was a purely arbitrary figure. The price of gold on world markets, during the period September 1931–January 1934, was well above the statutory price of $20.67. Gold prices quoted in the annual reports of the Director of the United States Mint belie the charge that the $35 figure was arbitrary.

Average price in London per fine ounce[1]

Year:	
1930	$20.68
1931	22.51
1932	28.73
1933	30.38
1934	34.94

[1] Conversion on basis of legal monetary parity; exchange not a factor. Source: Annual Report of the Director of the Mint, 1935, pp, 90–91.

During the depression the people in this country, as well as foreign countries, were fearful of future economic developments. There was a natural urge to hold or hoard gold as a protection against further deterioration in economic conditions. The price of gold was quite naturally bid up in the world markets and in the United States as well. For a time gold flowed out of the United States at an alarming rate. There was considerable domestic hoarding.[2]

The knowledge abroad that there was hoarding of gold in the United States and the knowledge of the anticipated action of the Roosevelt administration undoubtedly had an influence in pushing up the price of gold in the world markets.

To prevent exportation of gold, among other reasons, the Treasury Department in September 1933, and later the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, started buying gold at prices substantially higher than $20.67. The following is a table of daily price quotations for newly mined domestic gold in the United States, September 8, 1933, to January 31, 1934:

	Price[1]
Sept. 8, 1933	$29.62
Sept. 30, 1933	31.46
Oct. 31, 1933	32.12
Nov. 30, 1933	33.93
Dec. 30, 1933	34.06
Jan. 15, 1934	34.06
Jan. 30, 1934	34.45

[1] Prices shown from Sept. 8 through Oct. 24, 1933, represent the price at which the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to sell newly mined domestic gold received on consignment under authority of Executive order of Aug. 29, 1933. Quotations from Oct. 25, 1933, through Jan. 15, 1934, represent the price fixed for newly mined domestic gold by the RFC in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the President. Quotations from Jan. 15 to Jan. 31, 1934, represent the price at which the Federal Reserve Bank of New York as fiscal agent purchased newly mined domestic gold consigned to the mints and assay offices.

Source: Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1934, p. 205.

Thus the price of $35 per fine ounce actually approximated market conditions prevailing during 1933 up to January 31, 1934. Some believe the price of gold might have gone even higher had not the United States set the price at $35 per fine ounce.

[2] President Hoover made two separate appeals, one on February 1, 1932, and another on March 7, 1932, exhorting the American people to refrain from hoarding currency. On February 4, 1932, President Hoover announced that $1,300,000,000 had been hoarded, and a month later, on March 7, this figure had risen to $1,500,000,000, which was about 25 percent of the currency in circulation.

Despite the increase in the price of gold from $20.67 to $35 per fine ounce in 1934, the domestic gold mining industry is now and has been since the end of World War II at a disadvantage by rising costs and the inaccessibility of world markets.

The following table illustrates how the relationship between the price of gold and other commodities has changed since 1926. The year 1926 is commonly chosen because it was a normal year as far as prices and economic activity are concerned.

Selected indexes of commodity prices and the price of gold

Year	Wholesale prices, all commodities	Wholesale prices, metals and metal products	Consumers' Price Index	U. S. Government official gold price
1926	100	100	100	100
1927	95.4	96.3	98.0	100
1928	96.7	97.0	97.0	100
1929	95.3	100.5	97.0	100
1930	86.4	92.1	94.0	100
1931	73.0	84.5	86.0	100
1932	64.8	80.2	77.0	100
1933	65.9	79.8	73.0	(1)
1934	74.9	86.9	76.0	[2]169
1935	80.0	87.0	78.0	169
1936	80.0	95.7	78.0	169
1937	86.3	95.7	81.0	169
1938	78.6	94.4	80.0	169
1939	77.1	95.8	79.0	169
1940	78.6	99.4	79.0	169
1941	87.3	103.8	83.0	169
1942	98.8	103.8	92.0	169
1943	103.1	103.8	98.0	169
1944	104.0	103.8	99.0	169
1945	105.8	104.7	102.0	169
1946	121.1	115.5	110.0	169
1947	152.1	145.0	126.0	169
1948	165.1	163.6	135.0	169
1949	155.0	170.2	134.0	169
1950	161.5	173.6	136.0	169
1951	180.4	189.1	147.0	169

[1] Although the official mint price of gold remained at $20.67 per fine ounce of gold until Jan. 31, 1934, the Treasury price for newly mined domestic gold on Dec. 30, 1933, was $34.06 per fine ounce. (Annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, 1934.)

[2] This index figure of 169 is based on the statutory price of $35 an ounce set forth in the Presidential proclamation of Jan. 31, 1934.

Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Monthly Labor Reviews.

From the preceding table it can be seen that the price of gold increased 69 percent in 1933–34 and has remained there. The increase in the gold price was from $20.67 to $35 per fine ounce. The wholesale price index on all commodities has risen 80 percent, in the period 1926–51. The wholesale price index for metals and metal products has risen 89 percent, fully 20 percentage points more than the increase in the price of gold.

For a period of 24 years, 1927–50, the index of the price of gold was higher than the wholesale price index of all commodities. That is, from 1926 to 1932 the price of gold remained stationary while the level of wholesale prices declined. This was, of course, the result of the depression. For the period 1933–51 the price of gold rose 69 percent and has remained there. The price of gold started rising in early 1933 and was finally fixed at $35 per fine ounce on January 31, 1934. On the other hand, the level of wholesale prices, declined from 1926 to 1932. Thereafter, wholesale prices have moved upward until, at the end of 1951 they were 80 percent above the levels of 1926. This increase is 11 percentage points greater than the rise in the price of gold. Similarly the index of wholesale prices remained below the index of the price of gold until 1949. The level of consumer prices is still below the gold price, based on price relationships prevailing in 1926.

There is no doubt that the gold mining industry enjoyed an advantageous cost-price relationship over a period of some 16 years. With the depression and resulting low pro-

duction costs in the country, the gold mining industry was doing well prior to the increase in the price of gold. From 1934 to 1942 its advantage of price over cost was even greater, since the price levels of other commodities did not rise proportionately to the rise in the price of gold paid by the Government.

With the advent of World War II, the picture changed. Other prices and therefore, costs increased somewhat. Material and labor shortages appeared. Furthermore, production was severely restricted because the gold mining industry was not classed as a vital industry in the war effort.

Action has been taken by several gold mining companies to collect damages allegedly resulting from the War Production Board's Limitation Order L. 208 (7 FR. 7992) issued October 8, 1942.

In *Idaho Maryland Mines Corp.* v. *the United States* before the United States Court of Claims, the Idaho Maryland Mines Corp. alleged in part the following:[3]

"Plaintiff alleges that whereas Order L-208 recited and purported on its face to be necessary and appropriate in the public interest, and to promote the national defense, for the preservation of critical materials for defense, for private account, and for export, which materials were used in the maintenance and operation of gold mines, numerous circumstances conclusively rebut the presumption that the order was reasonably calculated to accomplish such manifest purpose, and the order was in fact arbitrary and confiscatory.

"It is alleged that the particular critical materials used in gold mining were, at the time the order was issued and thereafter, subject to allocation and restriction by virtue of duly issued War Production Board priority regulations; that only a relatively small amount of critical material was actually used in gold mining; that the limitation order did not allocate, restrict, or distribute materials or equipment, but merely prohibited the removal of any ore from plaintiff's mine, above or below ground; that notwithstanding the statement in the order that gold mining was nonessential to the national defense, mining equipment valued at more than $300,000,000 was produced and manufactured in the United States during the years 1942 through 1945, and exported to foreign countries; that to the extent of such exports, both the critical materials used and the manpower employed to produce such equipment, were diverted from national defense with the approval of defendant.

"It is alleged that defendant at no time found or determined that gold mining was a public evil requiring regulation for the protection of the public peace, health, or safety; that defendant prepared and issued the order hastily, without any notice to, or opportunity to be heard by, plaintiff or the gold mining industry who were thus deprived of their right to be heard on their own behalf by the War Production Board before the mines were summarily closed; that no other industry was directly and completely closed down by defendant during the war; that despite the fact that gold and silver are analogous metals with analogous uses for industry and as the basis of the national currency, the silver mines were allowed to operate at all times.

"It is alleged that the true purpose of defendant in closing the mines was to alleviate the manpower shortage in the nonferrous metal mines, particularly the copper and zinc mines; that in issuing the order, the War Production Board did not exercise its own independent judgment, but acted under pressure from the War and Navy Departments; that as a manpower measure, the order was unenforceable and no attempt was ever made to so enforce it because no agency of the defendant, including the War Production Board, had the right or power to compel the transfer of labor from one employer to another, or from one industry to another."

After the war, inflation with increased costs made production prohibitive for many mines. Current domestic gold production is only 43 percent of production of 1941. In a survey of the gold-mining industry for 1951, Standard & Poor's described present conditions as follows: "* * * domestic gold mines have been slow to recover from recent wartime restrictions. Because of an unchanged $35 gold price and mounting costs, many mines have never reopened. Others have failed to reattain full-scale operations."[4]

All mines which were able to resume operations found that profits were lower and the profit dollar dropped progressively in terms of purchasing power. For example, in terms of consumer purchasing power, profits of $1,000,000 in 1951 would only have had two-thirds of the purchasing power the same profits had enjoyed in 1926.

A comparison of prices alone does not tell the whole story. The disadvantage in which domestic gold miners find themselves today could better be told in terms of wage costs, since in the domestic gold mining operating costs mainly reflect labor costs. Unfortunately, few published figures on labor costs are available. The final answer as to the effects of the Government's current gold policy must be illustrated in terms of profits. Here, too, we are handicapped by the nature of the domestic gold-mining industry, since a large portion (30 percent) of the gold produced at present is on a by-product basis. Profit figures for the gold-mining industry as a whole, and for most mines producing gold on a byproduct basis are therefore unavailable. An effective gage of the profit picture for illustrative purposes, can, however, be drawn from the Homestake Gold Mine in South Dakota.

Homestake Mining Co. is normally the largest gold-producing mine in the United States. The following table shows the Homestake's net profits after depletion and depreciation for the period 1926–51:

Net profits of Homestake Mining Co.

Year	Net profits [1]	Cost per milled ton [2]
1926	$2,283,996	[3]
1927	3,359,368	[3]
1928	1,473,547	[3]
1929	1,044,070	[3]
1930	1,492,871	[3]
1931	2,436,599	[3]
1932	2,495,789	$3.29
1933	5,077,743	[3]
1934	7,104,352	[3]
1935	8,144,528	[3]
1936	7,650,452	[3]
1937	7,188,854	5.53
1938	6,940,848	[3]
1939	7,103,698	4.94
1940	6,091,137	4.63
1941	5,682,999	4.50
1942	4,416,322	3.57
1943	364,437	12.18
1944	[4] −1,148,220	nil
1945	[4] −478,228	10.98
1946	2,361,657	6.93
1947	2,585,047	7.85
1948	2,445,868	8.23
1949	2,869,446	8.63
1950	3,659,065	8.40
1951	[1] 1,820,000	[3]

[1] Net profits for all years except 1951, are after depreciation and depletion; for 1951, net profits are after depreciation but before percentage depletion.
[2] Cost per ton is not available for all years.
[3] Not available.
[4] For years 1944–45 there was a net loss or deficit; very little ore was milled.

[3] The United States Court of Claims, *Idaho Maryland Mines Corp.* v. *the United States* (No. 50182, decided May 6, 1952).

[4] Standard & Poor's Industry Surveys, Metals, gold and silver, February 7, 1952, p. 2.

The preceding table shows that profits of the Homestake Mining Co. for the postwar years have been well below the level of profits for the period 1933–43. The trend of profits lends itself to three definite phases.

The following is the average annual profits of Homestake Mine for these three periods:

Average annual profits of Homestake

Period:	
1926–32	$2,083,749
1933–42	6,540,099
1943–51	1,606,787

The cost figures that are available also show the disadvantage that has accrued to the gold industry, as a result of inflation. Costs at the Homestake Mine per milled ton in 1932 were $3.29. The year 1932 was the depth of the depression in the United States and the costs figure is slightly lower than the costs which probably prevailed for the previous years 1926–31. From 1943 to the present, costs per milled ton have continually run from 2 to almost 3 times higher than the costs prevailing in 1932. It will be noted that costs in the postwar years are at least twice as high as those which prevailed in the period 1933–42.

Since the Homestake Mining Co. is the most profitable single gold mining operation in the United States it is evident that many mines could not have resumed operations because of the unfavorable cost-price relationship.

The following table shows gold production for the same period, 1926–51; and includes domestic, world, and Homestake's production for selected years:

World gold production, United States gold production and the production of Homestake Mining Co., 1926–51

[Gold in fine ounces]

Year	World production	United States production	Homestake Mining Corp. production	Homestake as percent of United States
1926	19,252,000	2,232,526	[1]	
1927	19,180,000	2,107,032	[1]	
1928	19,399,000	2,148,064	[1]	
1929	19,673,000	2,058,993	314,000	15
1930	20,836,000	2,138,723	[1]	
1931	22,329,000	2,224,729	[1]	
1932	24,306,000	2,269,353	479,000	21
1933	25,367,000	2,291,697	[1]	
1934	27,930,000	2,778,789	472,000	17
1935	29,999,000	3,236,951	[1]	
1936	32,930,000	3,782,667	[1]	
1937	35,723,000	4,117,078	550,000	13
1938	37,603,000	4,267,469	[1]	
1939	39,651,000	4,673,042	568,000	12
1940	40,907,000	4,869,949	542,000	11
1941	40,332,000	4,750,865	632,000	13
1942	35,582,000	3,457,000	487,000	14
1943	28,900,000	1,363,815	104,000	7
1944	26,200,000	998,394		
1945	26,100,000	954,572	53,000	6
1946	27,500,000	1,573,073	298,000	19
1947	28,900,000	2,107,188	393,000	19
1948	29,700,000	2,014,257	361,000	18
1949	30,600,000	1,991,783	447,000	22
1950	31,000,000	2,392,000	549,000	23
1951	[1]	[2] 2,000,000	[1]	

[1] Not available.
[2] Estimated.

Source: World production and United States from Annual Report of the Director of the Mint; Homestake production from Standard & Poor's, Industry Surveys.

The preceding table shows that world production has surpassed its level of production of 1926 and has recovered to some extent, that is, between 75 and 80 percent of its record production of 1940. On the other hand, production in the United States has continued, for the postwar years, at a level equal to that of the period 1926–32, but it has never recovered fully. Production presently is approximately only 40 percent of the record domestic production of 1940.

It is interesting to note that the Homestake production has been approximately

one-fifth of the total domestic production of the United States in the postwar years. Its share of total production is much larger than in previous years. This would tend to point up the fact that production costs have prohibited many of the less prosperous gold mines from reopening.

Comparing the trend of world and United States production of gold, it can be seen that other major gold-producing countries have been more successful in recovering and maintaining their production, although they too have experienced inflated costs. The high levels of world production reflect the discovery of new gold fields and use of modern technology, whereas the production in the United States has been from older, more depleted gold fields.

Among the reasons for these higher levels of gold production in other countries has been the treatment of the gold mining industries in these countries. We shall, therefore, briefly explore governmental action in some of the major gold producing countries as regards their mining industries.

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE TO GOLD MINING COMPANIES IN THE MAJOR GOLD PRODUCING COUNTRIES

The major gold producing countries of the world have experienced their own special problems of cost-price relationship in regard to gold production. This is true on the cost side since the inflation of the postwar period has been world wide, varying, of course, in degree in the different countries.

As to the price of gold the International Monetary Fund has opposed, basically, most governmental action that might have the effect of increasing the price of gold above $35 per fine ounce. One of the primary aims of the IMF is, "to promote exchange stability" and "to maintain orderly exchange arrangements among members." Since exchange parities are expressed in terms of gold, it is laid down that no member shall buy gold at a price above, or sell gold below, par value plus or minus a small prescribed margin.

Since December 11, 1947, the fund has deprecated both the continued and increasing external purchases and sales of gold at premium prices and measures to subsidize the production of gold. The fund was forced to modify its position as to subsidies very soon after its first policy pronouncement, and on September 28, 1951, it had to drop its gold policing policy, admitting its inability to police the traffic in gold at premium prices.

It has developed then that most of the major gold-producing countries have actively sought to alleviate the disadvantageous position of their gold-mining industries. This action has taken a variety of forms. Direct subsidization, tax relief, including special depletion and depreciation allowances, special exchange-rate treatment, and permitting sales at premium prices have all been important forms of assistance.

The sterling area and some 30 other countries devalued their currencies in 1949. This devaluation increased the price of gold in terms of the devalued currencies. While the primary aim of these currencies adjustments was not a rise in the gold price, the gold miners in the devaluating countries benefited.

The two following sections describe the afore-mentioned governmental assistance to the gold-mining industry. The first covers the postwar period through 1950. The second, the action that has taken place between January 1951 and June 1952. Both of these sections were written by Mr. E. E. Billings, analyst, International, Fiscal, and Financial Affairs, of the Economic Section of the Legislative Reference Service, the Library of Congress.

WORLD GOLD PRODUCTION IN 1951

I. World gold production was smaller in 1951 than in 1950. This is the first year during the postwar period that gold production has failed to increase moderately. The greatest absolute decline was in the United States, and the largest relative declines were in Ecuador and Venezuela where gold mining has practically stopped. Among the large gold producers only some of the countries of Asia, whose production is still far below prewar, Australia, the Gold Coast, and Colombia, showed an increase in production.

Throughout the postwar period world gold production has averaged only about three-fourths of prewar production. This decline has been very general among almost all gold producing countries and areas. Again, the largest absolute decline has been in the United States. The largest relative declines were in the countries of Asia. The only important exception has been in Central America, where gold production in the postwar period has been about three times its prewar level. While the decline in gold production from prewar to postwar has been general, differences in the rates of change have produced large shifts in the relative importance of different gold producing areas. The Sterling Area's gold production has increased from about 50 percent of world production before the war to 62 percent in 1949 and to 60 percent in 1951. Central American production has increased from less than one-half of one percent to almost one and one-half per cent of world production. On the other hand, United States production has declined from about 13 percent of world production to less than 10 percent, and production in Asia has declined from 10 percent of the total to less than 4 percent.

Many of the most important gold producing countries devalued their currencies near the end of 1949. It might have been expected that gold production in the following year would increase appreciably in the devaluing countries inasmuch as gold is the only commodity for which the national currency price would be expected to increase to the full extent of the devaluation and its national currency costs of production ought not to have risen differently from those of other domestic goods. In fact, however, production in 1950 was smaller than in 1949 in almost every devaluing country and larger than in 1949 in almost every non-devaluing country.

II. The table of world gold production on the opposite page has been revised in two important particulars. More importantly, the world total that is being measured has been reduced to the world excluding all iron-curtain countries. Formerly the world total referred to production of the world excluding only the U. S. S. R. There are no reliable data on gold production in China, Hungary, Rumania, and other iron-curtain countries, and world estimates including them cannot have any appreciable degree of reliability. The significance, moreover, of gold-production data excluding the iron-curtain countries is probably greater than that of data including those countries even if production in those countries could be known reliably. Gold is an important part of the financial mechanism of the free world. The importance of gold-production data lies therefore in the knowledge that it provides for the interpretation of financial events in countries for which gold plays a role in financial events.

The data have also been regrouped by economic areas rather than by continents as was formerly done, and the economic areas have been listed in the order of their importance as gold producers. The continental totals are shown at the bottom of the table.

The 1951 estimates are based upon complete data for the year from 30 countries whose production accounts for approximately 96 percent of the total. The estimates for New Zealand, Peru, and French Africa, and for a number of the small producers for whom separate entries are not shown, are derived from data covering less than the full year. For several countries no information on 1951 is available but rough estimates are included in the area and world totals.

III. Estimates of world gold production are made by a number of governmental and private agencies. The differences between the available estimates reflect primarily the extent to which attempts have been made to include data for the U. S. S. R. and for other iron-curtain countries and from the differing amounts of these estimates. The available estimates are summarized below (in millions of United States dollars):

	1937	1948	1949	1950	1951
I. M. F.: World, excluding all iron curtain countries	1,034	785	817	844	826
Samuel Montagu & Co.: World excluding U. S. S. R.	------	792	831	854	830
U. S. Bureau of Mines: World, excluding U. S. S. R.	1,059	798	833	861	-----
U. S. Federal Reserve: World, excluding U. S. S. R.	1,042	794	826	------	-----
B. I. S.: World, excluding U. S. S. R.	------	805	840	868	-----
Samuel Montagu & Co.: World, including U. S. S. R.	------	862	901	924	900
U. S. Bureau of Mines: World, including U. S. S. R.	1,247	1,043	1,078	1,106	-----

IV. Comparing the amount of world gold production in countries outside the iron curtain for any period with the increase during the period in the official gold holdings of those countries indicates the extent to which the gold producers or the monetary authorities have made net sales of gold to industrial users, private hoarders, or the iron curtain countries. During the period 1914–21 official gold stocks increased by an amount approximately equal to new gold production. During the period 1922–30 official stocks increased by an amount equal to about 75 percent of gold production, and during the thirties they increased by an amount equal to about 20 percent more than gold production. During the entire postwar period, however, the increase in official gold stocks has been very much less than the amount of gold production. The provisional estimate for 1951 shows that the increase in official gold stocks during the year was exceptionally small and that in the first and last quarters of the year official gold stocks actually declined. The data for recent years and for the quarters of 1951 are as follows:

	Gold production	Increase in stocks	Increase in stocks as a percentage of production
1948	785	380	48
1949	817	480	59
1950	844	415	49
1951:			
I	207	−5	−7
II		120	58
III		60	29
IV		−40	−19
Total, 1951	826	125	15

World gold production in 1951

[In millions of United States dollars at 35 United States dollars per ounce]

	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	Basis of 1951 estimates
World total [1]	1,034	1,117	1,190	1,264	1,247	736	752	767	[2] 785	[2] 817	[2] 844	[2] 826	
Sterling area	546.23	576.12	607.37	655.58	656.89	508.21	502.35	483.76	498.22	503.28	500.98	*497.00*	
In Africa	467.00	486.91	515.01	563.20	573.41	470.77	460.99	433.16	450.29	455.32	453.69	*448.00*	
Union of South Africa	410.71	425.65	448.75	491.63	504.27	427.86	417.45	392.01	405.47	409.68	408.23	403.08	Complete data.
Gold Coast	19.57	23.62	27.38	31.02	31.11	18.87	20.51	19.53	23.53	23.69	24.13	24.45	Do.
Kenya	1.92	2.42	2.71	2.70	2.52	1.35	1.05	.77	.82	[3].70	.80	[3].97	10 months data.
Southern Rhodesia	28.15	28.52	27.85	28.96	27.67	19.89	19.06	18.30	18.00	18.49	17.89	17.04	Complete data.
Tanganyika	2.64	2.86	4.40	5.05	4.99	1.73	1.70	1.66	2.02	2.42	2.28	[3] 2.30	Do.
In Oceania	63.65	73.59	77.52	78.98	70.54	30.82	35.94	43.56	40.57	41.00	39.25	*40.00*	
Australia	48.49	55.72	57.60	57.54	52.38	23.00	28.86	32.82	30.99	31.12	30.14	30.66	Do.
Fiji	.87	3.23	3.77	3.90	4.15	3.32	2.88	4.72	3.26	[3] 3.64	3.62	[3] 3.28	Do.
New Guinea	7.60	8.27	8.62	10.32	7.43	----------	.02	2.07	3.03	3.26	2.80	----------	
New Zealand	5.90	5.32	6.26	6.50	6.11	4.49	4.17	3.93	3.29	2.97	2.68	[3] *2.90*	9 months data.
Papua	.79	1.04	1.26	.73	.46	----------	----------	.02	.01	.02	.01	----------	
In Asia	14.32	14.27	13.57	12.27	11.79	5.90	4.62	6.21	6.72	6.28	7.60	*8.51*	
India [4]	11.58	11.24	11.01	10.13	10.01	5.89	4.61	6.01	6.33	5.74	6.89	7.92	Complete data.
Canada [5]	143.94	166.02	178.87	186.46	187.66	94.80	99.59	107.84	123.88	144.32	155.44	152.75	Do.
United States	143.92	148.58	161.74	170.20	169.12	32.04	51.17	75.79	70.89	67.27	80.10	69.88	Do.
Latin America [6]	82.95	90.82	96.02	104.02	99.83	70.02	64.86	59.03	55.20	59.82	61.38	*58.10*	
Mexico	29.62	32.33	29.46	30.91	28.00	17.48	14.72	16.26	12.99	14.19	14.28	13.66	Do.
Central America	3.20	3.98	5.92	8.22	10.29	8.68	9.01	8.85	9.50	9.91	10.72	11.64	
El Salvador	.30	.36	.30	.33	.29	.40	.76	.38	.73	.95	1.02	.94	Do.
Honduras [3 7]	.79	.74	.82	.94	1.02	.76	.52	.51	.51	.86	1.08	1.24	Do.
Nicaragua	.98	1.72	3.75	5.91	7.72	7.40	7.40	7.64	7.89	7.80	8.27	9.06	Do.
South America [8]	51.38	55.86	61.92	66.05	62.70	44.58	41.93	34.76	33.37	36.40	36.82	*33.50*	
Brazil	7.13	7.58	8.84	9.25	8.24	7.43	6.12	6.12	5.68	5.30	5.72	5.99	Do.
Chile	9.54	10.29	11.53	11.74	9.23	6.31	8.08	5.91	5.75	6.27	6.49	6.08	Do.
Colombia	15.48	18.22	19.95	22.12	22.96	17.73	15.30	13.41	11.73	12.58	13.28	15.08	Do.
Ecuador	2.45	2.47	3.10	4.01	3.80	2.43	2.68	2.03	2.77	3.46	3.38	.34	Do.
Peru	8.54	9.11	9.36	9.84	9.98	6.04	5.54	4.06	3.89	3.98	5.18	[3] *5.55*	6 months' data.
Venezuela	3.97	3.95	5.04	5.02	4.57	2.67	1.68	.74	1.74	2.15	1.20	.02	Complete data.
Other Africa	22.67	24.87	28.05	29.66	25.96	18.33	17.49	15.85	15.39	16.67	16.92	*16.00*	
Belgian Congo [9]	15.14	16.57	18.08	19.58	19.69	12.14	11.60	10.55	10.49	11.68	11.88	[3] 12.80	Do.
French Africa [10]	6.37	7.18	8.40	8.36	4.71	3.71	3.32	2.93	2.66	2.50	2.44	*2.53*	6 months' data.
Other Asia	81.48	96.02	104.49	130.77	99.18	7.68	10.40	18.63	15.13	19.00	21.75	*24.88*	
Formosa	1.47	1.90	1.42	.90	1.01	.02	.02	.29	.62	.58	.64	----------	
Japan	25.89	27.08	29.18	30.35	28.13	2.96	1.40	2.42	3.49	4.62	5.44	6.62	Complete data.
Korea	25.71	31.21	32.85	28.46	28.79	3.38	6.76	11.36	[3].12	[3].17	[3].18	[3] *.04*	11 months data.
Philippines	25.63	32.31	37.06	39.23	[11] 36.89	----------	.04	2.28	7.32	10.07	11.69	13.83	Complete data.
Saudi Arabia	----------	----------	.56	1.12	1.28	1.33	1.70	1.80	2.60	2.35	2.32	----------	
Europe	12.83	14.92	13.23	14.14	8.20	4.67	6.40	5.91	6.10	6.94	7.65	*7.50*	
France	2.32	3.05	2.33	2.84	2.10	1.39	1.69	1.16	1.21	1.16	2.21	----------	
Sweden	6.76	8.19	7.56	7.62	5.33	3.00	3.20	2.64	2.52	2.81	2.83	----------	
Yugoslavia	3.06	2.74	2.50	2.62	----------	----------	.72	.76	.92	1.21	1.50	1.55	Do.
Continental totals: Africa	489.67	511.78	543.06	592.86	599.37	489.09	478.46	449.02	465.58	472.00	470.61	*464.00*	
North America	317.49	346.93	370.06	387.57	384.78	144.31	165.48	199.90	207.75	225.78	249.83	236.28	
Central America	3.20	3.98	5.92	8.22	10.29	8.68	9.01	8.85	9.50	9.91	10.72	11.64	
South America	51.38	55.86	61.92	66.05	62.70	44.58	41.93	34.76	33.37	36.40	36.82	*33.90*	
Oceania	63.65	73.59	77.52	78.98	70.54	30.82	35.94	43.56	40.57	41.00	39.25	*40.00*	
Asia	95.80	110.20	118.06	116.04	110.97	13.58	15.03	24.84	21.84	25.28	29.36	*33.40*	
Europe	12.83	14.92	13.23	14.14	8.20	4.67	6.40	5.91	6.10	6.94	7.65	*7.50*	

[1] Estimated world total excluding U. S. S. R., China, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania.
[2] Excluding North Korea.
[3] Exports.
[4] Undivided India excluding Burma up to 1947; thereafter Indian Union only. Pakistan production estimated as negligible.
[5] Including Newfoundland.
[6] Not including British Guiana which is included under the sterling area.
[7] Fiscal year ending June.
[8] Including British Guiana.
[9] Including Ruanda Urundi.
[10] Including Cameroun, Equatorial Africa, West Africa, Madagascar, and Morocco.
[11] January to October.

NOTE.—World and continental totals include estimates for countries listed when no figures for those are given. Figures in italics represent preliminary estimates. In almost all cases continental totals include estimates for countries not listed.

ADMINISTRATION DEPRECIATES PURCHASING POWER OF WAGES, SAVINGS, AND INSURANCE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, for 20 years following the removal of the gold standard from the money of this Nation the administration, supported by a subservient Congress, has stolen one-half of the wages, savings, and insurance of the citizens of this Nation through deliberate inflation.

LORD KEYNES AND THE ADMINISTRATION

Lord Keynes, in the early 1930's, persuaded the administration that there was something about deficit financing that would make a nation wealthy.

If a government could just succeed in spending more money than it could possibly collect from the taxpayers each year, that nation would be on the way to untold riches—there would never be another depression, no hardship, and everybody would be happy and wealthy.

Perhaps it was not very hard to persuade the administration to follow that line of reasoning, because they needed money to put over the various schemes to influence the electorate of the Nation.

To accomplish their purpose they needed more money each year than they

could possibly collect from the taxpayers annually.

COUNTERFEIT MONEY

They called it deficit financing, and while the citizens of the Nation were wondering what deficit financing meant, the Government simply printed anywhere from five to fifteen or twenty billions of dollars in counterfeit money each year and poured it into the economic bloodstream of the Nation.

Of course, this counterfeit money thinned out the existing currency to that extent, so that inflation was the foreordained result.

Of course, it required a considerable time for the inflation to really take effect.

This country had built up a very sound system over the many years, and it requires a long time to wreck a really sound economic system. Naturally they kept the printed money ahead of the inflation, so that they could spend it each year and the resulting inflation was a delayed effect.

It required about 10 years for it to really start to take effect.

UNREST—WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

Then came the unrest among the workingmen of the Nation—the working people of the Nation.

PULLING THE RUG OUT FROM UNDER THE WORKINGMAN

The administration was always telling the working people of the Nation what a great friend it was to labor—that they could write their own labor legislation if they would support the remainder of the administration's program—including "free trade"—called "reciprocal trade."

While they were emphasizing their friendship for the workingman, they were pulling the rug out from under his feet by thinning out the purchasing power of his wages through deliberate inflation through making his wages purchase less.

FRICTION BETWEEN WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

The real unrest and friction between the workingmen and the management representing the investors started as soon as inflation began to be felt. Strikes were threatened all over the country, because investors could not understand why working people were not satisfied with the wages they had been getting.

By the same token the workingmen could not understand the reason why their wages would no longer pay the rent and the grocery bill—and send the children to school.

DEFICIT SPENDING—PAINLESS PROSPERITY

The investors did not pin the trouble on the deficit financing because everybody had money—and the old law of supply and demand was thrown out of gear.

Plenty of money was available, nevertheless, the economic system resembling the water in a stream or reservoir, finds it own level unless you can keep it dammed up some place along the line and support on the unusual condition. So it is with respect to the purchasing power of money. There must be a definite relation to the money available for purchasing goods and services in relation to the amount of such goods and services available to be purchased.

When money is printed at random and turned into the money supply of the Nation over the past 20 years, without commensurate production, of course it simply made that much more money available to purchase the same amount of goods, and the money was worth correspondingly less.

Therefore, wages had to go up to purchase the same amount of groceries and house rent.

WAGES AND PRICE RISES DO NOT CAUSE INFLATION

Raising the wages and the raising of prices of goods on the shelves was the result of inflation—and not the cause of it.

Deficit financing is the phrase used to cover up the real objective—inflation.

Deficit financing sounds very fine and uplifting. It sounds like a banker's term—which is what it is.

The phrase "deficit financing" is like the phrase "reciprocal trade"—both are misleading. The language belongs in a different strata of society; everybody is for reciprocity if he receives any reciprocity, but in both cases—deficit financing and reciprocal trade—it is a one-way street. The workingmen and investors can only lose.

Of course, inflation is a direct cause of labor unrest, the unrest of the working men, and the quarrel between investors represented by management and workingmen.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND A SUBSERVIENT CONGRESS

Unrest throughout the Nation at the present time between the workingmen in the steel industry, in the mines, the textile industry, the crockery industry, and the investors is caused by inflation, which is directly and intentionally caused by the administration supported, of course, by a subservient Congress.

They are directly and solely responsible for it, not the workingmen and investors.

IF YOU MUST MIX WATER WITH THE MILK IT REQUIRES MORE OF IT

If you insist upon putting a milk can under the pump, it may still look like milk, but it does not taste like milk.

If you are going to water the baby's milk, you have to give him more of it.

It is the same with wages. They will purchase less, and you have to pay more wages.

So it is that the administration's own program of inflation has caused the unrest and the trouble between the workingmen and the investors—management—and it is catching up with them.

FABIAN SOCIALISM

Many suspect a long-range program of Fabian socialism, which is being carried out largely by men who do not really understand, for the most part, what they are doing.

For this part of the program I refer to my address to the Senate on June 28, 1952, entitled "The Free Economic System Versus Fabian Socialism."

THE SEA BOTTOMS OR SUBMERGED LANDS—THE SUPREME COURT DECISION—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20

Mr. President, public ownership of the sea bottom or submerged lands from low tide seaward to the established State line was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States on June 23, 1945, in what has long been referred to as the tidelands decision. It has also been said that States' rights have been violated.

NO TIDELANDS OR STATES RIGHTS AFFECTED

Mr. President, it is well known that no tidelands, inland waterways, or navigable rivers are included in the Supreme Court decision, and that they are affected in no way whatsoever. Nor are there any States' rights violated in any way. The States, for example, have exactly the same police power or general jurisdiction over such public domain, known as the sea bottom or submerged lands, as they have over any other public lands located within the respective States.

That is what the Supreme Court decided. The effect of the decision is that they are public lands within the State boundaries just the same as the approximately 65,000,000 acres of public lands located in my State of Nevada.

ONE BILLION ACRES OF PUBLIC LANDS

There are approximately 1,000,000,000 acres of public lands. My own State of Nevada includes approximately 65,000,000 acres. There is no question as to the authority of Congress to deed to the States wherein they are located in fee simple all or any part of such lands, but no State has ever claimed such lands as a right.

THE RECLAMATION FUND

In 1920 the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act decreed that 52½ percent of the royalties from the leases on such public domain shall go to the reclamation fund, 37½ percent to the States wherein such leases are located, and 10 percent to the Federal Government for supervision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Reno Evening Gazette of June 18 entitled "Not a States' Rights Issue." This editorial is a clear and concise statement of facts concerning this much maligned and misrepresented subject.

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

NOT A STATES' RIGHTS ISSUE

Once more the miscalled tidelands bill will come before the Senate on Thursday, when it will consider President Truman's veto of the measure that would give to the States title to the marginal lands offshore.

Since 1945 three States—California, Texas, and Louisiana—have sought to establish title to the undersea lands where rich oil and gas deposits have been discovered. The Supreme Court has held that these submerged areas beyond the low water mark belong to the Federal Government, not to the contiguous States. Even while the Supreme Court decision was pending, the State of California endeavored to pass through Congress a bill that would give it title to the offshore sea bed.

Bills passed by Congress were vetoed by the President, on the ground that the coastal States were endeavoring to seize upon lands

and resources which belong to the entire Nation.

Proponents of these measures have deliberately confused the issue by referring to the disputed lands as "tidelands," and making it appear that the States' undisputed rights to the submerged lands between high- and low-tide marks, the inland waters—lakes, bays, and rivers—are threatened by the National Government. These rights have long been established by laws and court decisions, and would not be affected by the recent Supreme Court decisions on the offshore lands, or the President's veto of the bills that would give the offshore lands to the States.

The three States now pressing for the gift of lands beneath the marginal sea are not making a desperate stand in the name of State's rights. They are doing it for the very selfish reason that they want to derive all the benefits from the rich mineral deposits. Coming from public lands, these benefits go to the Federal Treasury, and under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, are distributed as follows: 37½ percent is paid to the respective States within whose boundaries the lands comprising the source of income are situated; 52½ percent goes into the reclamation fund, and 10 percent is deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Nevada has a direct interest in this "tidelands" bill, for it is one of the great beneficiaries of the reclamation funds. Senator GEORGE MALONE voted against giving the offshore lands to the States claiming them, for the very sound reason that it would be depriving Nevada of the funds it expects to receive for reclamation.

Senator MALONE, whose experience as State engineer, and as consulting engineer on both State and Federal projects, qualifies him as an authority on such matters, has pointed out that the ownership or title of real tidelands and of inland waters is not threatened by the Supreme Court's decision on the offshore lands, nor is the Federal Government's insistence on retaining control over the disputed undersea areas going to put any cloud over State and private water rights.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, an article from the Christian Science Monitor of October 2, 1951, entitled "Tidelands Versus Marginal Sea." This is a further very clear and concise explanation of what has been made a very muddled subject.

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

TIDELANDS VERSUS MARGINAL SEA

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

Attorney General Daniels, of Texas, has presented the so-called tidelands controversy, the case for the States. The following is a brief statement, the case for the Nation, and we believe answers the arguments set forth by Mr. Daniels.

The fundamental arguments Mr. Daniels presented for the States are:

1. The States have always owned the tidelands from the time the Nation was formed until the Supreme Court decisions; therefore, Congress should now return these tidelands to the States.

2. The three Supreme Court decisions have endangered State ownership of navigable inland waters, lakes, and rivers, areas which the States have owned since the Union was formed.

3. The Supreme Court introduced a new doctrine in the cases of *U. S.* v. *California-Texas-Louisiana* which would give the National Government the right to take, without just compensation, any State property; and this doctrine is in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

4. The Supreme Court has not yet decided that the United States owns the disputed area but only that it has paramount rights to and dominion over this property; therefore, Congress should settle the question and quitclaim the disputed area to the States.

5. The oil operators who went into the disputed area, secured State leases, and developed for oil, did so in good faith and have now spent millions of dollars to improve these leases, and these leases should not now be taken away from them.

We believe all the answers to Mr. Daniels' arguments are very simple and complete:

1. The most fundamental misrepresentation regarding this problem is the statement that the disputed area is tidelands. There is not one foot of tidelands involved—never has the National Government claimed any part of State-owned tidelands or State-owned inland waters. The three Supreme Court decisions described the area in dispute as commencing where the tidelands end and extending oceanward. The complaints and decisions in all three cases specifically exclude tidelands from the controversy.

The use of the word, "tidelands," has been retained by the oil lobby to becloud and misrepresent the real issues to Congress and the American people. There are 54 Supreme Court decisions which hold that tidelands actually belong to the States. The oil-lobby group want to make it appear as if the Supreme Court had overruled all these prior decisions—taken the tidelands from the States and given them to the National Government under this new doctrine of necessity. Never has a Supreme Court decision been so completely misrepresented.

The only area in dispute is the offshore marginal sea, commencing where the tidelands end and extending oceanward. In regard to this area the Supreme Court said: (a) The case of *United States* v. *California* was the first time a question of ownership of this offshore belt had ever come before the Supreme Court; (b) Neither the original 13 States, nor any new State after being admitted into the Union, have ever owned or controlled this submerged offshore belt.

"California, like the Thirteen Original Colonies, never acquired ownership in the marginal sea. The claim to our 3-mile belt was first asserted by the National Government. Protection and control of the area are indeed functions of national external sovereignty (332 U. S. pp. 31-34). The marginal sea is a national, not a State concern. National interests, national responsibilities, national defense, relations with other powers, war and peace focus there. National rights must therefore be paramount in that area." (339 U. S. 704).

If the statements (a) and (b) are true (and a rereading will convince anyone that that is exactly what the Supreme Court decided) then the States have never owned the disputed area—the Supreme Court did not take this disputed area from the States and give it to the National Government—there is no new theory or doctrine of law which the Supreme Court announced that the National Government can take property from the States without just compensation contrary to fundamental constitutional law.

2. The argument that the three Supreme Court decisions have endangered State ownership of navigable inland waters, lakes, and rivers, areas which the States have owned since the Union was formed, has caused many governors, states attorneys general, and states legislatures to support the quit-claim bills before Congress.

The President and all national officials having anything to do with the problem, have repeatedly stated that the National Government makes no claim to these State-owned areas. The disclaimer bills introduced into Congress would, if passed, settle the question forever, but the lobby group won't let any one of these disclaimer bills be passed.

It just seems impossible after reading the Supreme Court decisions that anyone should now question the United States' ownership or its exclusive right to take the oil and other minerals from the marginal sea belt.

3. Have all operators in the marginal sea been fairly dealt with? At the time the oil operators actually began taking any amount of oil from the offshore oil pools they had full notice that the United States was making claim to the offshore area. The States in granting State leases were very careful not to guarantee title to these offshore leases, and the operators took their chances with full knowledge that the States might not own this offshore area and that the State leases might be void.

These operators have made millions and millions of dollars on these State leases after paying their costs of operation, and have now succeeded in convincing Congress that they should not be liable for any oil wrongfully taken by them, and Congress will pass a bill that will relieve these operators of any obligation to repay for any oil wrongfully taken.

Many are of the opinion that a bill introduced in the Senate by Senators DOUGLAS, HILL, and others is the best solution of this controversy. Under their proposal control over the marginal sea areas would remain in the Federal Government but revenues from them would be devoted to grants-in-aid for schools in all States. Thus natural resources, which under three Supreme Court decisions belong to the Nation as a whole, would be dedicated to the welfare of the youth of the land at the local level.

HAROLD MORGAN.

SALT LAKE CITY.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, there has been some discussion relative to the status of the scrip applications in connection with the sea-bottom lands.

The status of such applications seem clear from the press dispatch which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. It is entitled "Scrip Oil Land Bid Turned Down." It is from the Reno Evening Gazette of November 21, 1951.

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

SCRIP OIL LAND BID TURNED DOWN

WASHINGTON, November 21.—Secretary Chapman today turned down the move by E. L. Cord and others to get oil-rich submerged coastal lands in exchange for old Government land scrip.

The Secretary of the Interior announced he had denied all applications to acquire lands off the coast of Texas, Louisiana, and California. They had been filed by Cord, former automobile manufacturer, and 10 others.

The applicants bid for the lands with scrip the Government issued many years ago. This scrip, or land certificates, allowed early settlers and Indians to choose acreages of unoccupied public lands in exchange for lands which had been taken from them.

With the Federal Government claiming title to the oil-valuable coastal lands, it presented a knotty problem when Cord and the others turned up with quantities of this old scrip and called for delivery of the lands to them.

THE NATIONAL OIL AND GAS LEASING ACT

Mr. MALONE. The Secretary of the Interior also denied that the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act applied to the sea-bottom or submerged land.

This action was taken immediately following the Supreme Court's decision, obviously to prevent many applications under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act from applying to selected sea-bottom lands.

It will be understood that the sea-bottom land is located from the mean low tide seaward to the State boundary which we are discussing at this moment. It has nothing to do with tidelands or inland waterways, or navigable rivers. It in no way affects those areas.

APPLICANTS SUED THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Secretary denied that the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act applied to the sea-bottom or submerged lands.

But, Mr. President, the applicants for such selected sea-bottom lands sued the Secretary of the Interior in the Federal district court to reverse his decision. The decision of the Federal district court is due to be handed down at any time.

THE SPECIAL MASTER

The case has been argued, and I understand that the decision is being withheld only until the special master appointed by the Supreme Court reports on the boundaries of the inland waterways.

The Supreme Court appointed a master to inspect, hold hearings, and to collect all the available information with respect to the position of the outside boundaries of the inland waterways—the inland waterways being harbors, inlets, and other indentations along the coast, already adjudged by many Supreme Court decisions as belonging to the States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement by Mastin White, general counsel for the Department of the Interior, in relation to the sea-bottom or submerged lands.

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

I. BEDS OF NAVIGABLE INLAND WATERS

Inland waters are the bodies of water, both tidal and nontidal, which lie inside the coast line of the United States. Rivers, lakes, harbors, and bays are examples of inland waters.

Navigable inland waters are those inland waters which are available for navigation in their natural condition, or which can be made available for navigation upon the basis of reasonable improvements.

Some obvious examples of navigable inland waters are Mobile Bay, San Francisco Bay, Chesapeake Bay, Delaware Bay, New York Harbor, Boston Harbor, Long Island Sound, Mississippi Sound, Puget Sound, the Columbia River, and the Mississippi River.

The initial Supreme Court case involving the question as to the ownership of the bed of a navigable inland water was *Martin et al.* v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367), which was decided by the Supreme Court in 1842. It involved a controversy over the title to an oyster bed on the bottom of Raritan Bay and River in the State of New Jersey. The Supreme Court held that the title to the beds of navigable rivers and bays within the limits of the American Colonies, including New Jersey, had been vested in the Crown of England prior to independence; and that when the Thirteen Original States, as the result of the Revolutionary War, became free and independent, they severally succeeded to the rights of ownership previously held by the Crown of England in the beds of navigable rivers and bays within their respective boundaries. Accordingly, it was decided that the State of New Jersey, upon the attainment of independence, became the owner of the bed of Raritan Bay and River; and that the State had the authority to issue an exclusive license for the taking of oysters from the bed of the bay and river.

A number of subsequent Supreme Court decisions have reaffirmed the principle of constitutional law announced in 1842 and have held that the beds of navigable inland waters situated within the boundaries of a State belong to the State (or its grantees). A list of such decisions is set out below:

Smith v. *Maryland* (18 Howard 71 (1855));
Mumford v. *Wardwell* (6 Wallace 423 (1867));
Barney v. *Keokuk* (94 U. S. 324 (1876));
McCready v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391 (1876));
Illinois Central v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387 (1892));
United States v. *Mission Reck Co.* (189 U. S. 391 (1903));
McGilvra v. *Ross* (215 U. S. 70 (1909));
Scott v. *Lattig* (227 U. S. 229 (1913));
Port of Seattle v. *Oregon & W. R. R. Co.* (255 U. S. 56 (1921));
Oklahoma v. *Texas* (258 U. S. 574 (1921));
United States v. *Holt Bank* (270 U. S. 49 (1926));
Massachusetts v. *New York* (271 U. S. 65 (1926)); and
United States v. *Utah* (283 U. S. 64 (1931)).

II. TIDELANDS

Tidelands are the lands which are situated between the line of mean high tide and the line of mean low tide.

The question as to the ownership of tidelands situated within the boundaries of a State was first presented to the Supreme Court in the case of *Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan et al.* (3 Howard 212). That case was decided by the Supreme Court in 1845. It involved a controversy over a tideland area bordering on the Mobile River in Alabama. It was held by the Supreme Court that when Alabama ceased to be a Territory and was admitted into the Union as a State, the ownership of the tidelands within the boundaries of the new State was automatically transferred from the United States to Alabama.

Subsequent Supreme Court cases holding that the respective States (or their grantees) own the tidelands situated within the States' boundaries are listed below:

Goodtitle v. *Kibbe* (9 Howard 471 (1850));
Weber v. *Board of Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wallace 57 (1873); *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1 (1894); *Mobile Transportation Co.* v. *Mobile* (187 U. S. 479 (1903); and *Borax Consolidated* v. *City of Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10 (1935)).

III. BED OF THE MARGINAL SEA

The marginal (or territorial) sea is that portion of the open ocean which begins at the line of mean low tide (sometimes referred to as the ordinary low watermark) on the coast of the United States, or at the mouths of rivers, bays, harbors, and other inland waters, and extends seaward to the boundary line of the United States.

The Federal Government has consistently asserted ever since 1793 that the seaward boundary line of the United States is located three nautical or geographical miles (3½ statute or land miles) from the coast line. However, the State of Texas contends that, when it entered the Union, its seaward boundary line was fixed in the Gulf of Mexico at a distance of three marine leagues (10½ statute or land miles) from the Texas coast. A similar contention is made by the State of Florida with respect to its seaward boundary line in the Gulf of Mexico. The contentions of Texas and Florida have not been passed upon by the Supreme Court.

The first Supreme Court case that ever involved the question of the respective rights of the United States and of a State in the bed of the marginal sea contiguous to the coast of the State was *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19). That case, which was instituted in 1945 and decided on June 23, 1947, involved a controversy between the United States and the State of California over the oil and gas deposits in the bed of the marginal sea off the coast of California. The Supreme Court held that the lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea off the California coast are lands of the United States rather than State-owned lands; and that the United States, rather than the State of California, has the authority to dispose of the oil and gas deposits in such lands.

The principle of constitutional law announced by the Supreme Court in the California case was subsequently reaffirmed in the cases of *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699 (1950)), and *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707 (1950)), which involved (among other lands) lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea off the coasts of Louisiana and Texas.

During the interval between the announcement by the Supreme Court of its decision in the California case and the announcement of its decisions in the Louisiana and Texas cases, the Court had occasion in the case of *Hynes* v. *Grimes Packing Co.* (337 U. S. 86 (1949)), to consider the status of lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea off the coast of a territory. In that case, the Supreme Court upheld the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, in establishing the Karluk Indian Reservation on Kodiak Island in Alaska, to include within the boundaries of the reservation coastal waters to a distance of 3,000 feet from the shore line at mean low tide.

IV. EXERCISE BY COASTAL STATES OF POLICE POWER IN THE MARGINAL SEA

That the police power of a coastal State extends over the marginal (or territorial) sea contiguous to its coast was clearly established by the Supreme Court in the case of *Skiriotes* v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 69 (1941)). That case involved the power of the State of Florida to regulate the sponge fishery off its coast. The Supreme Court held, among other things, "* * * that Florida has an interest in the proper maintenance of the sponge fishery and that the [Florida] statute so far as applied to conduct within the territorial waters of Florida, in the absence of conflicting Federal legislation, is within the police power of the State" (p. 75).

The Supreme Court, in the case of *Toomer* v. *Witsell* (334 U. S. 385 (1948)), again upheld the authority of a coastal State to exercise its police power in the marginal sea contiguous to its coast. That case involved the authority of the State of South Carolina to regulate commercial shrimp fishing in the marginal sea.

The Toomer case was decided after the Supreme Court had rendered its decision in the case of *United States* v. *California*, holding that the lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea are Federal rather than State-owned lands. Thus, it is clear from the decision in the Toomer case that the fact that the lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea are Federal lands does not affect the authority of a coastal State to exercise its police power with respect to activities conducted in such lands or in the waters above them. A State's police power over activities conducted in the marginal sea is comparable to a State's police power over activities con-

ducted on public domain lands situated within the boundaries of the State.

V. DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES DERIVED UNDER THE MINERAL LEASING ACT

The revenues derived by the United States from mineral operations on public lands under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 are distributed as follows: 37½ percent is paid to the respective States within whose boundaries the lands comprising the source of the income are situated; 52½ percent goes into the reclamation fund; and 10 percent is deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts (sec. 35, Mineral Leasing Act of 1920; 30 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 191).

There are pending at the present time in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia several cases involving the question whether the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 applies to lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea. It it should be judicially determined as a result of the pending litigation that the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 is applicable to such lands, the income derived from the development of the oil and gas deposits in these lands would, of course, be distributed in the manner outlined above—i. e., the several coastal States would get 37½ percent of the money derived from operations in the portions of the marginal sea bed contiguous to their respective coasts; 52½ percent of the money would go into the reclamation fund and would be used for the reclamation of arid lands in the 17 Western States; and 10 percent would be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

VI. BED OF THE HIGH SEAS

The Continental Shelf that begins at the line of mean low tide along the coast of the United States, or at the mouths of rivers, bays, harbors, and other inland water, not only comprises the bed of the marginal sea, but it extends seaward beyond the marginal sea for varying distances beneath the high seas. In some places, the Continental Shelf extends seaward for a total distance of approximately 250 miles from the coast of the United States. In other places, it is much narrower. The average width of the Continental Shelf off our Atlantic coast is approximately 73 miles, the average width of the Gulf coast is approximately 59 miles, and the average width off the Pacific coast is approximately 18 miles.

The question of the respective rights of the United States and of coastal States in the Continental Shelf beneath the high seas adjacent to the seaward boundary line of the United States was decided by the Supreme Court for the first time in the cases of *United States* v. *Louisiana* and *United States* v. *Texas*, previously cited. These cases were instituted in 1948 and decided in 1950. The State of Louisiana had purported to extend State control and ownership over the Continental Shelf for a total distance of 27 nautical miles from the Louisiana coast line, and the State of Texas had purported to extend State control and ownership over the Continental Shelf to its outermost edge. The Supreme Court held, however, that the United States, rather than the States of Louisiana and Texas, is entitled to exercise rights in the adjacent Continental Shelf underlying the high seas; and that among the rights held by the United States in such lands is the right to dispose of the oil and gas deposits contained in them.

THE HOLLAND BILL, OR SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20

Mr. MALONE. The measure variously known as the Holland bill, or Senate Joint Resolution 20, seeks to transfer that part of the public domain known as the sea bottom or submerged lands between low tide and the State line, to the States wherein they are located.

The transfer would mean, of course, that all the royalties or revenues from such leases would accrue to the individual States to the exclusion of the reclamation fund, and thereby nullify the 32-year old Government policy initiated by the Congress in 1920.

ONE HUNDRED BILLION DOLLARS WORTH OF PETROLEUM

It is estimated that from $40,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000 of petroleum will be produced within the sea-bottom lands area affected by the Supreme Court decisions affecting the sea-bottom lands. Twelve and one-half percent has been the customary royalty to be received from these areas. Fifty-two and one-half percent of that amount would go to the reclamation fund, amounting to between two and a half billion and six billion dollars to such reclamation fund, with which to construct reclamation projects in the 17 Western States.

Nevada is vitally concerned in the disposition of the royalty payments from oil and gas production in the public domain, since Congress stipulated in the 1920 National Oil and Gas Leasing Act that 52½ percent of such royalties should accrue to the reclamation fund, to be expended in the 17 reclamation States.

THE PUBLIC LAND STATES SHOULD BE TREATED ALIKE

I may say that this act has been amended from time to time, but as it stands now, that is the situation. If the oil and gas-bearing public lands are to be transferred to the States it should be done through a bill introduced in the Eighty-third Congress in 1953, simply stipulating that when oil or gas is discovered on the publicly owned lands, immediately such lands are to be transferred to the States.

That would then equalize the situation. Many companies are drilling for oil and gas now in my State of Nevada under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act.

We have high hopes that they will discover oil. Under a bill then of that nature, when such oil was discovered such lands would be automatically transferred to the State of Nevada in the same manner as it is proposed to transfer to the States in this case the publicly owned lands including the submerged or sea-bottom lands seaward from low tide to the State boundaries.

NOT RETURNING LANDS TO THE STATES

I point out that the Government is not, as is often said, returning anything to the States through the legislation. The States never have had these lands. There has been only one previous decision touching the submerged or sea-bottom lands. That was an Alaskan decision, in regard to fisheries, in which it was held that the Government controlled the lands and had the right to reserve such lands for the Indian fisheries.

NO PRIOR DECISION AFFECTING SEA-BOTTOM LANDS

Mr. President, in this connection there never has been a direct decision on sea-bottom or submerged lands with reference to ownership until the 1947 Supreme Court decision.

The question was never raised before the Supreme Court until that time.

There were many decisions by the Supreme Court, however, involving inland waterways, tidelands, navigable rivers, and lakes. Mr. President, those decisions always held that the States owned and controlled such lands.

The Supreme Court decision to which I have referred did not in any way affect these lands or these decisions.

If it was not feasible to introduce a bill to transfer to the States the public lands within their borders whenever oil should be discovered, a bill could be introduced in the Eighty-third Congress transferring selected lands to the public-land States. Out of the 11 Western States which contain most of the public lands, many have for a long time wanted to own such lands within their boundaries.

We in Nevada have never desired to own such public lands. However, if oil were to be discovered upon such public lands within our State, there might be a change with respect to the desire to own and control such areas.

SELECTED LANDS—SCHOOL LANDS

Areas in any case could be selected by each public-land State with a view to the value of the lands. It should be remembered that certain of such lands including section 36 of each township was transferred to the States for school purposes. States could either lease the land, or sell it, and use the money derived from the sale for school purposes.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF SUCH LANDS

All other public lands in the same category as the area seaward from low tide to the State boundary were judged to be public lands by the Supreme Court.

The only method by which these public lands could be transferred to private ownership is under some public law—a law passed by Congress—such as the homestead law, calling for 160 acres; the additional homestead law, calling for an additional 160 acres; the grazing homestead law, calling for 640 acres; or the mining-claim law, calling for 600 feet one way and 1,500 feet the other way. When a mineral discovery is made on public land, it can be held indefinitely for $100 of such work on the claim a year, and later can be patented if $500 worth of work is done on it in a constructive manner.

Then there is the placer-claim location, which is a different method of operation than a lode claim.

The Pittman Act was passed by Congress under which certain lands can be taken up for irrigation.

Of course, all of these laws are not applicable to all of such lands. It is obvious that certain lands could not be farmed, therefore not subject to a homestead location. A homestead could not be taken up if it were impossible to find water with which to irrigate it, and naturally the sea-bottom land would not be available for that purpose.

However, I point out that a placer location on the black sands on the beaches of Oregon, for example, containing chromite sands, would be subject to a placer claim location. In the same manner a mining claim might be filed on any ledge which either showed above the surface of the water or could be worked under water in this submerged or sea-bottom area.

So, Mr. President, I merely point out that propaganda with respect to these lands has been misleading in stating that it included tidelands and violated States' rights and that neither of these items are included in the Supreme Court decision.

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. 423. An act for the relief of Orazio Balasso;

S. 732. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 1454. An act for the relief of Walter Koelz;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Adele Frattini;

S. 1707. An act for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co.;

S. 1741. An act for the relief of Samuel A. Wise;

S. 1840. An act for the relief of Tsuneo Tanigawa, also known as David Lawrence Rogers;

S. 1876. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc;

S. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Connell;

S. 2046. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith for retirement as an emergency officer under the provisions of Emergency Officers Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States;

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Arthur K. Prior;

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Jo Ann Fosberg;

S. 2212. An act for the relief of Charles Michell;

S. 2249. An act for the relief of Biancamaria Cori;

S. 2277. An act for the relief of Nicholas J. and Elizabeth Miura;

S. 2289. An act for the relief of Michiko Okuda;

S. 2313. An act for the relief of Hsieh Ta-Chuan or De Ott-Kuan;

S. 2393. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire and the town of New Boston, N. H.;

S. 2395. An act for the relief of Ioannis Dimitriou Cohilis;

S. 2573. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Anson Pease;

S. 2609. An act for the relief of Iwanna Pryjma and Roma Pryjma;

S. 2733. An act for the relief of Donald Lee Ferguson, Jr.;

S. 3032. An act for the relief of Bonnie Jean MacLean;

S. 3132. An act for the relief of Jun Miyata;

S. 3140. An act for the relief of Victor de la Bretoniere; and

S. 3240. An act for the relief of Ichiro Iida.

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

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Harris A. Bakken;

H. R. 1732. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 2470. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3653. An act for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia;

H. R. 4163. An act for the relief of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, of Eastover, S. C.

H. R. 4842. An act for the relief of Joseph Manchion;

H. R. 4932. An act for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and others;

H. R. 5350. An act to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7331. An act for the relief of Andrianne Luiz and John Luiz; and

H. R. 7594. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen;

H. R. 1558. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 3060. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co.;

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of northern Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 3527. An act for the relief of Morris Tutnauer;

H. R. 3975. An act to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one or more of his copatentees is barred from doing so;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar;

H. R. 4188. An act for the relief of Josephine F. Garrett;

H. R. 5238. An act for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland; and

H. R. 7305. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

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. 1989. An act to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington as Rufus Woods Lake;

S. 2252. An act to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks; and

S. 2605. An act to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON SUPERVISORY SELECTION IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (S. REPT. NO. 2100)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I submit, pursuant to Senate resolution 53, as amended by Senate resolutions 206 and 288, a report relating to supervisory selection in the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). The report will be received and printed.

REPORT ON INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (S. REPT. NO. 2101)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 53, as amended by Senate Resolutions 206 and 288, a report relating to the incentive awards program in the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed.

REDUCTION IN FORCE SYSTEM IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (S. REPT. NO. 2102)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 53, as amended by Senate Resolutions 206 and 288, a report relating to reduction in the force system in the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION IN WYOMING

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have consulted the majority leader and the minority leader. I have a report prepared on the REA in my own State. The report comes within the rule, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document.

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

OIL FOR EDUCATION—RESOLUTION OF COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Communications Workers of America at their annual convention at Cleveland, Ohio, June 16–21, 1952. The resolution en-

dorses the oil for education amendment which I and Senators DOUGLAS, MORSE, LANGER, BENTON, TOBEY, NEELY, SPARKMAN, KEFAUVER, CHAVEZ, HUMPHREY, HENNINGS, LEHMAN, MURRAY, GILLETTE, AIKEN, MOODY, FULBRIGHT, CASE, KILGORE, SEATON, GREEN and MAGNUSON are sponsoring to S. 3306.

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

OIL FOR EDUCATION

The oil resources of the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf are too great to be dealt with as a plaything or a political gain or the pawn of a financial group. Geologists in the oil industry and the geological survey of the United States Department of the Interior estimate the off-shore oil reserves of the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf at 15,000,000,000 barrels. It is estimated that at the present prices these 15,000,000,000 barrels are worth over $40,000,000,000.

Legislation has been proposed in this Eighty-second Congress by Senator LISTER HILL which provides for the royalties from these oil resources be given to the Federal Government and used to aid education for our children in all 48 States.

The Office of Education, in releasing its annual enrollment estimates, claims that the highest enrollment of students was recorded last year. The enrollment in elementary high schools and colleges was 33,000,000. Elementary-school enrollment jumped by nearly a million last year as the wartime baby group began to become of school age. Ten thousand new elementary school teachers are required just to meet the increased enrollment this year. Expanded school enrollments in 1951–52 calls for 25,000 new class rooms. To replace obsolete facilities an additional 18,000 class rooms should be provided. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That CWA support wholeheartedly Senator LISTER HILL's proposal that the royalties from the off-shore oil developments be put into a special fund to finance improved education in the United States.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

By unanimous consent, the following additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 3486. A bill to eliminate the requirement that certain preference be given with respect to the sublease of power privileges leased from the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3487. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the last above-named bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 3488. A bill to provide for the transfer to the States of the money in the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, for the establishment and operation by the States of old-age insurance systems, and for the abolition of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Finance.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, July 5, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 4 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Joseph R. Jackson, retired.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Grace M. Stewart, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, vice Ellen K. Raedy, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for appointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 37 of the National Defense Act, as amended:

To be brigadier generals

Col. LeRoy Hagen Anderson, O239452, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Hugh Barclay, O402854, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Michael Joseph Galvin, O279304, Armor Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Hugh Stanford McLeod, O143285, Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Lamar Tooze, O107927, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States.

POSTMASTER

Van Drennen Hicks to be postmaster at Oak Ridge, Tenn., vice George E. Bowling, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 4 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Raymond Ross Paty, of Georgia, to be a member of the Board of Directors for the term expiring May 18, 1960.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

James T. Hill, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

James William Johnson, Jr., of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. John Reed Hodge, O7285, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be Chief, Army Field Forces, with the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. John Taylor Lewis, O7000, United States Army, to be commanding general, Army Antiaircraft Command, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. George Price Hays, O7149, United States Army, to be commanding general, United States Forces, Austria, with the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Silas Beach Hays, O17803.
Brig. Gen. Frank Huber Partridge, O7497.
Brig. Gen. Herbert Bernard Loper, O12243.
Brig. Gen. Homer Watson Kiefer, O12701.
Brig. Gen. Edward Thomas Williams, O-12818.
Brig. Gen. Robert Leroy Dulaney, O15351.
Brig. Gen. William Nelson Gillmore, O-16196.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Pringle Cleland, O16239.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Harold Thomas Miller, O12633.
Col. Rawley Ernest Chambers, O16733.
Col. Francis Marion Day, O15614.
Col. Gordon Byrom Rogers, O15620.
Col. Aubrey Strode Newman, O16099.
Col. Thomas Morgan Watlington, O16780.
Col. John Cogswell Oakes, O17160.
Col. Legare Kilgore Tarrant, O17208.
Col. Lionel Charles McGarr, O17225.
Col. Carl Ferdinand Fritzsche, O17234.
Col. Russell Lowell Vittrup, O17681.
Col. Paul Lamar Freeman, Jr., O17704.
Col. Andrew Pick O'Meara, O18062.
Col. Robert Jefferson Wood, O18064.
Col. Hamilton Hawkins Howze, O18088.
Col. John Knight Waters, O18481.
Col. John R. Beishline, O18523.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Thomas Wade Herren, O7430.
Maj. Gen. Alonzo Patrick Fox, O8434.
Maj. Gen. William Arthur Beiderlinden, O10303.
Maj. Gen. Reuben Ellis Jenkins, O11658.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Robert Alwin Schow, O12180.
Brig. Gen. John Harrison Stokes, Jr., O12181.
Brig. Gen. Kester Lovejoy Hastings, O12219.
Brig. Gen. Herbert Bernard Loper, O12243.
Brig. Gen. John Bartlett Murphy, O12338.
Maj. Gen. Edmund Bower Sebree, O12376.
Maj. Gen. Joseph Sladen Bradley, O12428.

Lt. Gen. Henry Spiese Aurand, O3784, commanding general, United States Army, Pacific (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsec. 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be generals

Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad, 25A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander in chief, United States Air Forces in Europe.

Lt. Gen. Otto Paul Weyland, 63A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Far East Air Forces.

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Charles Pearre Cabell, 70A, to be Director, the Joint Staff, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Maj. Gen. Laurence Carbee Craigie, 61A, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Development.

Maj. Gen. Leon William Johnson, 88A, to be commanding general, Continental Air Command.

Maj. Gen. Charles Trovilla Myers, 37A, to be commander in chief, United States Northeast Command.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Smith, 84A, to be commander, Military Air Transport Service.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Raymond P. Coffman for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general.

Samuel K. Bird for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general.

POSTMASTERS

TENNESSEE

Bernard F. Vandergriff, Clinton.
Van Drennen Hicks, Oak Ridge.
Francis E. Durrett, White House.