

fact that there might well be a quorum call, and possibly half the time would be involved, it seems to me that 11:15 would be the logical time for the Senate to meet tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I amend the request. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate takes a recess tonight, it takes a recess to reconvene at 11:15 o'clock a. m. tomorrow, and that at the time the junior Senator from Nebraska be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska will then have the floor, and may do as he pleases.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall have the floor, and I can yield for a quorum call if I care to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? If not, it stands approved.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess, in accordance with the order just entered.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 21, 1949, at 11:15 a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate on July 19 (legislative day of June 2), 1949, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services today:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947:

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Ruth Agnew, ~~XXXX~~
Catherine Barbara Bean, ~~XXXXX~~
Florence M. Christman, ~~XXXXX~~
Mildred O. Conin, ~~XXXX~~
Patricia L. Crocker, ~~XXXX~~
Helen Elizabeth Cundiff, ~~XXXXX~~
Dorothy M. Cunningham, ~~XXXXX~~
Elsie F. Easterling, ~~XXXXX~~
Margaret Catherine Farley, ~~XXXX~~
Margaret Cecelia Flynn, ~~XXXX~~
Helen Marie Hays, ~~XXXX~~
Bernice Isabel Heath, ~~XXXXX~~
Maralee Ruth Hodgson, ~~XXXX~~
Betty Jane Hughes, ~~XXXXX~~
Mary P. Kent, ~~XXXX~~
Ruth A. Kruger, ~~XXXX~~
Marietta Levy, ~~XXXXX~~
Alice M. Linhares, ~~XXXX~~
Etta Mildred Lowe, ~~XXXX~~
Gertrude I. Mahn, ~~XXXXX~~
Mamie Sue May, ~~XXXX~~
Irene Ethel Miller, ~~XXXX~~
Ruth Theodora Mills, ~~XXXX~~
Mary Cecelia Murphy, ~~XXXX~~
Anne Loretta Nodziak, ~~XXXX~~
Mary Patricia Reilly, ~~XXXX~~
Rosalie M. Requist, ~~XXXX~~
Lucille D. Russell, ~~XXXX~~
Rosemary Slavin, ~~XXXX~~
Maude Morrin Smith, ~~XXXXX~~
Catherine Curtis Stein, ~~XXXXX~~
Margaret Ruth Stonaker, ~~XXXX~~
Isabelle Alma Tarutis, ~~XXXX~~
Ruth Elizabeth Tucker, ~~XXXXX~~
Mary Elizabeth Vaughan, ~~XXXXX~~

To be captains, Women's Medical Specialists Corps

Edyth Hildegard Emerson, ~~XXXX~~
Evelyn Folmar, ~~XXXX~~
Catherine S. Hooper, ~~XXXX~~

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 20 (legislative day of June 2), 1949.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Edward Mount Webster to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1949.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 1949

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Acting Chaplain, Rev. Jacob S. Payton, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whom is our sufficiency, we turn to Thee. Within these walls may the honor of America be kept bright this day. Within our hearts may a place be set apart for things worthy of reverence—truth and beauty, loyalty and heroism, faith and sacrifice. Within the scope of our purposes may there be room only for qualities that bear the hallmark of character. Suffer us never to forget, O Lord, that with Thee evaluation of service rests upon the degree to which we identify ourselves with causes that bless and redeem mankind. May Members of this body dedicate themselves to the establishment of righteousness throughout the land. In Thy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES OF INDIANS

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1407) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and the better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORRIS, MURDOCK, WHITE of Idaho, D'EWART, and LEMKE.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, one of the members of that committee

has informed me that he is very anxious to hear the debate on the agricultural bill and he hoped his own committee would not be in session; therefore I would feel constrained to object in accordance with his request, if the gentleman persists.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH, SCIENCE, AND COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Health, Science, and Commerce may have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Samuel B. Pettengill notwithstanding that it exceeded two pages of the RECORD and, according to the Public Printer, costs \$240 to print.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday and Tuesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday next for 1 hour following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in Committee of the Whole today and include statistical tables and extracts on farm legislation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Gen. Bedell Smith.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three editorials.

Mr. NIXON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day set for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

ARTHUR C. JONES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 275) for the relief of Arthur C. Jones.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arthur C. Jones, of Dover, N. H., the sum of \$4,881.36, plus the sum of \$987.60 for medical expenses, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him on July 28, 1942, while serving as a laborer at the United States naval shipyard, Portsmouth, N. H., and the subsequent aggravation of such injuries which resulted in the amputation of both feet: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAYWARD O. BRANDON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1266) for the relief of Hayward O. Brandon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hayward O. Brandon, of Philippi, W. Va., the sum of \$259. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Hayward O. Brandon against the United States for wages for overtime work performed during 1941 as an employee of the Post Office Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM D. NORRIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 40) for the relief of William D. Norris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to

pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William D. Norris, of 715 North E Street, Las Vegas, Nev., the sum of \$6,760, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for loss of earnings and for pain and suffering as a result of personal injuries sustained on December 19, 1942, near Boulder Dam, when a United States Army vehicle collided with an automobile driven by the said William D. Norris: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIA BUSCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 660) for the relief of Julia Busch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Julia Busch, of Little Falls, N. Y., the proceeds of national service life insurance policy No. XXXXXXXX issued to Clifford J. McCarter, late private, Company H, Two Hundred and Seventy-third Infantry, United States Army, who was killed in action in Italy, on February 11, 1944. Although the said Julia Busch was designated by the insured as beneficiary of such policy, her claim for payment thereunder was disallowed by the Veterans' Administration on the ground that she did not stand in loco parentis to the insured within the meaning of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, because such relationship did not have its conception during the minority of the insured.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES A. GORDON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1080) for the relief of James A. Gordon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That James A. Gordon, of Columbia, S. C., is hereby relieved of liability for payment to the War Department of the sum of \$861.25, such sum having been charged against the said James A. Gordon by the War Department as a result of the theft of public funds in his custody, without fault or neglect on his part, while he was on active duty as a second lieutenant in the Army of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LACEY C. ZAPF

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1429) for the relief of Lacey C. Zapf.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lacey C. Zapf, of Washington, D. C., the sum of \$486.56 in full satisfaction of his claim for transportation

costs and other expenses incident to the return of his dependent daughter, Mrs. Betty Zapf Prudden, from Sydney, Australia, to Washington, D. C., in February 1940, incurred by the claimant when he was acting under appointment as American trade commissioner to Australia under travel order issued by the United States Department of Commerce.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOUTHERN FIREPROOFING CO., CINCINNATI, OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 627) for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$32,935.52 to Jacob Lichter and Jennie L. Lichter, partners doing business as Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States under certain negotiation agreements between them and the Secretary of War (now the Secretary of the Army).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$32,935.52" and insert "\$27,019.39."

At the end of the bill, add the following: *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD GRAY AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 752) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Edward Gray, Sr.; Edward Gray, Jr.; Bertha Mae Gray; Bertha Patmon; and Lindsay Gardner, all of the city of Hamtramck, Wayne County, Mich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment, as if the United States were suable in court, upon the claim of Edward Gray, Sr.; Edward Gray, Jr.; Bertha Mae Gray; Bertha Patmon; and Lindsay Gardner, all of the city of Hamtramck, Wayne County, Mich., against the United States for loss and damage sustained when the automobile of Edward Gray, Sr., was struck by a truck owned by the United States at Camp Custer Military Reservation, at the corner of Gallagher and Jacob Avenues in the city of Hamtramck, on the 28th day of June 1942.

Sec. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the

enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIGUEL A. VIERA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1474) for the relief of Miguel A. Viera.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to Miguel A. Viera, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injury sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army truck at Leghorn, Italy, on January 11, 1946.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Miguel A. Viera for damages sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army truck at Leghorn, Italy, on January 11, 1946.

"SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Miguel A. Viera for damages sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army truck at Leghorn, Italy, on January 11, 1946."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN J. O'MARA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1631) for the relief of John J. O'Mara.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John J. O'Mara, Dublin, Eire, the sum of \$1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John J. O'Mara against the United States arising from an attack made upon him in Dublin on January 27, 1944, by a citizen of the United States who was under prison sentence as the result of a general court martial and who had

escaped from the custody of the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAURICE J. SYMMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1666) for the relief of Maurice J. Symms.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944, Maurice J. Symms, New Orleans, La., shall be held and considered to have been employed for 3 years by the Isthmian Canal Commission on the Isthmus of Panama during the construction period of the Panama Canal, from May 4, 1904, to March 31, 1914, inclusive. The said Maurice J. Symms was compelled to leave such employment after 2 years 11 months and 23 days because of illness.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JACOB ORNSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Dr. Jacob Ornstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, is authorized and directed to furnish to Dr. Jacob Ornstein, professor of modern languages, Waldorf College, Forest City, Iowa, an automobile equipped with such special attachments and devices as may be necessary to enable the said Dr. Jacob Ornstein to operate such automobile by hand. Such automobile shall be purchased out of funds available to the Bureau of Employees' Compensation for the payment of compensation under authority of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended. The said Dr. Jacob Ornstein served with distinction during World War II in the Office of Strategic Services, his knowledge of European languages being of invaluable assistance to the work of such Office. While on duty in Milan, Italy, in 1945, he was stricken with poliomyelitis, and has never regained the use of his legs.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, after "hand," strike out the and 6 down to and including "Iowa," and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,858 to Dr. Jacob Ornstein, of Waldorf College, Forest City, Iowa, for the purchase of."

Page 2, line 2, after "hand," strike out the remainder of line 2 and all down to and including "amended," in line 9.

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRACE L. ELSER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2594) for the relief of Grace L. Elser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the civil-service retirement and disability fund, to Grace L. Elser, the widow of Wilbur L. Elser, formerly a soil conservationist with the United States Department of Agriculture, an annuity equal in amount to the annuity which she would have been entitled to receive had the retirement of the said Wilbur L. Elser become effective on May 15, 1947, and had he elected in writing, at the time of such retirement, to receive a reduced annuity equal to such reduced annuity payable after his death to the said Grace Elser, as surviving beneficiary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AULDON ALBERT AIKEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2628) for the relief of Auldon Albert Aiken.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Auldon Albert Aiken, of Hampton, Va., the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Auldon Albert Aiken against the United States on account of personal injuries (including medical and hospital expenses), property damage, and loss of earnings sustained by him as a result of gunfire by an Army sentry on January 5, 1942, at the airport of the College of William and Mary, on the old Richmond Highway near Williamsburg, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1,
COWLITZ COUNTY, WASH.**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3193) for the relief of Public Utility District No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not already appropriated, the sum of \$62,299.38 to Public Utility District No. 1, Cowlitz County, Wash., in full settlement of the said public-utility district's claim against the United States for a fee paid by the said public-utility district to the clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, Southern Division, in cause No. 8592, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 8, section 555, title 28, United States Code, Annotated, as then in effect: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY THOMAS SCHIEK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3300) for the relief of Mary Thomas Schiek, a Red Cross employee injured by the Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$50,000 to Mary Thomas Schiek, in full settlement of all claims against the United States and against Charles H. McDewitt, Jr., formerly a major in the Medical Corps, and Chief of the Surgical Service, Three Hundred and Seventy-second Station Hospital, for permanent injuries suffered as the result of the negligent operation of an Army truck on May 27, 1945, in Bengal Province, India, and as the result of neglect and malpractice by Army Medical Corps personnel of the Three Hundred and Seventy-second Station Hospital: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$50,000", and insert "\$35,000."

Page 1, line 6, after the name "Schiek", insert "of Milwaukee, Wisconsin."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "States", strike out the bill down to the colon in line 3, page 2, and insert: "for personal injuries, pain and suffering, permanent disability, and loss of earnings sustained by her and arising out of an accident which occurred in Bengal Province, India, on May 27, 1945, while she was riding in an Army truck, and against all officers, agents, or employees of the United States whose acts or omissions caused or con-

tributed to the personal injuries, pain and suffering, permanent disability, and loss of earnings sustained by the said Mary Thomas Schiek."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mary Thomas Schiek."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**ALASKA NATIVE BROTHERHOOD AND/OR
SISTERHOOD**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3494) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer a building in Juneau, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood, Juneau, Alaska, camp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transfer without charge to the Alaska Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood, Juneau (Alaska) Camp, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in the following-described building in Juneau, Alaska, now owned by the Alaska Native Service:

A one-story two-room frame building, 28 by 45 feet and 24 feet high, presently located on a tract of tidelands shown as lot 2, block A, on the unofficial survey plat of the Juneau Indian Village.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**KNICKERBOCKER INSURANCE CO. OF
NEW YORK AND ATLAS ASSURANCE
CO., LTD.**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3726) for the relief of Knickerbocker Insurance Co. of New York and Atlas Assurance Co., Ltd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Knickerbocker Insurance Co. of New York, the sum of \$2,639.07, and to Atlas Assurance Co., Ltd., the sum of \$18,473.48, in full and final settlement of all of their claims against the United States resulting from property damage to the West Dallas (Tex.) Works of the Texas Co. caused by the crash of a B-29 Army bomber into the said plant on October 8, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any one agent or agency, or by any one attorney or firm of attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARY L. W. DAWSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3803) for the relief of Mrs. Mary L. W. Dawson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mary L. W. Dawson, of Athens, Ga., the sum of \$1,740. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Mary L. W. Dawson against the United States for payment of a 6 months' death gratuity of which she was deprived by reason of an error in the naval record of her husband, Lieutenant (junior grade) Cosby Homer Dawson, now deceased. Such error has been corrected by the Board for Correction of Naval Records and the Secretary of the Navy acting pursuant to section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**NEW YORK QUININE & CHEMICAL WORKS,
INC., ET AL.**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4653) for the relief of the New York Quinine & Chemical Works, Inc.; Merck & Co., Inc.; and Mallinckrodt Chemical Works.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Merck & Co., Inc., acting on behalf of itself and on behalf of Mallinckrodt Chemical Works and the New York Quinine & Chemical Works, Inc., pursuant to the wartime arrangement entered into at the request of the Government between the three companies and Defense Supplies Corporation for stock piling critical materials, is hereby relieved from the liability of turning over to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as successor to Defense Supplies Corporation, the sum of \$139,293.55, which amount was received by Merck & Co., Inc., for the account of Defense Supplies Corporation pursuant to the above-mentioned wartime arrangement.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORFOLK COUNTY TRUST CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5356) to provide for the conveyance of land to the Norfolk County Trust Co. in Stoughton, Mass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal Works Administrator is authorized and directed to sell and convey by quitclaim deed to the Norfolk County Trust Co., in Stoughton, Mass., upon such terms and conditions as in his discretion he deems to be in the best interest of the United States, a triangular parcel of land off the northerly side of the United States postoffice site at Stoughton, Mass., particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point marked by a stone bound at the northwest corner of the postoffice site, said point also being the intersection of the east side of Washington Street

with the north side of the right-of-way nine feet wide, more or less; running thence eastwardly along the north side of said right-of-way a distance of eighty-six and two one-hundredths feet to a point in the west side of Park Street marked by a stone bound at the northeast corner of the post-office site; thence southwardly along the west side of Park Street a distance of eight and forty-one one-hundredths feet to a point in the south side of the said right-of-way; thence continuing southwardly along the west side of Park Street a distance of six and eight one-hundredths feet to a point; thence northwardly a distance of eighty-eight and sixteen one-hundredths feet to the point or place of beginning, containing six hundred and ten square feet, more or less.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the partial word "Fed-" after the word "the".

Page 1, line 4, strike out the partial word "eral" and the word "Works" and after the word "Administrator", insert the words "of General Services".

Page 1, line 4, after the word "authorized", strike out the words "and directed".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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

XXXXXXXXXX Acevedo, Ramona nee Diaz Galetty.

XXXXXXXXXX Adam, Emmanuel Konstantinos or Emanuel Constantinos Adam.

XXXXXXXXXX Altmann, Anton Frederick (Friedrich).

XXXXXXXXXX Alves, Domingos Esteves.

XXXXXXXXXX Angulano-Alcazar, Felix alias Agustin Valencia alias Agustin Valencia Anguiano alias Felix Anguiano alias Felix Anguano.

XXXXXXXXXX Andersen, Knud Kaspar.

XXXXXXXXXX Anderson, Axel Hjalmar alias Axel Hjalmar Carlsson.

XXXXXXXXXX Apeessos, Ioannis Pndelis alias John J. Apeessos.

XXXXXXXXXX Appelthaler, Katerina.

XXXXX Appelthaler, Kurt Robert.

XXXXXXXXXX Arellano, Domingos Ramos.

XXXXXXXXXX Arellano, Soledad Valadez or Soledad Maria Valadez.

XXXXXXXXXX Arellano, Innocencio.

XXXXXXXXXX Arellano, Domingo, Jr., or Dominic Arellano.

XXXXXXXXXX Arellano, Juan or John Arellano.

XXXXXXXXXX Arit, Hans Erich Lothar.

XXXXXXXXXX Arrighi, Alessandro or Alexander or Alessandro Arrigo.

XXXXX Bagniewski, Wanda Stanislaw or Wanda Stanislaw Kiernik.

XXXXXXXXXX Bastide, Genevieve Marcelle.

XXXXXXXXXX Bau, Siu-Tsung or Marguerite Janet Bau Chang.

XXXXXXXXXX Baum, Betty.

XXXXXXXXXX Baumann, Henrik Chaskiel or Henry Baumann.

XXXXX Beitelstein, Anton, Anton Stein, Tony Stein or Anton Beidelstein, Anton Beitelstein.

XXXXXXXXXX Berard, Jorge Vandesmet.
XXXXXXXXXX Berkle, Ivera Romalia.
XXXXXXXXXX Bernheimer, Ludwig.
XXXXXXXXXX Bianchi, Luigi.
XXXXXXXXXX Blake, Eulalie Constanca or Eulalie Constanca Turnbull.

XXXXXXXXXX Blake, Helena Ketruda or Helena Ketruda Powell.

XXXXXXXXXX Bober, Maria Theresia Gerber.

XXXXXXXXXX Borraccia, Lorenzo.

XXXXXXXXXX Bronner, Eugenia Michael formerly Eugenia Gavriloff, nee Losseff.

XXXXXXXXXX Bronner, Helen Tamara Marianna formerly Helen Tamara Marianna Gavriloff.

XXXXXXXXXX Brouwer, Frans Hieronimus Borgman.

XXXXX Brown, Doris nee Singh.

XXXXXXXXXX Brown, Morris Simon alias Movsa Braunreit.

XXXXXXXXXX Burgers, Willem Adolph Johan.

XXXXXXXXXX Butterick, Janet Barry or Janet Barry Mack.

XXXXXXXXXX Candia, Jose alias Jose Candia Urguidi or Jose Urguidi or Joe.

XXXXXXXXXX Carro, Alfredo or Alfred Carro.

XXXXXXXXXX Castillo, Geronimo or Giro Castillo.

XXXXXXXXXX Chalmers, Bromley Russell Scott.

XXXXXXXXXX Chalmers, Jill.

XXXXXXXXXX Chin, Yuen Chew or Chin Yuen Chew or Chew Yuen Chinn.

XXXXXXXXXX Chui, Wan; Chui Wan; Hang Kin Chui; Hankin Hunt.

XXXXXXXXXX Ciesla, Ludwik.

XXXXXXXXXX Valdes, Maria Hortensia Clemente y Sanchez McDonald; or Hortensia Clemente Y Sanchez McDonald Valdes nee Hortensia Clemente Y Sanchez; Maria Hortensia Clemente Sanchez or Maria Hortensia Clemente McDonald.

XXXXXXXXXX Cohen, Joseph.

XXXXXXXXXX Cohen, Gertie Gertrude.

XXXXXXXXXX Conradt, Ernst Heinrich Wilhelm or Ernst Henry Conradt.

XXXXXXXXXX Cuculli, Francesca R.

XXXXXXXXXX DaGoutis, Louise Emilie nee Masse.

XXXXX Davis, Diane May.

XXXXXXXXXX Davis, Eileen Marie.

XXXXXXXXXX Davis, Philip Bennet.

XXXXXXXXXX Dawson, Harriet Mae or Hattie Mae Lloyd or Harriet Mae Gibson.

XXXXXXXXXX De Escalante, Alicia Adriana Vara or Alicia Adriana Vara-Solis DeCordero.

XXXXXXXXXX De Gomez, Rita Avena alias Rita Avena.

XXXXXXXXXX Dimakos, Christos alias Christos Demakos.

XXXXXXXXXX DiPietro, Sebastiano or Pietro Petrillo or Grido Cardella.

XXXXXXXXXX Drioli, Salvatore.

XXXXXXXXXX Elvir, Cesar Augusto.

XXXXXXXXXX Engles, Elsie Violet nee Elsie Violet Huffman.

XXXXXXXXXX Fahie, Adeline nee Nibbs.

XXXXXXXXXX Fahie, Joseph Alfred.

XXXXXXXXXX Fahie, Rebecca.

XXXXXXXXXX Fekete, Agnes Elizabeth nee Pauza now Kourcosk or Korscak.

XXXXXXXXXX Frank, Annie or Ann Frank or Ann Burtnik Frank or Annie Burtnik Frank.

XXXXXXXXXX Frazer, Joseph Wellington.

XXXXX Frenkel, Mayer.

XXXXXXXXXX Gabriel, Manuel Gimenez.

XXXXXXXXXX Gallegos, Manuel or Manuel Medina.

XXXXXXXXXX Garcia, Juan or John Garcia.

XXXXXXXXXX Garcia, William Joseph.

XXXXXXXXXX Garlipp, Franz Hermann or Frank Herman Garlipp.

XXXXXXXXXX Ghinelli, Germano or Jerry Ghinelli.

XXXXXXXXXX Gobb, Marguerite Elinor nee Aaron also known as Marguerite Elinor Aaron.

XXXXXXXXXX Gomez, Maria Pilar alias Olivia Gomez alias Maria Olivia Gomez Pedroza or Maria Pilas Gomez Quesada.

XXXXXXXXXX Greaves, Anne Marie nee Anne Marie Erneste Pierre Monlouis-Eugene.

XXXXXXXXXX Gson-Niebling, Goesta Bertil.
XXXXXXXXXX Hanko, Joseph Ewald or Joseph or Jozef Hanko.

XXXXX Harvie, Meryl Lorraine or Meryl Lorraine Grayson.

XXXXXXXXXX Hernandez-Gutierrez, Jose Maria.

XXXXXXXXXX Haimburger, Rudolf Gustave or Rudolf Haimburger.

XXXXXXXXXX Huggins, William Archibald.

XXXXXXXXXX Jacobs, Olive Jane.

XXXXXXXXXX Joanta, Florence nee Florence Antonescu.

XXXXXXXXXX Johansen, Kristian Rudolf.

XXXXXXXXXX Kimbell, Ofelia Aycardi nee Aycardi.

XXXXXXXXXX Kokolis, Jonnes Peter; or Kokolis, John Peter alias John Nicholas Kokolis or Ioannis Kokolis or Ioanis Giannaris or Ioannis Panagiotis Kokolis or Ioanis Koukalis.

XXXXXXXXXX Kostrzak, Lita Foerster nee Lita Foerster.

XXXXXXXXXX Kovar, Anton or Anton Joseph Kovar.

XXXXXXXXXX Kromhout, Arie Jan.

XXXXXXXXXX Laeske, Hedwig Anna formerly Browne nee Bardeleben.

XXXXX Lansford, Ethel Matilda formerly Ethel Matilda Molohon nee MacDonald.

XXXXXXXXXX Lee, Ruth Mo or Ruth Lo-Tak Mo.

XXXXX Lencovich, Joseph Peter.

XXXXXXXXXX Lepore, Salvatore alias Samuel or Sam Lepore alias Samuel Le Poce.

XXXXXXXXXX Lettsome, Edward or Edward Letsome.

XXXXX Levitsky, Thomas.

XXXXXXXXXX Longos, Katina.

XXXXXXXXXX Lopez-Martinez, Juan.

XXXXXXXXXX de Lopez, Maria Valadez-Romero.

XXXXXXXXXX Lo Gurdo, Sebastiano.

XXXXXXXXXX Lucas, Lieselotte or Lieselotte Muenzer or Lotte Muenzer or Munzer.

XXXXXXXXXX Luschnig, Klaus Oswald or Klaus Carnival.

XXXXXXXXXX Mac Clymont, David or Thomas Wood.

XXXXXXXXXX Mahlman, Bruno William or Bruno William Dietrich Mahlman.

XXXXXXXXXX Malerba, Domenico or Domenick Malerba.

XXXXXXXXXX Mantzuranis, Evagelia or Evagelia Mantzuranis or Evagelia Stratigakis.

XXXXXXXXXX Mar, Judy alias Judy Muck.

XXXXXXXXXX Mar, James alias James Muck.

XXXXXXXXXX Mariades, Helene Agouras formerly Helene Andrea Agouras.

XXXXXXXXXX Marquez, Arturo.

XXXXXXXXXX Marquez, Maria Del Carmen.

XXXXXXXXXX Martinez, Cruz.

XXXXXXXXXX McDougall, Joseph Ignatius.

XXXXXXXXXX McGill, John Joseph.

XXXXX Mendoza, Julio.

XXXXXXXXXX Mendoza, Jose Salome.

XXXXXXXXXX Montgomery, Clem.

XXXXXXXXXX Muller, Mathias or Mathew Muller.

XXXXXXXXXX Muller, Barbara nee Messner.

XXXXXXXXXX Munz, Maria Amparo Gegunde Gomez nee Maria Gegunde.

XXXXXXXXXX Munroe, Harold Bruce.

XXXXX Newton, Arthur.

XXXXXXXXXX Nimench, Thomas Kun or Thomas Nimench or Thomas Nimench Bey or Thomas Kun Nemere or Keen Nimench or Sam Nimench or Keen Nimeh.

XXXXXXXXXX O'Dyer, Elizabeth nee Ahern alias Elizabeth Organ.

XXXXXXXXXX Ottley, Robyn Josephine.

XXXXXXXXXX Palceira, Vicente or Vicente Palceira Perez.

XXXXXXXXXX Palermo, Rosario or Richard Ross Palermo or Ross Palermo.

XXXXXXXXXX Palermo, Salvatore or Samuel Palermo.

XXXXX Palermo, Vincenzo or James Palermo.

XXXXXXXXXX Palermo, Anna.

XXXX Pane, Antonino or Anthony Pane or Antonio Pane.
 XXXX Papadakis, Georgia N.
 XXXX Parasiliti, Nicola Sebastiano Colazzo or Nicola Sebastiano Parasiliti Colazzo or Nicholas Parasi or Benny Pernite or Nicholas Benny Pernite.
 XXXX Paul, Alvin Colton Thomas Theophilus.
 XXXX Piekarz, Hersz.
 XXXX Pilostomos, Christos Antonios.
 XXXX Questel, Francois Marie Edouard, or Edouard Questel.
 XXXX Ramos, Anastacio.
 XXXX Ramos, Anacleto.
 XXXX Rando, Bartolo.
 XXXX de Rangel, Rita Morales or Rita Arroyo.
 XXXX Rehen, Estrid Viola Margareta or Estrid Viola Margareta Tengwall nee Sundberg.
 XXXX Reinsma, Otte or Otto Reinsma.
 XXXX Reiter, Fanny nee Diamond or Fany Reiter.
 XXXX Resch, Frank or Frank Reck or Franz Resch.
 XXXX Reynolds, Bernard Douglas.
 XXXX Robles, Isidro.
 XXXX Roberts, Norma Elizabeth or Norma E. Roberts or Norma Roberts.
 XXXX Rodgers, Naomi Elizabeth.
 XXXX Roman-Rodriguez, Antonio.
 XXXX Rostar, Victor.
 XXXX Rothstein, Izidor.
 XXXX Rothstein, Helena.
 XXXX Rudd, James Sidney.
 XXXX Ruiz-Carillo De Quintero, Maria or Dolores Cardenas-Soto.
 XXXX Rullo, Hazel Ann nee DeLisle.
 XXXX Russo, Salvatore.
 XXXX Sagert, Clarence James.
 XXXX Schenk, Otto alias Otto Lehman.
 XXXX Schneider, Richard Georg.
 XXXX Schoenberg, Wilhelm Heinrich August or William Schoenberg.
 XXXX Semega, Maria nee Maria Palov-clik.
 XXXX Shee, Ong Kwok or Ong Kwok Shee or Roy Ong.
 XXXX Shumis, Artemis Troyannou or or Artenoula Trogiannou or Artemis Troiannou or Artemis Troyannou.
 XXXX Sirianos, George or Georgios Theodore Sirianos.
 XXXX Smedley, Shane Karen Douglas.
 XXXX Sommer, Oscar Felix or Oskar Felix Sommer or Felix Sommer.
 XXXX Stevens, Annie Isabella.
 XXXX Sturmer, Gerlinde Maria.
 XXXX Tackolander, Leonard Helga alias Leonard Quire.
 XXXX Tatem, Edmund Adolphus.
 XXXX Tomas-Morely, Jose or Jose Tomas, Junior.
 XXXX Tornow, Marie nee Wejnls or Marie Fischer.
 XXXX Trapatsa, Chrysoula.
 XXXX Ullah, Anfar.
 XXXX Vafides, Olge nee Rafaeledes.
 XXXX Valjas, Artemi.
 XXXX Vasquez, Jorge Carrion alias Robert Franco.
 XXXX Vestes, Stratos or Ernest Vestes alias Histiatis Vestis.
 XXXX Villegas, Ramon alias Ramon Villegas-Ortiz.
 XXXX Wallace, Ezra.
 XXXX Wasserman, Benjamin or Bernard Wasserman or Benjamin Wasserman.
 XXXX Wayditch, Julia alias Julia Bornyaszi Oroczy.
 XXXX Whearty, James Patrick or James Wheatley.
 XXXX Willman, Philip John Archibald.
 XXXX Wilson, Arthur Rutherford.
 XXXX Wilson, Walter Allen.
 XXXX Wright, Lourdes Dizon.
 XXXX Yang, Chao-Chen.
 XXXX Yang, Dzing-Tsch Shun.
 XXXX Yuelling, Joseph or Yoesef.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 8, lines 22, 23, and 24, strike out the registration number and the name "XXXX Nimeneh, Thomas Kun or Thomas Nimeneh or Thomas Nimeneh-Bey or Thomas Kun Nemerea or Keen Nimeneh or Sam Nimeneh or Keen Nimeh."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer several amendments, which are at the Clerk's desk and ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FEIGHAN:

On page 7, after line 5, add the following registration number and name:

"XXXX Diamantopoulos, Sapho."

On page 6, after line 22, add the following registration number and name:

"XXXX Kahn, Akram or Mohamed Akram or John Elk or Chief Running Elk."

On page 9, after line 17, add the following registration number and name:

"XXXX Pirrone, Antonino."

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary has agreed to expedite the approval of three individual cases in which personal and family hardship is involved. The cases have been submitted by the Attorney General with his favorable recommendation during the year 1949. The three aliens have submitted valid reasons for urgent trips abroad to be made within the next few weeks. Should the approval of the Attorney General's recommendation be withheld until next year, the three aliens in question will not be able to leave the United States and return legally.

The committee has examined the three cases and it recommends that the three names be added to Senate Concurrent Resolution 28. The Senate concurrence in these amendments has been unofficially promised by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The amendments were agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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

XXXX Abbott, Arnold, or Felix Arnold Abbott.

XXXX Acuna-Salcido, Francisco.

XXXX Adamopoulos, Georgios Athanasius, or George Athos Adamson, George Athos Adamopoulos.

XXXX Andrianos, Panagiotis Stauros, or Peter Andrianos.

XXXX Apell, Karin Guborg Dagmar (nee Ericsson or Karin Apell or Appell).

XXXX Arraiza, Dafne Raquel Alvarez.

XXXX Atkinson, Marguerite Anne or Marguerite Anne Franklin Cavens or Marguerite Alice June Cavens (nee Marguerite Anne Franklin).

XXXX Balloff, Sophia (nee Papadopoulos).

XXXX Bencivenga, Giuseppe, or Joseph Bencivenga or Raffaele Cirillo.

XXXX Bennett, Raya.

XXXX Blankenberg, Frederick Moritz Anst, or Frederick Moritz Ernest Blankenberg (alias Frederick Morris Ernest Blankenberg, alias Fred Blackwell, alias Fred Blankenberg).

XXXX Boellaard, Helena.

XXXX Bond, Austin.

XXXX Borg, Carmel Charlie.

XXXX Borza, Guiseppe.

XXXX Borza, Antonia.

XXXX Bushey, Elmer Joseph, or Boucher, or Bushey or Dick or Richard Bushey.

XXXX Caballero-Bustamante, Alberto Antonio.

XXXX Caballero-Bustamante, Rafael. Caballero-Bustamante, Maria Estela.

XXXX Caramsaledis, Fotini (nee Dileveu).

XXXX Castellano, Vincenzo, or Vincent James Castellano or James Castellano.

XXXX Cavallarini, Guerrino.

XXXX Chan, Kenneth Ivan, or Kenneth Ivan Hing.

XXXX Chavez-Reyna, Alfredo, or Alfredo Chavez.

XXXX Chew, Kwong Hai, or Harry Kwong (Hal Chew).

XXXX Christake, Merope (nee Kiloni).

XXXX Cipolat, Romano.

XXXX Cohen, Dora (nee Rom).

XXXX Coutsis, Elias Athanasius or Koutsis.

XXXX Cristiani, Henrietta Edith, or Henrietta Cristiani.

XXXX Cybulski, Benjamin, or Robert Gordon or Manuel Solis or Josef or Joseph Royer or Emilio Valdez or Emilio Honorato Valdez y Ramirez or Myer Bursyn or Burstein or Benumek Subelsky or Zubelsky.

XXXX DeGarcia duenas, Adela Aguilera.

XXXX DeLeon, Manuel Valencia.

XXXX Del Valle, Raul Rodriguez, or Raul Del Valle.

XXXX DePolendo, Genoveva Zavala.

XXXX Dittner, Pierre Raymond.

XXXX Eng, Winifred, or Winifred Ho Chong or Ho Gum Lan.

XXXX Fischer, Bela.

XXXX Fox, Irene (nee Fuchs or Ronia Malka Fuchs).

XXXX Gall, Orzalo.

XXXX Gensen, Friedrich Paul, or Frederick Gensen.

XXXX Godinez, Juan.

XXXX Griffin, Robin Delmar.

XXXX Grizopoulos, George.

XXXX Grove, Marmaduke, or Marmaduke Grove-Valenzuela.

XXXX Guillemette, Dorothy Leslie.

XXXX Harb, Salem Abraham Esah.

XXXX Hobbs, Ernest Frank.

XXXX Horvath, Zofia Mary Rawicz, or Zofia Mary Rawicz Oldakowska.

XXXX Koenig, Brigitta.

XXXX Kyriakakis, Consta.

XXXX Lawson, Marjorie Ing-Kai (alias Marjorie Naitto).

XXXX Lee, Yung Tsin.

XXXX Lee, Joseph Tsu-An, or Jew On Lee or Joseph On Lee or Lee Jew On or Joe On Lee.

XXXX Leibovitch, Harold.

XXXX Lorenz, Kurt Paul.

XXXX Madrid, Manuel.

XXXX Madrid, Maria Elodia.

XXXX Matiatos, Spiros.

XXXX Matthios, Theodoros, or Terry Matthios.

XXXX Meireles, Domingos Amaral.

XXXX Mishas, Eithimia (nee Mandicas).

XXXX Nahra, Gabriel or Nahara.

XXXX Nemes, Bella, or Bill Names.

[REDACTED] Niethe, Karl Wilhelm.
 [REDACTED] Onorati, Umberto, or Albert Onorati.
 [REDACTED] Orta, Maria De La Luz, or Maria De La Luz Horta.
 [REDACTED] Orta, Pilar, or Pilar Horta.
 [REDACTED] Orta Ramona, or Ramona Horta.
 [REDACTED] Palmisano, Gaetano.
 [REDACTED] Panciera, Mario.
 [REDACTED] Pandelaras, Paraskevi Gregory (nee Paraskevi Apostolou Pavlou).
 [REDACTED] Papadatos, Evangelos Gregorius, or Angelos Pappas.
 [REDACTED] Perez, Antonio, or Antonio Perez Matesanta.
 [REDACTED] Perez, Virginia Soto, or Virginia Soto Lagos Perez.
 [REDACTED] Pieber, Gerda, or Bessie Soukaras.
 [REDACTED] Pinto, Alessio.
 [REDACTED] Pollett, Robert Anderson.
 [REDACTED] Ramirez, Jesus, or Jesus Ramirez-Carrasco.
 [REDACTED] Randolph, Frank Charles.
 [REDACTED] Reichenbach, Mary Elaine (nee Pye, formerly Beebe).
 [REDACTED] Richter, John Frank.
 [REDACTED] Rodriguez, John Negrete.
 [REDACTED] Rouse, Peter John.
 [REDACTED] Samuel, George Ryan.
 [REDACTED] Schlupp, Anna (nee Helman).
 [REDACTED] Sereni, Pier Dino.
 [REDACTED] Sobenko, Mary (nee Maria Kuzniak).
 [REDACTED] Sootzmann, Alex Fritz, or Alex Soodzmann.
 [REDACTED] Staub, Hyman, or Herman Staub.
 [REDACTED] Stewart, Charlotte Rattray.
 [REDACTED] Stipanovic, Branko, or Branko Stipanovich.
 [REDACTED] Tarin, Berta Alicia.
 [REDACTED] Tavares, Henry De Amorin Paula.
 [REDACTED] Theodorides, Georgios Basilelos, or Georgios Theodorides or Michael Panagiotis Hadjistylanos.
 [REDACTED] Thomas, Eugene Watkin.
 [REDACTED] Thompson, Oscar Leonard, or Cyril Oscar Wilson.
 [REDACTED] Tomaselli, Charles Rudolph.
 [REDACTED] Trepcos, Helene (nee Helene Kovatsis).
 [REDACTED] Van Hanen, Toivo Albert.
 [REDACTED] Vargas, Cesar Medrano, or Cesar Vargas Medrano or Jesus Maldonado Santiago.
 [REDACTED] Vassilaros, Sofia Ilias (formerly Apostolakis).
 [REDACTED] Vassos, Alfonso Apostolas, or John Paul Pappas or Paul P. A. Vassos.
 [REDACTED] Vene, Bruno.
 [REDACTED] Vitiello, Gennaro.
 [REDACTED] Volksdorff, Ernest William.
 [REDACTED] Vucetic, Henrik Emil.
 [REDACTED] Walters, Junior, Alfred Ernest.
 [REDACTED] Wineland, Marion Gladys (formerly Bundy, nee Walker).
 [REDACTED] Yee, Gloria.
 [REDACTED] Yue, Yeun Shai.
 [REDACTED] Ha, Chan (Chow) Min.
 [REDACTED] Zarate-Urzu, Dionisio; Dionisio Zarate-Covarrubias.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, favoring suspension of deportation in certain cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has sus-

pending deportation for more than six months:

[REDACTED] Allegritti, Giovanni.
 [REDACTED] Alvear, Manuel, or Manuel Alvear Rabanal (alias Ravanada).
 [REDACTED] Anderson, Neoniella Ermakova (nee Vasilevna Tsiba Ermakova).
 [REDACTED] Barbiani, Giordano, or George Barbiani.
 [REDACTED] Bogikes, Maria.
 [REDACTED] Borgman-Brouwer, Peter Willem.
 [REDACTED] Budicin, Pietro or Peter.
 [REDACTED] Cambel, Ali Bulent.
 [REDACTED] Canela, Ignacio.
 [REDACTED] Carson, Donald Frank.
 [REDACTED] Cerniglia, Pasquale.
 [REDACTED] Chien, Alan Richard.
 [REDACTED] Chien, Philip Karl.
 [REDACTED] Chien, George David.
 [REDACTED] Chow, David Zai-Chen, or David Chow.
 [REDACTED] Churchill, Ethel Lightfoot, or Ethel Lightfoot.
 [REDACTED] Deighton, Josephine Amelia, or Josephine Amelia Deighton (nee Suchy); Josephine Amelia Suchy Deighton.
 [REDACTED] De Jimenez, Teresa Ramirez.
 [REDACTED] Del Castillo, Jose Manuel Villa, or Jose Manuel Del Castillo.
 [REDACTED] Delnanos, Evangeline (nee Slotka).
 [REDACTED] De Luzuriaga, Luis Ruiz.
 [REDACTED] De Saldana, Martha Reyes, or Martha or Marta Reyes de Saldana.
 [REDACTED] Saldana, Elisa, or Maria Elisa Saldana.
 [REDACTED] Dickson, Mary Lynn Holland.
 [REDACTED] Eckardt, Ruth (nee Jankwitz).
 [REDACTED] Eddy, Maria Inez (nee Cabanellas).
 [REDACTED] Estrada-Marquez, Edmundo Gamaliel, or Edmundo Gamaliel Estrada.
 [REDACTED] Fenner, Muriel Constance Steele.
 [REDACTED] Fiedler, Otto Erich (alias Otto Fiedler).
 [REDACTED] Florent, Benoit Charles Leys, or Benedict Leys.
 [REDACTED] Forles, Mary (Maria), or Maria Furlis.
 [REDACTED] Fung, Ng.
 [REDACTED] Garcia, Cristobal Bandera, or Christobal Garcia or Cribotal Garcia.
 [REDACTED] Garcia, Maria Jesus.
 [REDACTED] Garcia, Maximiano Macaya, or Max Macaya Garcia.
 [REDACTED] Garcia, Brigida Yulo.
 [REDACTED] Gerovich, Anthony Lennard.
 [REDACTED] Gerstein, Joseph; Joseph Gershon; Joseph Paul Gershon; Joseph Gerstien.
 [REDACTED] Gobas, Eudokia Nicholas (alias Erdokia Gobas alias Eudokia Demetrius Zoldou).
 [REDACTED] Guldberg, Fleming Halfdan.
 [REDACTED] Gundlach, Arend.
 [REDACTED] Hua, Chung Wu, or Chung-Hua Wu.
 [REDACTED] Wu, Ming-Hua Lee (nee Ming-Hua Lee).
 [REDACTED] Johannesen, Jorgen.
 [REDACTED] Juristo, Julius, or Julian Juristo Zabala.
 [REDACTED] Kolakowski, Anna, or Anna Francis Kolakowski or Anna Franciska Kolakowski (nee Polanska).
 [REDACTED] Koulakiotis, Alexandra (nee Tzamtha Coulakiotis or Colakiotis).
 [REDACTED] Lehti, Unto Oskari.
 [REDACTED] Leong, Ruth Lee (nee Yee-Yan Lee).
 [REDACTED] Li, Yuan Chuen, or Lee Yung Chuen or Yuan Chuen Lee.
 [REDACTED] Limas, Casimiro Sanchez, or Casimira Limas Sanchez or Casimira Sanchez Limas.
 [REDACTED] Mansour, Iris Isaac Ades.
 [REDACTED] Marcellin, Andre Louis.
 [REDACTED] Masi, Luigi.
 [REDACTED] Mattsson, Matts Erik.
 [REDACTED] Mellinger, Paul Frederick.

[REDACTED] Moulton, Raymond John, formerly Rowe.
 [REDACTED] Moulton, Lynne Esther Alice, formerly Rowe.
 [REDACTED] Mozzano, Lentino or Valentino.
 [REDACTED] Muzzin, Marcellina Moro (nee Moro).
 [REDACTED] Myers, Myrtle Haley (nee Skeene).
 [REDACTED] Nyl, Hual Fen Li, or Gloria Hual Fen Li.
 [REDACTED] Nyl or Mrs. Henry Nyl.
 [REDACTED] Olivera, Roque Tanada.
 [REDACTED] Owens, Stanley Jasper.
 [REDACTED] Penna, Bruno.
 [REDACTED] Pineiro, Enrique Hermo, or Enrique Hermo.
 [REDACTED] Pulli, Toivo.
 [REDACTED] Rivera, Jose.
 [REDACTED] Rodriguez, Eusebio, or Eusebio Rodriguez-Carbajal.
 [REDACTED] Rodriguez-Hernandez, Aurelio (alias Aurelio Rodriguez, alias Jose Zamora Hernandez).
 [REDACTED] Rosen, Harold.
 [REDACTED] Roth, Richard John, or Richard Roth.
 [REDACTED] Sanchez, Jesus, or Jesus Sanchez-Sosa or Jesus E. Sanchez.
 [REDACTED] Sassoon, Frank.
 [REDACTED] Schwitz, Agnes (nee Adams alias Curtis and Moran).
 [REDACTED] Simmons, Evelyn Nora.
 [REDACTED] Sisco, James Everett, or James Everette Sisco.
 [REDACTED] Skend-rogiou, Jordan or John or Ioannis Skenderoglou.
 [REDACTED] Spektor, Izak.
 [REDACTED] Spektor, Rebeka (nee Kawenoki).
 [REDACTED] Steinfeld, Marie Rose Armanda (nee Lafond, Rose Corrin, Rose Vallee).
 [REDACTED] Strand, Andreas.
 [REDACTED] Stronge, Thomas Ranken, or Strong.
 [REDACTED] Tetrick, Margaret Elizabeth, or Margaret Hedwig Tetrick or Margaret Warren (nee Coyne).
 [REDACTED] Thomas Gracita.
 [REDACTED] Tolmunen, Martha (nee Tivanainen).
 [REDACTED] Tuckett, Ebenezer.
 [REDACTED] Uddin, Tomiz.
 [REDACTED] Van Der Leek, Hendrik.
 [REDACTED] Zwart, Jan, or Jan Lawrence Zwart.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, favoring suspension of deportation in certain cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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

[REDACTED] Bag, Mufjur Rhoman, or Mufjur Bag Rohman or Beg.
 [REDACTED] Chang, Mavis Clare (nee Chen See).
 [REDACTED] Davalos, Ernestine Bautista.
 [REDACTED] De Corral, Concepcion Corbala, or Concepcion Talamantes De Corral.
 [REDACTED] Corral, Jaime Rafael (alias James Rafael Corral).
 [REDACTED] De Delgado, Rafaela Rodriguez Delgadillo.
 [REDACTED] Ellingsen, Nils Johan.
 [REDACTED] Esteves, Nelson Geraldo.
 [REDACTED] Folie, Sophie.
 [REDACTED] Gazzola, Ernesto.
 [REDACTED] Graske, Kurt Robert, or Lais Christiansen.
 [REDACTED] Kannevischer, Walter Oswald, or Walter Brandt or Walter Parker.

Kastanos, George C.
 Kastanos, Helen C.
 Kesiosoglou, Romylos (alias George Iades or Georgiades).
 Kristoffersen, Harald.
 Makridis, Elefterios Sava or Makridis.
 Pavlis, Ekaterini, or Aikaterini Pavlis (nee Voidomatis).
 Psaltides, Fotini, or Fotini Sotiriades.
 Renteria, Jesus Jose, or Jesus Jose Renteria Macias.
 Shulman, Louis.
 Sklavoonos, Angelo, or Evangelos Sklavoonos.
 Vorlop, Kurt.
 Waxman, Ethel (nee Rosenbaum or Rosen).
 Aboitz, Maria Antonia.
 Aboitz, Teresita Isabel.
 Aboitz, Jose Miguel.
 Aboitz, Xavier.
 Berman, Samuel or Sam.
 Broinstein, Sam, or Schaja Broinstein.
 Calvo, Manuel Rosello, or Manuel Calvo or Manuel Calvo y Rosello.
 Calvo, Norma.
 Calvo, Angellita.
 Chillemi, Agata (nee Russo).
 Chin, Arthur, or Chin Git or Chan Git.
 Coone, Olga Alexandra or Hoffman (nee Tuovinin).
 Curiel, Mauricio Santiago.
 Daniel, Emma I. nthe, or Emma Iantha Daniel (nee Smith, Emma Ianthe Smith).
 Santillan De, Rufina Garcia.
 Santillan, Silvia Garcia.
 Grando, Ives Grgas, or John Grgas Grando.
 Hackshaw, Mona May (nee Cockran).
 Jackman, Woodrow Wilson.
 Jorgensen, Petrus Kornelius.
 Robberstad, Trygve, or Teddy Robberstad.
 Roosekrans, Petrus Johannes.
 Santellan-Lopez, Baldomero (alias Gustavo Tempzen-Lopez alias Gustavo Lopez Tempzen).
 Shamarides, Adonis Arghyrou, or Adonis Shamarides or George Chamer.
 Soininen, Seppo Paavo.
 Thordahl, Preben Eric, or Preben Gustav Eric Thordahl.
 Tonani, Fred.
 Uras, Pasquale, or Patsey Uras.
 Baker, France Stella, or France Stella Juhel-Renoy.
 Clocchi, Luigi.
 Cuni, Battistina Elena (nee Vaerini).
 Davis, Stanley Arundel, or Stanley Davis.
 De Fonte, Sallustio.
 Dollah, William Henry.
 Kenedi, Tamas Klein or Thomas.
 Malouf, George Sleiman, or Georges Maalouf.
 Percival, Norward Edward.
 Spithogiannis, Stefanos or Spetogianis.
 Antzoulatos, Gerasimos, or Gerry or Jerry Angel.
 Ballarin, Massimo.
 Barraza, Cecilio, or Cecilio Alvarado Barraza.
 Bekavac, Anton Ivan.
 Boldin, Anthony or Baldin (alias Antonio Vittorio Isidoro Baldini, alias Antonio Nino Baldini, alias Nino or Nine Baldini).
 Casas, Jose, or Jose Casas Rosales or Jose Covos or Cobos.
 Edwards, Muriel, or Muriel Danied or Danell.
 Ferghina, Teobald Isala, or Ubaldo Isala Ferghina.

Flores, Buenaventura Garcia, or Buenaventura Flores (alias Joe Garcia).
 Franz, Jacob, or Jacob Frantz.
 Gagner, Marie (nee Minard or Mimi).
 Gilcourt, Charles Henry, or Chas. Gilcourt or Charles Gilcourt or Gilcourt.
 Hall, Bertram Carlton.
 Harrigan, Ethel Margery (nee Peterson).
 Henden, John Hovde.
 Kelly, Joseph Francis.
 Krost, Ernst Wilhelm.
 Kruse, William Herbert.
 Leon-Sanchez, Jose Gregorio, or Jose G. Leon.
 Lopez, Mauro (alias Mauro Lopez Rodriguez).
 Morales, Esteban.
 Pavich, Joseph, or Jose Pavic or Yoso Pavic.
 Perales, Carmen Dolores Guevara, or Carmen Guevara or Carmen D. Guevara or Camoli.
 Raymond, Inez Eugenia (nee McKelly or Inez Eugenia Raymond).
 Reasola, Antonio.
 Reosola, Maria Remedios Olvera.
 Sacco, Pietro Vincenzo.
 Sala, Carmelo.
 Scarcella, Leonardo Agostino.
 Silano, Carmine Sabino.
 Smith, Richard (alias Richard Valba).
 Storie, William Aitken Stewart.
 Tchekowitch, Alexander Borisovich, or Alexis Boris Alexander.
 Von Hoefel, Frederic Joseph, or Fred Von Hoefel.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

TRUSTEES OF PORTER ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1742) removing certain restrictions imposed by the act of March 8, 1888, on certain lands authorized by such act to be conveyed to the trustees of Porter Academy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to release to the trustees of Porter Academy by an appropriate written instrument the restriction placed upon that land in Charleston, S. C., which was conveyed to the trustees of Porter Academy pursuant to the provisions of the act of March 8, 1888, entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer to the trustees of Porter Academy certain property in the city of Charleston, S. C.," sections 1 and 2 of which required that the property should be inviolably dedicated to educational purposes and no other and required that the deed of conveyance contain a condition to that effect.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WINNEBAGO RESERVATION, NEBR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1330) to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell the trust allotment numbered 322 of Paul Bighead, deceased Winnebago allottee, described as the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter, section 25, township 26 north, range 6 east, sixth principal meridian, Nebraska, containing 40 acres, conveyance to be made by the issuance of a patent in fee

to the purchaser and to distribute the proceeds of such sale among the heirs of the said Paul Bighead in accordance with their respective interests: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall deduct from the amount payable under this act to any such heir a sum equal to the principal and accrued interest on any unpaid loan charged against such heir.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM HENRY TICKNER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 897) for the relief of William Henry Tickner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws of the United States, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 213 (c)), which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to William Henry Tickner, of Yokohama, Japan, minor son of the fiancée of Arthur L. Prior, private, first class, United States Army, and the said William Henry Tickner shall, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, be deemed to be the child of said Arthur L. Prior.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POON LIM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1405) to provide for the admission to, and the permanent residence in, the United States of Poon Lim.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Poon Lim shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence on November 29, 1943, the date upon which he was temporarily admitted into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year in which such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ETHEL BARRINGTON MACDONALD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1033) for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Barrington MacDonald.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Ethel Barrington MacDonald, who was naturalized as a citizen of the United States through the naturalization as an American citizen of her father at Grand Forks, N. Dak., on November 4, 1890, and who lost citizenship of the United States by residing at Bogota, Colombia, since 1929, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year from the enactment of this act, before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act.

Sec. 2. From and after naturalization under this act, Mrs. Ethel Barrington MacDonald

shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. LEON L. KONCHEGUL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2928) for the relief of Dr. Leon L. Konchegul.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws Dr. Leon L. Konchegul, of Washington, D. C., who was admitted into the United States on a student's visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Turkey.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALFRED BAUMGARTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3413) for the relief of Alfred Baumgarts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Alfred Baumgarts as of February 24, 1949, at the port of New York, N. Y., the date on which he entered the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Latvia of the first year that such quota number is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNIE BALAZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3837) for the relief of Annie Balaz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State and the Attorney General be, and they are hereby, authorized to provide for the admission into the United States for permanent residence of Annie Balaz, a native and citizen of Czechoslovakia.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Czechoslovakia of the first year that such number is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Annie Balaz shall be considered to be the natural-born daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Adrej Balaz, United States citizens."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCESCA LUCARENI, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5155) for the relief of Francesca Lucareni, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, William F. Kretzinger, now chief warrant officer, United States Army, [REDACTED], and his wife, Mildred Cole Kretzinger, are hereby declared to be the natural parents of the infant Francesca Lucareni, the custody of such infant having been granted to them by the Provincial Institution for the Protection and Assistance of Infancy, of the city of Leghorn, Italy, under order No. 131, dated January 17, 1948, signed by its director, Dr. Ullisse Foresti.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GIUSTINA SCHIANO LOMORIELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5160) for the relief of Mrs. Giustina Schiano Lomoriello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Giustina Schiano Lomoriello, a citizen of the United States, who lost citizenship by voting in an Italian election, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year from the enactment of this act, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended.

SEC. 2. From and after naturalization under this act Mrs. Lomoriello shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABRAHAM J. EHRLICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4789) to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Abraham J. Ehrlich.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 283 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 5345) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of

1938, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read, and after the reading of the first section of such bill, it shall be in order to move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the text of the bill H. R. 5617, and all points of order against such amendment are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill H. R. 5345, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage, without intervening motion, except one motion to recommend, with or without instructions.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 129]

Andrews	Fulton	Noland
Barden	Gilmer	Pfeifer
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Joseph L.
Bennett, Mich.	Green	Powell
Bentsen	Hall	Richards
Bland	Edwin Arthur	Rivers
Bonner	Hall	Sadowski
Buckley, N. Y.	Leonard W.	Sasser
Bulwinkle	Halleck	Secret
Cannon	Hays, Ark.	Shafer
Celler	Heffernan	Short
Chatham	Irving	Smathers
Chudoff	Judd	Staggers
Clevenger	Kee	Stanley
Coudert	Lichtenwalter	Taber
Davenport	McCarthy	Thomas, N. J.
Davies, N. Y.	McGregor	Thornberry
Davis, Ga.	McMillen, Ill.	Towe
Dingell	Mack, Ill.	Velde
Dollinger	Madden	Vorys
Dolliver	Morrison, La.	Vursell
Eaton	Moulder	Wolcott
Fernandez	Murdock	Wood
Fisher	Murphy	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 361 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has been recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the agricultural bill. It provides for 6 hours' general debate. It is an open rule and provides that the so-called Gore amendment may be substituted for the committee bill, known as the Pace bill, embodying some of the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture, which has been reported to the House by the Committee on Agriculture after weeks and weeks of careful consideration, and after hearing many witnesses. It was passed by a vote of nearly 2 to 1. I feel, therefore, that the Pace bill is the bill that is entitled to consideration.

As to myself, Mr. Speaker, I am the last man who should call up this rule on

an agricultural bill because, unfortunately, ever since 1933 the consumer has been forgotten and legislation has been passed in the interest of the farmers. The Pace bill is in the interest of the farmers, and to the consumer is the least objectionable, certainly less objectionable than the Gore bill, because the Pace bill for the first time provides a method whereby the consumer will receive some consideration. As one who has at all times supported farm legislation I shall, of course, support this; but I plead and urge with the membership that the Pace bill is entitled to, and deserves, favorable consideration, because it is the fairer of the two bills. The Gore bill, as I see it, is merely a Republican move to thwart the efforts of the Democrats to continue legislation in the interest of the farmers and to some extent, also, the consumers of the country.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take just a few minutes of the time of the Chairman of the Rules Committee, and of the time of the House, to put the issue fairly in front of this House, being a member of the Committee on Agriculture. Much has been said in the last few days to the effect that we wanted the Gore bill, that we wanted the present program and suspend the Aiken bill for another year.

Mr. Speaker, last June, one Sunday, about 6:30 in the morning, the Aiken bill was crammed down the throats of the Members of the House of Representatives. I am in favor of repealing this monstrosity known as the Aiken bill. I have not heard one Republican, much less any Democrat, who voted against it last year; certainly, not one Republican say he was in favor of the Aiken bill. If there is one I should like for him to stand up.

Mr. MASON. Here is one.

Mr. SUTTON. I am glad to see there are two Members here who are for the Aiken bill.

Now to put the issue squarely in front of this House, personally I am for the Pace bill because it helps the farmers of America.

Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I shall offer a substitute which will continue the present program and repeal the Aiken Act and put the proposition squarely up to the House. Then you will have one of two issues to determine. You will have the present program plus repeal of the Aiken bill, or you will have the Pace bill. Personally I favor the Pace bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentleman and he has actually made my speech because I did wish to call attention to the Aiken bill. Everyone who appeared before our committee, Republican and Democrat alike, condemned the Aiken Act and stated it was passed during the last few minutes of the Eightieth Congress, when it was about to adjourn, and that no one knew anything about what was contained in that act. Consequently, I am pleased to note the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee, coming from the same State that the gentleman from Tennessee

[Mr. GORE] comes from, who is going to introduce a substitute for the Pace bill.

I am not going to delay the House. The Members are all familiar with the question. May I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic Party has consistently legislated in the interest of agriculture and in the interest of the farmer. For 43 years I have voted for legislation to help the farmer and have done so on the theory that I have so often expressed—that if the farmer has money he will buy and create demand for manufactured goods which he needs, whether they be farm implements, clothing, shoes, or other requirements. He creates a demand for manufactured products that make for work which keeps labor employed. You all know what the conditions of the country were in 1931, 1932, and 1933 when the Democratic Party came into power.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman this question: If I understand the situation correctly, the proposition to be submitted to the House by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is in effect to suspend for an additional year the Aiken Act. The proposition which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] said he would submit to the House is repeal of the Aiken bill. As between those two propositions, which one does the gentleman from Illinois favor?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, there is no question in my mind but what the righteous thing to do is to repeal that infamous law, the Aiken Act. No one is for it. It would bankrupt the farmers and it will not do any good for the consumers. However, at this time I am supporting the Pace bill because in a measure it adopts the recommendations to some extent of the Secretary of Agriculture who I consider the best posted and the fairest man so far as agriculture is concerned. He has not only his own Department at heart; he has the interest of the Nation at heart.

Now, he realizes what the Democratic Congress under the leadership of President Roosevelt and now under President Truman has done for agriculture. I do not have to tell you what the prices in 1933 were on the various commodities. Here are the prices that the farmers received in 1932 on some of their commodities and livestock as compared with the prices received on June 15, 1949:

	1932	1949
Beef cattle.....	\$4.....	\$20.
Hogs.....	\$3.....	\$18.
Poultry.....	11 cents pound.....	26 cents pound.
Wheat.....	38 cents.....	\$1.86.
Corn.....	31 cents.....	\$1.21.
Eggs.....	14 cents dozen.....	44 cents dozen.
Butter.....	21 cents pound.....	56 cents pound.
Milk.....	\$1.28 per hundred.	\$3.55 per hundred.
Cotton.....	6½ cents.....	30 cents.

The farm subsidies, farm loans, crop loans, seed loans, and support prices were justified in 1933, when the vast majority of the American farmers were losing their farms and homes.

The extremely low prices received by the farmers for their commodities were destructive, because 16,000,000 people

were unemployed and nearly the same number employed only part time and at greatly reduced wages which were insufficient to enable them to buy enough food to sustain themselves and their families, nor to buy even those cheap things that the farmers were trying to sell.

Mr. Speaker, we must not—we cannot afford—and I am sure the country will not tolerate the recurrence of such terrible conditions and suffering by the American people. In view of the splendid record of the Democratic Party I appeal to you to give favorable consideration to this administration bill—the Pace bill.

What is the record of the Republican Party as to agriculture? What is the record? They have no record, unless it was the greedy Smoot-Hawley tariff bill that destroyed America, or unless it be the \$500,000,000 wheat relief bill of 1929, which as soon as it was expended led to the collapse of farm prices and brought on the greatest crash in this country's history. The farmers went bankrupt, losing their homes and their farms.

Now the farmers are prosperous. The Nation is prosperous; and I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, that every section of our country is prosperous. The South has derived as great a benefit under the New Deal and the Democratic administration as any section of the country. For this reason I hope my colleagues will not be led astray by the "collusive combination" of Republicans and Dixiecrats, but will vote against the mongrel Gore substitute and for the Pace Democratic administration bill.

You Republicans received and enjoyed these benefits as well, because many of your farmers in 1932 and 1933 went bankrupt, were committing suicide, and were losing their homes and all they had. The stores were closed. It was under a Democratic President and by a Democratic Congress that legislation was enacted making this country as prosperous as it is. For that reason I support the Pace bill, although I was hopeful it would give more liberal consideration to the consumer.

Therefore, I again implore and urge that you vote against the Gore substitute which has the blessing of the Republicans, and that you vote for the Pace bill.

You gentlemen have taken the following oath—that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of your office. I ask, and the country demands, that you keep this solemn pledge and obligation, and not play cheap politics in considering a farm policy at the expense of the present and future well-being of the farmers and consumers of our great country.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I shall rather quickly attempt to explain this rule and make clear that the rule now before us provides for 6 hours of general debate on the bill H. R. 5345, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. This Pace bill would amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938

by doing a number of things which I am not sure I could explain to you in full detail if I attempted to do so. I do know however that it would change the present parity price formula, it would change the present support price system that American agriculture has known for the past 10 years, and it would also permit a so-called trial run on the Brannan plan of paying the farmers of the Nation high prices for their products, while selling the same products to the consumers at a low price, with of course, the general taxpaying public paying the difference.

This rule would also—and it is a special rule as far as this particular feature is concerned—make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 5617, introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], as a substitute for the so-called Pace bill. The Gore substitute would simply postpone for 1 year, or until January 1, 1951, the effective date of the so-called Aiken law passed by the last Congress, and would continue in operation the present farm price support law, and the present farm parity formula, all of which has been in effect since 1938, so as to give to the Congress an opportunity to study the whole American agricultural problem further.

I may add it is my understanding the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau support the Gore bill and are opposed to the Pace bill, while the Farmers Union, headed by Mr. Patton is in favor of the Pace bill.

By the way, both of these bills, H. R. 5345 and H. R. 5617, contain some technical errors, either in printing or in the structure of sentences, that will undoubtedly have to be amended. So there will in all probability, be technical amendments offered to both measures.

In conclusion let me say there seems to be a great deal of confusion in the minds of almost everyone I have talked to about just what H. R. 5345, the Pace bill, will do. Certainly the bill was not explained thoroughly to the Committee on Rules. Certainly there was a sharp division of opinion among the members of the great Committee on Agriculture, who appeared before the Committee on Rules, on this bill. No one could give us any information as to what the cost of the Pace bill will be or just exactly what will be done under it. However, it was rather freely admitted that the bill would confer a very, very broad grant of powers on the Secretary of Agriculture, giving him almost dictatorial control and authority over the farmers of the Nation.

I might add, in conclusion, if I may, that after listening to my great chairman, that outstanding agriculturist and farmer, the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. SABATH], explain this rule and attempt to inject partisanship into this whole question, that I am still confused just as I think most of the Members of the House are still confused as to what can actually be done under this bill.

This is not a partisan question. The future of American agriculture is a serious bipartisan matter. Incidentally both bills that will be considered by the House have been introduced by Members of the majority on the right side of the House, rather than by Members of the minority, so it is not a partisan issue which we have

before us. Instead, it is a great national problem which confronts us. One upon which not only the future and the welfare of millions of farmers depends but also the future welfare of our entire country.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I favor the rule, and I also support the Gore bill which will be proposed as an amendment to the Pace bill.

I regret that the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has seen fit to make a political speech on this issue. There is too much politics this time in farm legislation.

But I am supporting the Gore bill because that represents the views of all the members of the Subcommittee on Agriculture that has charge of the drafting of farm legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in my long experience as a member of the Committee on Agriculture that political partisanship has entered into the drafting and consideration of our complicated farm problem. I regret this exceedingly, because it vitally affects the welfare of 6,000,000 American farm families. Because of great diversity in American agriculture, the farm problem is an economic question, which can only be solved by honest and sincere consideration on the part of Members of Congress of both political parties and the people whose welfare is at stake.

I have been one of those who has pursued the philosophy that general prosperity for the people of the United States stems from a prosperous agriculture. American farmers are the only group in our economy to produce an annual crop of new wealth from the same soil, and this new wealth supplies the vitality in the blood stream of our economy to determine whether we have a depression or generally prosperous conditions in the country. In view of this strong conviction, I have always endeavored to be fair to every segment of our greatly diversified agricultural economy in the shaping of legislation for the welfare of American farmers. I cannot say that I have always received the same consideration at the hands of some of my colleagues in the consideration of problems affecting the welfare of millions of farmers engaged in the production of diversified farm products and dairying. Be that as it may, I insist that the stakes are too high, and the risk too great, to solely place the solution of the farm problem on a political basis.

Since our discussions in past years involving agriculture have generally been on a high economic plane, recognizing the realities of our action, it is difficult for me to understand why some of my colleagues of long experience and able judgment, should overnight, cast aside their better judgment to make a political football out of the future welfare of 6,000,000 American farmers. Time and events will supply us with the reason for this radical change in conviction on the part of the majority members of our once great Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

The House is about to pass judgment on H. R. 5345, commonly known as the Pace bill. There are some good features of this bill, over which agreement could be reached. However, the injection of the Brannan plan as the important part of the bill raises the vital and controversial issue on the merits of the proposal and the sincerity of its sponsors.

The Brannan plan which promises prosperity to farmers and cheap food for consumers, rich and poor alike, is the most fantastic scheme that has ever been presented to Congress for consideration. It is not a new plan, for it has been used in every country where Communists and Socialists have gained control over the government by promising the people, if they vote right, all kinds of food and luxuries at low costs and prosperity for the farmers, at the expense of the taxpayers. In England, where farmers have lost their freedom, the Socialist government paid out more than \$2,000,000,000 in subsidies in 1948. In the past 4 years, American taxpayers have given England more than \$6,000,000,000. Under the Marshall program, the British are slated to receive more than \$1,000,000,000 this year, and they are asking for additional billions.

While the Secretary of Agriculture possesses more power than any other Cabinet member, the enactment of the Brannan plan, as presented to the committee on April 7, would complete the circle, and the Secretary would become the czar over 6,000,000 American farmers. The plan would regiment and control every farmer, his production and his income. In other words, it would destroy freedom for American farmers and reduce them to economic slaves dependent upon the edicts and bounty of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress for billions of dollars in appropriations to carry out the commitments of the Secretary. I will not be a party to any scheme which destroys freedom for American farmers.

It will be said by the sponsors of the Brannan plan that the proposal is only a trial run on three commodities to be selected by the Secretary and therefore we should authorize the plan. Section 3 of the Pace bill is permanent legislation. It is not a trial run. The Secretary can select three commodities in 1950, three commodities in 1951, three other commodities in 1952 and so on upon which he can use his experiment. The cost of the experiment will be terrific. It will run into billions of dollars annually and there will never be enough tax money in the United States Treasury to pay the bill. This will mean that the farmers will wind up without any program whatsoever and we all know what that will mean to the economy of our country. It would be disaster.

Those who urge a little bit of the Brannan plan as a trial run are unwittingly, I am sure, sponsoring an experiment in Old World socialism, which will destroy freedom for American farmers and be the beginning of the end for our Republic. I want no part of it in our country. Not even a little bit as a trial run. I am satisfied, from past experience, that the members of our Committee on Agriculture can get together and draft sound farm legislation along American lines

that will assure abundant supplies of food, fiber, and tobacco for consumers and prosperity for those who till the soil.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee presented this rule in the form in which you find it because the committee understood that was the manner in which the membership of the House wanted the question presented.

I am opposed to the so-called Pace bill. The embarrassment that I experience in opposing this measure arises out of the fact that the sponsor of the bill is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], who has given the heart of his life to the cause of those who till the soil. I regard him as being the best informed man, or certainly one of the best informed men, in the country on the subject of agriculture. I am not disposed to assault the bill that he sponsors; there has been too much time, thought, and deep interest of the farmer put into it to make an attack of this kind in good form. I am glad, however, that I see signs of a disposition upon the part of the Committee on Agriculture to give ground on the Pace bill. I think that is evident to everyone. It is something that is probably the result of what seems to be the sentiment of this body.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes; in a moment.

Let me say that I do not question the very deep sincerity of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]; I know that he has given no sign of any willingness to compromise; but compromise, in my judgment, is what we shall get; the result will not be a victory for either the majority or the minority; it will, in my judgment, be "dog fall."

In my belief, the Pace bill is out; I am confident that this committee will turn it down by a vote of from 70 to 120—perhaps not quite so high. It is my opinion, however, that some substitute will be accepted. If my only choice were limited to the pending bill and the Gore substitute I would take the Gore substitute. A motion, however will be made to amend the Gore substitute providing for the repeal of the Aiken bill rather than defer its effective date to January 1951.

If the Aiken bill has any friends, I do not know who they are; and if the Gore bill is accepted, or some substitute offered by some member of the committee which provides for a continuation of the present program carrying the repeal of the Aiken bill, I trust that the result will satisfy the membership and both the majority and minority. I do not know why anyone should want to continue the Aiken bill except that party pride may be involved, and while not interested in putting the measure into effect, I can understand that there may be some disposition to let the matter ride until a later date when the Congress will have had time to restudy and propose a different bill covering the general subject of agriculture.

Friends of the pending bill should recall that acceptance of the Gore bill, amended to repeal the Aiken Act will be doing that which the gentleman from

Georgia proposed in a bill introduced by him earlier in the session. So, no matter which way the vote goes the gentleman from Georgia is bound to win.

Personally, it would be much more preferable to me to continue the present program and repeal the Aiken bill outright. I can see no good sense in continuing that bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

THE ORIGIN OF THE BRANNAN PLAN

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have learned that the much-publicized Brannan farm plan is the brain child of Henry Wallace, Rexford Tugwell, and Alger Hiss. Prepared when Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture, it was buried for several years and then resurrected by Mr. Brannan when he became Secretary. He dusted it off and is now trying to sell it to the American farmers as a 1950 election issue. If the plan will bring prosperity, as Mr. Brannan claims, why wait until 1950 to put it over? If, on the other hand, the plan is the brain child of the Wallace-Tugwell-Hiss trio, as reported, then our American farmers should beware.

Mr. Brannan has had months to work out the details of the Wallace-Tugwell-Hiss plan, but according to observers at Des Moines, he was unable or unwilling to reveal a single definite item of cost. He had no answer to charges that milk subsidies alone would cost the taxpayers nearly \$2,500,000,000 a year. He refused to hazard a guess on the cost of guaranteeing an income standard on corn and wheat surpluses. He asks the farmers to buy "a pig-in-a-poke" that he labels prosperity without any mention of cost to the taxpayer, or of the socialistic regimentation involved in the plan.

Our farmers do not want their prosperity dependent on the whims of political planners, who, within the last 6 months, have revised their own publicly announced platform, and have reversed themselves completely. Farmers still resent the killing of little pigs, ordered by the Wallace-Tugwell-Hiss trio 15 years ago, and they will resent the Government controls Mr. Brannan now proposes. When we start writing programs of this sort in Washington and begin poking them down the people's throats, we can no longer call our Government a Republic.

BRANNAN'S DOUBLE-BARRELLED FARM PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, in trying to analyze Secretary Brannan's new farm program one finds it difficult to decide whether it is a farm program or a consumer program. Secretary Brannan proposes that farm prices should be allowed to sink to whatever level the law of supply and demand will bring about. This will please the 145,000,000 consumers by providing cheap food, but it will saddle upon the same 145,000,000 consumers added taxes to make up the difference between the cheap food prices and prices that guarantee a fair return to the farmer—plus a heavy pay-roll burden for the thousands of extra Government employees that will be needed to implement the program.

The 6,000,000 farmers of the Nation, on the other hand, are expected to be delighted with definite assurance that they will receive a check from Uncle Sam to guarantee them a fair return for their labor. Not so pleasing, however, to these same 6,000,000 farmers will be the endless bureaucratic dictation, controls, edicts, and restrictions that will be insisted upon as a necessary part of the Brannan plan. In advancing this program to subsidize and socialize American agriculture, Secretary Brannan did not consult any of the leaders of our farm organizations. Nor does he have any idea of the cost of his new farm program—at least he refuses to make an estimate.

Our present farm program is a good one; it has been tried and tested. Perhaps we had better hold on to that which is good, and try to improve it as we go along. We would be foolish to discard our present program and adopt an untried socialistic program which even if it did work would destroy the traditional independence of our farm people. The question is, "Will the American farmer benefit by regimentation and Government control, which is what the program involves?"

THE HANDS OF ESAU, BUT THE VOICE OF JACOB

Mr. Speaker, we all know how Jacob fooled his old father and robbed his older brother Esau of his birthright. Under the new Brannan Farm plan the Administration hopes to drown out the voice of reason with the clink of dollars. With promises of price security the administration expects to get complete Government control over the farmer, and thus rob him of his birthright of independence.

Mr. E. R. Eastman, editor of the American Agriculturist, expresses it as follows:

This plan is the slickest vote-getting scheme ever pulled out of a politician's hat. The cost of the plan would be tremendous, running into an estimated seven or eight billion dollars annually. To share in the plan and the Government subsidies, the farmer would practically have to turn over the management of his farm to the Government bureaucrats.

The Brannan plan is thoroughly bad and inherently dishonest. It should be fought tooth and nail, not only because of the heavy tax burden that it would place upon us all, but also because it would be a long step toward a controlled economy and socialism. It would place the American farmer exactly in the same place that the British farmer finds himself today—at the mercy of government planners. Do our farmers want to exchange their birthright for a mess of pottage? Perhaps as Mr. Eastman suggests in his article, "They had better look this gift horse in the mouth."

POLITICAL SHENANIGANS WITH AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Brannan's recent announcement that under authority of the CCC Act he would make loans to farmers up to 75 percent of support prices on wheat stored on the ground makes one wonder why he did not take such action last year at this time. He had full authority to make loans of this kind last year but did not do so. Mr. Brannan steadfastly refused

then to make grain loans unless proper storage facilities were provided. He refused to loan one dollar on wheat stored on the ground. This caused wheat producers to lose at least \$100,000,000 on their crops. Today with the same legal authority that he had last year he announces a large loan on wheat stored on the ground. The President during the campaign blamed the Republicans for lack of grain-storage facilities and for the slump in grain prices.

As a result of Secretary Brannan's recent loan announcement the price of wheat immediately advanced as much as 9 cents per bushel. This change in policy was no accident. It demonstrates to the farmers of the Nation that the administration has the power to raise or lower grain prices at will simply by using or refusing to use the authority it has under the CCC Act and other acts of similar nature. Can it be that the Truman administration is deliberately playing politics with the welfare of the 6,000,000 farmers of the Nation, using them as pawns in the political New Deal game?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the last night session of the Eightieth Congress the Aiken bill was passed. Subsequently it was signed, becoming a public law, the effective date being January 1950.

Before this public law has ever been in effect, the Eighty-first Congress has before it House Resolution 5345, which does three things:

First. It changes the parity formula to an income-support standard, doing away with the original parity formula which was endorsed and accepted by the accredited farm organizations, AAA, and the Grange. Do not ever forget this parity formula was written when farm help was needed badly.

Second. It uses the yardstick of proper farm prices as a moving period for the past 10 years, taking off a year at each end of the period.

Third. It adopts total cash farm receipts as the basis of applying the index.

Who knows whether the Aiken bill or the proposed Resolution 5345 is good or bad from the standpoint of agriculture or the Nation? If the Aiken bill is bad, why did it become public law instead of receiving a Presidential veto? Is it bad before being in effect? Did the Secretary of Agriculture declare its defects before it became public law? Did the Secretary recommend that this law be signed or vetoed? This would be interesting to know.

How many practical farmers who are members of the AAA or the Grange actually know the contents of the Aiken bill? How many know what House Resolution 5345 contains?

A practical farmer does not want his products too high and out of line such as the top of \$42 cattle, \$32 hogs, \$2.25 corn, and \$3.25 soybeans unless what he buys is at proportionately high level. No group has the right, legally and morally, to, by legislation, have what is sold at the top price and what that same group

buys at a low price and all out of proportion. The farmers, of all people, do not want this.

The same situation applies to wages and services rendered. No one group should have such privileges, regardless of the methods of attainment, political or otherwise.

When cattle were \$42 per hundred for the best grade, any cattle feeder wondered but did not question that he should not buy feed-lot cattle to market at 6 months later on that basis. That feeder knew he might take a severe loss. His better judgment said a \$42 cattle market is dangerous when he was dealing 6 months hence. When a hog raiser marketed hogs at \$32 he wondered how long it would last. He wondered whether to raise the same number of spring or fall pigs as he had before, again knowing they would be marketed 6 months later. His better judgment in most cases said sell the corn at \$2.25 instead of raising so many hogs. On grain crops he felt somewhat different and planted accordingly. He had to resort to some income method. He saw corn with a large crop go down to \$1.25. He saw cattle go down to a top of \$32. He saw hogs go down to \$18, and he was not too surprised. He was prepared, because he had proceeded slowly and with common sense. Yet he did not see what he was buying go down on a similar basis nor has he seen it yet.

Now, before a so-called trial run on House Resolution 5345, why not a trial run on the Aiken public law? Why fool the farmer? Neither of these are trial runs. They are liable to be just as permanent as any public law unless public reaction, namely, farmer reaction, dictates otherwise. As a Representative in Congress and wanting to help with the right kind of legislation, it would seem agriculture as a group would and should prefer legislation in their behalf that would not make them political guinea pigs but legislation sponsored and helped in the writing of by agricultural groups to which they belong and have faith in, namely, the AAA and the Grange. Who in all common sense should they feel has their practical long-range interests at heart, those representing them through the years at all levels or those wanting their votes? No political party has the right to trifle by playing political football with that group's economy. No elected or appointed official has that right, either.

H. R. 5345 does not contain the 1,800 norm unit system (as used in Russia) and set up in recent proposals and now included in Senate 1882 in that body. If this legislation passes what do you think will happen on the norm of 1,800 unit system, when it goes to conference. Should a plan on pigs be put into effect according to the explanation of H. R. 5345. The Secretary of Agriculture cannot put the same into effect until he decides whether or not it will throw beef and pork out of proper relationship as to price. He must decide whether the consuming public will eat more pork than beef. Neither can he put it into effect unless appropriations are available and who knows the cost.

The availability of appropriations remain with the Congress. Possibly Mr. Farmer today is thinking about taxes and spending down here in Washington. Possibly he wants some sense in Government.

If this legislation were public law years ago and applied to manufacturing the Congress would not allow automobiles to be built because it would hurt the buggy business. You could not have electricity because it would put the coal oil lamp on the shelf. Nuts.

Most practical farmers want fair prices for their products and efforts. In free enterprise which so far includes farming, if they take the losses, of course they feel entitled to the high profits during the good times of heavy demand. Most farmers resent being told what to do, and justly so. This is exactly what will happen if this legislation becomes public law. If the Aiken law contains provisions undesirable, they should be removed, and I am willing to help with such removal as long as I am here. The removals, however, should be with the distinct approval of the recognized agricultural organization. This Congress should not in my opinion rewrite legislation approved by these organizations before they have been put into effect, unless these same organizations have found constructive improvements can be added by amendment. Why should luxury perishable items be included with basic commodities in a support program. Everyone knows they were war measures and for the duration only, another trial run so to speak. This Government or this Nation does not have enough funds or available taxation to support all perishables. The public is fed up with potato programs. The original farm help legislation never intended that we should embark on such a program. Pork can be stored about 6 months without spoiling. Corn and other basic commodities can be stored indefinitely. Let Congress support storable corn and the prices of beef and pork will take care of themselves on a fair basis. This, of course, must be with the farmer's help.

Regardless of any agricultural legislation such as being proposed today or the Aiken public law, all farmers should never forget they still have the right by triple A elections to accept or reject whatever program is offered them. This will be their election. They can accept or reject by so voting. My suggestion is they had better be on hand to vote that day. They might be voted into an 1,800 norm or bondage.

Mr. Speaker, I am not voting to make the American farmer a sharecropper.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to production subsidies in any form, whether for the farmer, the manufacturer, the merchant, or the consumer. Subsidies which are but hand-outs from the Public Treasury are hostile to the philosophy of life which has made our country great. They destroy initiative and self-reliance. They dim vision and foresight. They circumscribe personal liberty and enterprise. They encourage indolence and extravagance. They generate regulation and regimentation. They require higher taxes and

greater public debt. They are class legislation.

The full power of Government must be used only to prevent extreme hardship of the people, including the farmer. It should be used sparingly and seldom. A permanent program of Government aid whether under the Brannan plan, the Hope-Aiken plan, or the Appleseed plan will eventually destroy the moral fiber and character of the American farmer. I cannot lend them my support no matter how politically expedient it might be.

The best way to help the farmer as it does all our citizens is to have a sound financial Federal structure. Subsidies beget more subsidies and lead to national bankruptcy.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise again because the gentleman from Ohio always refers to the Chicago farmer. I want to say to him that I have raised more crops than he has. Yes; I have shipped as many as 1,200 to 1,400 cars of produce that I raised on a 1,200-acre farm. I had done so up to 1931 or 1932, when I was obliged to give up. I could not stand it any more because of the Republican prosperity which was not ours.

Now, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] says, "Why, this will bankrupt the country. Look at what the Socialist Government of Great Britain has spent. They have expended \$2,000,000,000." Why, gentlemen, we spent on livestock alone in 1944, 1945, and 1946 in subsidies \$1,590,716,246. The dairy subsidy for the same 3 years was \$1,513,622,179. On these two items alone in subsidies we spent in the 3 years mentioned a total of \$3,104,338,425. That is only on these two agricultural commodities.

I venture to say that this new bill will not cost nearly as much as we have paid out in support prices and subsidies under present law, but that was during the depression and during the war. The depression has been over for years; the war is over. We now have real prosperity. Consequently I do not see how this bill could cost the amount Republican spokesmen charge, but I am not surprised because they double and triple the cost on all legislation they are opposed to.

I realize why some of you Republicans are not for this bill. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] also stated that it is political. To bear out this charge of politics, I insert an excerpt from a notice sent out by the Republican minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. LESLIE C. ARENDS, to the 171 Members comprising the Republican minority of the House, as follows:

Upon the completion of the 6 hours general debate, a substitute bill will be offered and voted upon within a short time. Accordingly, it is of paramount importance that every Member be constantly on the floor Tuesday and Wednesday, July 19 and 20.

Every Republican Member who is on his feet and breathing, or shows any sign of life and is free from doctor's orders must be accounted for on the above-mentioned dates, and be ready to vote on this important and far-reaching legislative proposal.

We must defeat the Brannan farm bill. It can be done if all Republicans are on the job. Your vote is needed.

The Republican aim is to suspend the operation of the Aiken Act for 1 year.

I say, we should do it, and do it now. Repeal this law. Did not all of you Republicans vote against the Pace bill in committee? Have you voted any real farm relief and are you not opposing it now? What is your record on that? I should like to see it. I want you to give the country the record of the Republican Party in the interests of the farmer and agriculture. You have no record with which you can go before the country. The Democrats have. All you have been giving the farmer is lip service. Our Democratic Party has demonstrated its ability and has legislated in the interest of the farmer and the country. I feel that we can trust again the party that has done so much for the country in the past and will do so in the future.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I realize how impatient the House is to proceed with this business, and with that realization in mind I shall not attempt in the limited time remaining during the debate on the rule to go into a detailed discussion of this bill. Rather, I shall attempt, and probably inadequately, to size up the situation as it appears to me.

First, this bill, as you will realize if you will only read it, and you will have to read it a good many times before you understand it—I have read it a good many times and I doubt that I understand it all—this bill does away entirely with the whole price support system as we have known it for 10 years, and to that extent it is revolutionary, and proposes in its place something that has never been tried in this country, the income support program.

To make that change means making a great decision which will have its effect down through the years to come—no one knows how many years. We would better pause before making that change.

Second, no one has been able to tell any committee of the House how much this program would cost if put into effect. No approximation of the figure has been given although there have been many, many guesses to the effect that if the program is put into effect under the income support philosophy, the cost might run anywhere from \$2,000,000,000 a year to \$8,000,000,000 a year—no one can tell. Surely we would be an adventurous Congress if we embarked upon a program with no understanding at all of how much it is going to cost—and the more adventurous if we should do so at this time when the Federal Treasury is in the red about \$1,800,000,000 a year, and will in all probability be in the red about \$5,000,000,000 a year at the end of the present fiscal year. We would better pause and look around a bit before we embark upon any such adventure.

Thirdly and lastly, as I see it, this bill plants some seeds—some seeds in the ground. True, its proponents say, "We will only plant a few at a time." I am referring now to the trial run proposal. They say, "We will only plant a few seeds at a time." But, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that once you plant those seeds,

there will develop from them hardy perennials which will live from year to year scattering their own seeds and multiply their own strength by the spread of the roots under the soil. You may plant only two or three rows, but having done that much those rows will grow and grow and finally spread over the whole field and with it will go the loss of liberty for the farmer. It is inevitable—it has happened in every country that has tried such a thing.

What do I mean when I say "loss of liberty to the farmer"? I mean that the Secretary of Agriculture, under the development of such a philosophy, would no longer properly be called the Secretary of Agriculture, but he would be called the Master of Agriculture, clothed with power unthinkable and never before proposed in this country until the Brannan philosophy was laid before us. The seeds of that philosophy are in the Pace bill—make no mistake about it.

May I close by stating to you my firm conviction that the most precious thing in the possession of the farmer is his liberty. Seldom, if ever, do you find a man going into farming with the hope or confidence that he will make a great fortune—seldom, if ever. The fact is that very few great fortunes have been made in agriculture. Why do men cling to that avocation? Why do they work 60 hours a week, or more than that if they happen to be dairy farmers? Because they like to plan their own lives. They like to sit on the porch on a Saturday evening after supper and gaze across their fields, noting the development of their livestock and the growth of their crops and the condition of their pastures. They like to sit there and plan freely not only as to what they will do on next Monday, or next month or in the next 6 months, but what they will do the next year, and the next 2 years, and for 3 years or more. Farming has to be planned. You cannot close down a farm the way you close down a factory. The man who does the planning is a man who must be free, and his most precious possession is his liberty. Take that away from him and the enjoyment of farming is gone.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, before I took the floor to close the debate on the rule, I inquired from the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], to whom I yielded 30 minutes to his side, if he or anyone else on his side desired to speak. This request was made because I felt it was my right and privilege to close debate. To my great surprise, after I concluded my remarks, the gentleman rose and asked to be recognized in order to use the unused time that I allowed him. This I consider unfair on his part, but I presume he wanted to make clear that he, representing the Republican side, is for the coalition reactionary Republican-Dixiecrat Gore substitute, which I designated in my first speech as the mongrel bill, and which, unfortunately, in no way will relieve the consumer of the exorbitant high cost of food.

I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5345) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5345, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] for 3 hours.

The gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, more than 128 years ago, in the year of our Lord 1820, the House Committee on Agriculture was created. A very distinguished North Carolinian, Congressman Lewis Williams, a native of Surry County, N. C., introduced the resolution which resulted in the creation of the House Committee on Agriculture. Although Congressman Williams served in this House for 28 years and died while a Member of Congress, he never actually served on the committee which had been created as a result of his own foresight and vision. Seventeen years later Congressman Edmund Deberry, another distinguished North Carolinian, became the first representative from my native State to serve on this important committee. Congressman Deberry became chairman of the committee and his service in that capacity terminated in 1845. No other North Carolinian served on the House Committee on Agriculture until I came to Congress. So for more than 104 years I am the only North Carolinian to become chairman of this very great and important committee.

I mention these things, Mr. Chairman, merely to emphasize the point that I take great pride in my membership on this committee. I am happy in the glad thought that after so many years, yes, so many long decades, another North Carolinian is serving on this committee. I am bold to assert that during my 15 years service on this committee more legislation beneficial to the farmers of this Nation has been enacted into law than had been enacted in all of the history of this Republic.

I take pride in the fact that I have been permitted to participate in the preparation and in the passage of various acts of Congress which go to make up a well-rounded Federal farm program, the first program that the farmers of this Nation have ever had; it is a program that has been tested and tried; it has served well the cause of agriculture both in times of peace and in times of war. When war came upon us there was no segment of our economy better prepared for the shock of war than American agriculture. Our warehouses were filled to overflowing, and our fields

were flourishing; and, yes, when peace came to the world again agriculture was prepared for the impact of peace. Under this program the farmers of this Nation have prospered to an extent heretofore unknown, and again I say that I take pride in my membership on this committee. I hope you will pardon this little personal reference.

I am a lawyer by profession; the law is my love and my life, and I was happy in the practice of law. But in my childhood I learned something about farmers and farm problems, and life on the farm. Early in life I became interested in the cause of agriculture. When I realized that my great State, which was one of the leading agricultural States of this Union, had not had representation on the House Committee on Agriculture for so many long years I told the people of my district that I would seek membership on that committee; and, fortunately, by the help of my friends here in the House and perhaps because of my announced purpose, I was elected to that committee in my first year.

I want to clear up another thing here and now: I have never in my life cherished political ambition. In my childhood I never cherished any ambition to sit in the seat of honor or to hold high office. I have said that on every platform in my district and in my State, and the people of my State know it. I now have no political ambition; my one burning desire is to vindicate the faith that the people of my State and district have placed in me. So I come before you not to pull anybody's chestnuts out of the fire. I have had many great predecessors; and I am now perfectly willing to bow with respectful deference before the splendor of their greatness and capacity and to confess that all of them were far greater than I. But to none of them will I yield in my sincere devotion to the cause of agriculture, and no one of my predecessors was ever motivated by a deeper degree of sincerity than I am at this moment.

I come before you proud of my agricultural record; and, yes, I am proud of another part of my record. I know that this House frequently breaks up into groups; I have a labor record, and it is just as good as I want it to be; I do not have to apologize for it here or at home. I have voted for the rights of labor, to give to labor the minimum wage, to give to labor collective bargaining, to give to labor job insurance, social security, and the right to strike.

I stand here now ready to increase that minimum wage, to make more secure the right to strike, to make more secure the right of collective bargaining. Yes, I have voted for and supported all of the basic fundamental rights of labor.

I realize that labor and agriculture must prosper together in this Nation. We have a great Nation, the greatest in the world and the men and women of America in the fields and factories of America have made it great. The farmer cannot be prosperous unless the worker in the city is prosperous. The city worker cannot enjoy that degree of prosperity which he has a right to enjoy in this Nation unless the farmers of this Nation are prosperous. So, agriculture and labor

and industry must go hand-in-hand and side-by-side along the road of progress, each pulling its part of the heavy load along the road that leads to prosperity.

Let me remind those who are prone to think perhaps too much of labor and too little of agriculture that agriculture is the mother of all the arts, it is the nursery of all industry. It supplies materials to commerce, jobs for labor, and food and fiber for the human race. It is the basic industry of America and we must keep it prosperous. I do not believe that any of us will ever be able to know or to fully understand the importance of the things we are about to do.

I believe that all of us know that when agricultural commodity prices go down, our agricultural economy is headed for trouble. When the farmers of this Nation find themselves in trouble, grief will soon visit the hearthstones of every man and woman that lives beneath our flag. We must support our agriculture at a high level, not only to protect the economy of our Nation but to protect the security of this Nation and to play our part in the international affairs of this great world.

I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the political implications and considerations which are here involved, I appreciate the fact that this issue has become involved in partisan politics, but I want to say for my committee that the Committee on Agriculture has been, for at least 15 years, during my service on it, free from partisan politics and seldom, if ever, has partisan politics lifted its ugly head in our committee. I deplore the fact that now partisan politics has lifted its ugly head in my committee and is lifting its head on the floor of this House. I abhor the thought that these great issues must be considered and decided in such a purely political atmosphere.

It does seem to me in deciding upon issues of this magnitude and importance that we as Americans could lift ourselves above the bondages of passions and prejudices and sit down together dispassionately and calmly and consider these issues which so vitally affect the lives and the livelihood and the happiness and the welfare of the people of our Nation; yes, of the people of the world.

Let us look at the issues before us. I take pride in the program that has been written for the last 15 years and under which we have operated so successfully. But I tell you now, after careful study, that that program is showing weaknesses and that it is not now a perfect program. If then that program shows weakness, why should we not give it strength? If it is displaying imperfections, why should we not try to perfect it?

When we came to this session of the Congress, I appointed some important subcommittees. I appointed the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], as chairman of the subcommittee to handle this problem, and on my motion the gentleman from Georgia was made vice chairman of my committee by unanimous vote. The gentleman from Georgia has worked diligently and faithfully and long hours, both in the daytime and nighttime studying the question here presented. We called upon the legal experts of the Department to analyze and

to interpret the Aiken bill line by line, and paragraph by paragraph, in an effort to find out what it contained. Now we know the Aiken bill for what it really is.

Coming again to partisan politics, I know that all of the Members of this House who were here in the Eightieth Congress recall the fact that on Sunday morning, June 20, 1948, after an all night conference, an important vote was taken. The vote was on the Aiken bill. When the roll was called, every single soul of us on this side of the aisle voted against it and my recollection is that every single soul on that side of the aisle voted for it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly will yield for a correction.

Mr. HOEVEN. For a correction.

Mr. COOLEY. I will modify that.

Mr. HOEVEN. Is the gentleman talking about the vote on the conference report last year?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. HOEVEN. There was no roll call, I would like to advise the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. But there was a vote. I accept the gentleman's statement to the effect that there was no roll call.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman would like to have the record straight. The gentleman knows that I did not vote for the Aiken bill. I voted "no" on it. He knows I voted against it in conference. What is the use of taking up so much time to tell who voted for it and who did not?

Mr. COOLEY. I apologize for that, and I just want to say to the membership that the very distinguished gentleman who has just spoken was one of the conferees, and along in the middle of the night, when the pressure was burning down from Philadelphia and the party lash was being used from one end of the Capitol to the other, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], withdrew from the conference rather than to give up his honest convictions.

That was the first time I have ever seen this House vote blindly and in woeeful ignorance of the proposition they were deciding. We know now that it was a blustering blunder. So we came out with this monstrosity, the Aiken bill, and even now the author of that bill is frank and fair enough to confess that he himself did not know what was in it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I suggest to the gentleman that the bill was written down in the Department of Agriculture and sponsored by the then Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know where it was written and I do not care where it was written. It was bad. If it is a serpent which will sap the life out of that segment of our economy that depends upon the soil. Why, pray tell me,

should any Democrat want to breathe another breath of life into it and extend it and hang that serpent over the heads of the farmers of this Nation for another 12 months?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What the gentleman is saying, and I agree with him, is that the paramount issue before the House today is whether or not that bill will be repealed.

Mr. COOLEY. That is, of course, the great issue. The committee bill provides for an outright repeal of the Aiken bill, with no apology for that bold action. Now we are met by an unusual sort of a situation, where, by some sort of collaboration, a bill has been written into the rule by number, which seeks to suspend that serpent over our heads. If it is a snake and if it is poisonous, and deadly, why not destroy it? I cannot see how any man who voted against it in ignorance and now discovers its vicious and foul provisions would want to extend its life. Let us face up to the issue. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON], a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, an ardent advocate and supporter of the committee bill but a man who desires to be frank and fair with this House, indicated to us a moment ago that he would place the issue squarely and fairly before us, whether we will repeal the Aiken bill or whether we will accept the proposition of his colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and extend its life for another year. On that vote I think we have no alternative other than to trample it beneath our feet and defeat it. Then comes the real issue involved, between that proposition and the committee bill.

Now a little bit about the committee bill. When we discovered as a result of our careful studies, extending over a period of weeks and months, that the present program has imperfections and weaknesses, we set out to do something about it. People say, what will this new program cost? I will ask the question, what will the old program cost? Nobody knows. We know this, though, that the potato program alone has cost the taxpayers of America \$408,000,000, that the egg program has cost the taxpayers \$84,000,000, and that the wool program has cost the taxpayers in excess of \$80,000,000. We have on hand 60,000,000 pounds of powered eggs, that are now deteriorating. That is a lot of rotten eggs. Talk to me about rotten apples in the barrel. These rotten eggs will wreck this program which has served agriculture if we do not do something about it. Now, are you going to sit here and say we will continue the old program and bring the house down on our heads?

We are not retreating. We are not compromising. We are not taking a nonsuit and we are not taking a nolle prosequere. We are here—every Democrat on the Committee on Agriculture, including the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON], sincerely and honestly believing that we understand the proposi-

tions involved and we are urging the House to accept and embrace and adopt and approve the committee bill.

I am taking nobody's chestnuts out of the fire. I do not believe that I will have to go home and try to sell myself to the farmers of North Carolina, and I am certain that not one among them would question my sincerity. I do not question the sincerity of those Members on the other side of the aisle. I accord them every right that I claim for myself. I do not know of a man in the House of Representatives for whom I have greater love and affection than the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPKINS]. I do not know a man whom I hold in higher esteem. He is honest and courageous and truthful and sincere. I know that he is certainly one who, when he comes to the well of the House, speaks from the impulses of a sincere heart.

But we have the responsibility as was pointed out a moment ago by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE]: shall we accept the old program as it is and refuse to improve it or perfect it?

What do we do here? This is not the Brannan plan. Heaven help us, the Brannan plan contains 86 pages. I show it to you here it is in my hand. It was introduced by Senator THOMAS in the Senate. This bill now before you contains only 12½ pages. I am frank and bold enough to say that I was not willing to embrace all of the Brannan plan. I do not believe that any of the members of the committee on either side were willing to embrace all of the Brannan plan. But when we studied the Brannan plan we found that after all it was not so bad. We have fixed it so that the Secretary, at least, could have an opportunity to experiment. This thing has been viciously maligned. They have said everything on earth about this bill which is now before you. It is burdened with all the vicious propaganda that could be leveled at it. This is the committee plan which contains only a small part of the Brannan plan—merely enough of it to afford an opportunity to conduct a proper experiment.

Then we decided on account of the uncertainty existing with regard to the experimental features of the program, although we had fully indicated in the report that it was a test or trial, there was nothing in the bill to so indicate, so the majority members of the committee agreed to offer a substitute which will contain a definite limitation of 2 years.

Further, upon consideration we decided that since we knew that eggs and potatoes and wool had been expensive commodities to handle under the price-support program, we would come out and name them so as to remove uncertainty as to what commodities would be selected. I believe, and honestly believe, that these programs handled by the Secretary with a combination of methods of supporting prices, will prove far less expensive than the old programs have proven. He must make certain honest findings. He must find that this price payment program on these three commodities will be the most practicable and most effective way to support prices.

Now, what is horrible about permitting this experiment, circumscribed as

it is, with directions to the Secretary concerning his findings and his methods.

The other change is the change in the formula for determining parity. We have abandoned the old period from 1909 to 1914 and we come up to the last 10 of the last 12 years and relate the income of the farmer to the income of the non-farmer and we have come out with the figure which fortunately or unfortunately is just about 90 percent of parity as we have known parity in the past.

I shall not go into any great degree of detail with reference to the provisions of this bill since I know that the author, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], will do so. I know the membership of the House is anxious to know something about this measure because all of us must go home, after having taken our position, and explain why we voted as we did.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. I wanted to be sure that the gentleman did not leave the impression—which some Members of the House, who are not well posted on these matters, may have—that we are striving to create something new in the handling of perishable commodities and junking the old. It is merely the implementation, another privilege that the Secretary has, without throwing out the old, and he cannot use this new power unless he finds it the best and most practical method. Is that right?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. WHITE of California. Now, just one further thing. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] dwelt on the theory that it makes a dictator out of the Secretary of Agriculture. That has been spread throughout the length and breadth of the land. I say to you that this is the only method under which the farmer can have price support and still have some semblance of freedom. He does not have to go in unless he wants to. Is that not right?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely right. They talk about regimentation. If the membership of this House will sit here and listen to this debate with open minds, they must be convinced that this bill circumscribes the authority of the Secretary almost to the nth degree. When you compare that with the broad, wide-open powers of the Aiken bill which will fall heavily upon agriculture unless we act now, I believe you will change your minds and will agree to support this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Does not the gentleman think it is a fact that the word "regimentation" has been used where the word "cooperation" would fit a great deal better?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is exactly right. The basic commodities will be handled in the future just as they have been handled in the past. Farmers will have an opportunity to express their

views with regard to the controlling of acreage and the marketing of their products. You cannot force it on them unless two-thirds of them vote in favor of it.

The difference in actual dollars and cents is about 19 cents for cotton under the Aiken bill or about 27 or 28 cents under the committee bill. Other commodities come out about the same.

Now, why all this agitation of mind and spirit about this simple proposition? Are we going to sit here and fail to act? The Aiken bill goes into effect on January 1. To all intents and purposes it actually goes into effect the minute that this Congress adjourns without doing something about it. Let me tell you, when that yoke falls on the necks of the farmers, it will prove to be a yoke of thorns that will bleed the farmers of this Nation to death. It will mean actual bankruptcy in many parts of the farming country of America. You cannot pull the rug out from under agriculture and hope that our national economy will survive. I say to you this is a sincere effort on the part of the Committee on Agriculture to bring to this House a proposition which we heartily endorse and recommend to you and urge your approval.

I want to say in conclusion that it is not the attitude of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] it is not my attitude, nor is it the attitude of the committee that we are trying here to force our will upon the Members of this House. We want this committee to work its own will, to make its own decision, but we want you to hear this debate with open minds and hearts, and then reach your own honest judgment about what your duty is. Do not refuse to give us a hearing. Do not repudiate this great committee of mine unless you have just cause to do so.

In the 15 years that I have been on this committee not one single solitary time have we met defeat at the hands of the House of Representatives. Oh, yes; we are in trouble now; we need the support of the thinking men and women of this House, and it will probably take every vote we can muster to adopt this committee bill. I urge you to believe me when I say that I am sincere in my determination not to weaken—and I shall not weaken—on this bill. I bring it to you from my heart, and I know as you hear the gentleman from Georgia, STEVE PACE, explain it you must be impressed with his great sincerity. But let me ask you this, you Democrats and Republicans alike: Am I indebted to the Democrats in the executive branch of this Government? Is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] influenced by bureaucracy here in Washington? Or are we free—I mean politically free—to exercise our own honest judgment. I do not know what you think about it, but I believe you would have to look a long time to find two men who are freer from evil political influence. Yes; all the men who sit with me on that Committee on Agriculture are free. We bring you the proposition; it is your decision; it is a great decision. It is a decision which vitally affects this Nation and perhaps will vitally affect this world. I appeal to every Republican and to every Democrat to hear this debate. It is a simple proposition; the issues have

been beclouded, the bill has been maligned and deliberately misrepresented, but it is a simple proposition, an important one; and I urge you, and I know you are Americans, to vote with the highest degree of intelligence. When you do that I shall be satisfied and I shall abide by the decisions which are ultimately made.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a bill which I believe goes a good deal further in its implications than most bills which come before this Congress. I desire to go into those implications a little later, but I do want to say in a preliminary way that I regret very much that the committee was not able to get together and bring out a unanimous report on a farm bill. I believe I speak for every member of the committee when I say that we all feel that some bill should be enacted at this session. With one or two exceptions, at least the minority members of the committee do not feel that the Aiken bill should go into effect next January and this of itself makes it necessary to pass a bill now. I had hoped that, as in the past, it would be possible for the committee to get together on a bill and, to be frank, I thought until quite recently that the subcommittee which was working on the legislation, and the committee as a whole would get together upon the bill which is now before us as the Gore substitute. That program was changed. I do not know why. All I know is that after the subcommittee had agreed to recommend a 1-year extension of the present program, something happened and the Pace bill was presented to the subcommittee and to the full committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that we did get together on a 1-year extension of the present law and suspension of the Aiken bill for that period?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; the members of the subcommittee did.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That was unanimous.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. Of course, the gentleman recognizes that a committee has the right to change its mind?

Mr. HOPE. Oh, yes. I said the committee did change its mind. That is, some members did, but I do not know why.

Now let me say, in the very beginning, that it is not true, as has been stated in the committee report, that the choice we have before us is the Pace-Brannan bill or the Aiken bill, because we have another choice. We have the Gore bill, which is reenactment of legislation now in effect, which is working as successfully as I think any farm legislation can work in a period of a changing economy—a law which has behind it several years of successful operation. The law

which the Gore substitute proposes to enact had its beginning, and I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] will bear me out, as the so-called Steagall amendment in the formulation of which I know the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] had a very important part. It was a proposal which came out of the Banking and Currency Committee as a part of one of the price-control bills, and it was adopted, as I recall, by the House without opposition. Republicans and Democrats alike voted for it back in 1941. It was the law during the war and by its terms it was in effect for 2 years following the war.

Last year, with a few modifications to adjust it to conditions that existed at that time, this House enacted it again. It was unanimously reported from the Committee on Agriculture. So the Gore bill, which I hope this Committee will see fit to adopt, not only has behind it a long history, of nonpartisan support in the House, but it has also a record of successful operation, as successful as I think we can possibly have in a period when our economy is changing as rapidly as it is now.

As to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], for whom I have the highest regard and esteem, I join in everything that his colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], said about him this afternoon. I am sure that he does not think that there is anything seriously wrong with the Gore substitute, because on the first day of the session, as I recall it, he introduced a bill which would have enacted the Gore substitute into permanent law. We are not asking that that be done. We are asking that it be extended for 1 year. So, I am sure that the gentleman from Georgia will not have to wrestle with his conscience if he should find that, through the course of events in this House, he must vote for the Gore substitute in order to start legislation on its way to the other body.

I do not need to go into any discussion of the Gore substitute, because I think everybody knows what it is. That is one advantage in considering it—we are all familiar with it; we know how it works; we understand its terminology. We do not have to try to understand some new plan, such as that embraced in the Pace bill, which, I am sure, is not generally understood among the Members of the House. For one thing, as far as the parity formula in that bill is concerned, I know that I am not confessing anything that is embarrassing when I say that most of the members of the Committee on Agriculture do not understand it. I wish the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] would use part of his time in an effort to explain to the House just how this new formula is arrived at, how it works, and what we can expect from it in the future.

Mr. Chairman, what I fear is that we are going to find ourselves at the end of this session in exactly the same position that we were at the end of the last session as far as farm legislation is concerned. There has been much criticism of the Aiken bill and the circumstances of its enactment and it is justified. However, no one in the House needs to make any apologies for that, for we were not re-

sponsible. We passed a bill, the same bill as you have before you in the Gore substitute, several weeks before adjournment. It went to the Senate, and then in the last week of the session, in the last days of that week, the Senate substituted the Aiken bill. I do not think it was properly considered in the Senate. There was no time to do it in the rush of adjournment, and, as far as the House is concerned, we had no opportunity either in the committee or in the House to consider any of its difficult and intricate provisions. It was a question of making the best agreement, the best compromise, that we could with the Senate, because the Senate was adamant. The Senate conference committee, both Democrats and Republicans, stood fast. They said "It is the Aiken bill or nothing." That situation prevailed until the very closing hours of the session. We had numerous meetings, and finally the House conferees made the proposal that we would accept the provisions of the House bill for a 1-year extension, and that we would accept the Senate bill and postpone its going into effect for a year. It was distinctly understood by the conferees of both the House and the Senate, and it was explained on the floor when the House adopted the conference report, that the House conferees had agreed to the compromise because otherwise we would have had no price-support legislation except the Triple-A Act of 1938, which provided price supports for the basic commodities on a flexible basis, mind you, of from 52 to 75 percent of parity, with no support provisions as to other commodities, except such action as the Commodity Credit Corporation might decide to take under its general authority to support prices.

The Steagall amendment would have been gone, all the price-support provisions that were worked out during the war would have been gone. So I have no apology to make when I say that we did the best we could, we brought back the best bill we could get, a bill which has worked well this year, and which, I believe, will work well for another year if we decide to continue it.

Something has been said about the fact that we ought to be passing permanent legislation. On that point, let me call attention to the fact that the Pace bill in its present form is permanent legislation. It is not a trial run. Do not let anyone tell you that. It is permanent legislation. If we adopt it we adopt most of the principles of the Brannan plan. If that is what we want to do, all right. But if we adopt so much of the Brannan plan as is contained in the Pace plan, I am sure most of the Members of the House are going to do so without a full and complete understanding of it and its implications, and they will find themselves in the final analysis in just the same situation Members of Congress were in a year ago when the Aiken bill was adopted.

I am not going to try to differentiate between the Pace bill and the Brannan plan because while the Pace bill does not embody all the Brannan plan it does take in a large part of it. I see that one of the commentators say it takes in 75 percent, and another one says it is 60 percent. I am not going to try to figure it out to a

mathematical percentage. But the principle of the Brannan plan is there, and it is the principle of the Brannan plan that I want to discuss. I want to discuss it as it is interpreted by those who have been sponsoring it and who proposed it in the first place, and by that I mean the spokesmen for the great labor organizations of this country, because that is where it came from. It did not come from the farm.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. As of yet I have heard no satisfactory explanation as to why the Farm Bureau and the Grange, two great, reputable farm organizations, were not consulted in the writing of this bill. I have a conviction that the adoption of the pending measure will give these two farm organizations a set-back from which they will never recover, because the Farmers Union, representing the Red element in agricultural circles, operating as a friend and a thing of the radicals, will be put in complete command as far as the farm problem of the country is concerned.

Mr. HOPE. I am afraid the gentleman is correct. I believe that if we accept the principle of the Brannan plan it means that we have turned the writing of farm legislation over to the heads of some of the great labor organizations of the country. I am glad the labor organizations of the country are interested in agriculture. Certainly I am not complaining about that. But I do not believe they should be permitted to write the legislation and/or that we should pass legislation here which has their approval but which does not have the approval of the great farm organizations of this country, with one exception, and that is an organization which has closely allied itself with organized labor on all political questions.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Was the American Farm Bureau Federation consulted in the writing of the Aiken farm bill, and did they give it their approval?

Mr. HOPE. I can only give the gentleman the best information I have on that question. If the gentleman will read the hearings on the Aiken bill he can get the position of the farm organizations. It is my understanding that the Farm Bureau supported the Aiken bill and that the Grange gave it a modified sort of support—they were in favor of part of its provisions and opposed to others. I understand the Farmers' Union gave it partial support and that the National Council for Cooperatives also supported it in part. But I am not attempting to speak for those organizations and am simply giving the gentleman the benefit of the best information I have on the subject.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. What I wanted to know is whether they were consulted in the writing of the bill. Were they consulted before it was written? Did they help to sponsor the Aiken bill or did they just appear before the committee after the Aiken bill was written? I

want to know if they had an opportunity in writing it, that is, to the gentleman's knowledge.

Mr. HOPE. Not to my knowledge. They may have been consulted. They did appear before the committee. The fact is that the Aiken bill was largely written down in the Department of Agriculture, and the strongest statement that was made for it was by the then Secretary of Agriculture, Clinton P. Anderson. In this he was assisted by his aides in the Department, including the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan.

The Aiken bill was thoroughly and completely a nonpartisan bill. It was the product of the Department of Agriculture and the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate. Whatever its merits or demerits may be, those are the people who have to take the responsibility.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that the Democratic National Convention endorsed the principles of the Aiken plan?

Mr. HOPE. That is the way I interpret the resolution which was adopted; yes.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of California. I know the gentleman is very sincere in what he says. Does he not believe that the Secretary of Agriculture, who preceded Mr. Brannan, was told by the Republican Party, which was in power at that time, that he had to get rid of the high, rigid price supports, and that if he wanted to save any part of the program he had to compromise and that is the reason Mr. CLINTON ANDERSON supported the so-called flexible price-support plan?

Mr. HOPE. The only answer I can make to the gentleman's statement is that this is the first intimation I have ever heard of anything of that sort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Some reference has been made to the different farm organizations endorsing or not endorsing the Brannan farm program. I want the record to show that in the State of Nebraska all three farm organizations have opposed the Brannan plan—the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the Farmers' Union. I believe in some States the Farmers' Union have endorsed the Brannan plan.

But in the State of Nebraska the Farmers' Union is just as strongly opposed to any part of the Brannan plan as the other two farm organizations.

Mr. HOPE. I am very glad to have the information, and thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to get to the philosophy of the Brannan plan as expounded by those who are responsible for it and who appear to be its principal

spokesmen. But before I do that, just in case there are some who think that the Pace bill is not the Brannan plan, I want to quote from an article in one of the great labor papers of the country which is published by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Trainmen, until recently headed by the late Mr. Whitney. This article is taken from the July 11 issue of the Trainmen's magazine, and reads as follows. I quote:

Grass-root support for the Brannan farm plan has grown so fast that those who did not give the bill a chance for enactment this year are changing their tune. The House Committee on Agriculture approved a measure which would permit application of Brannan principles to three crops in the coming year, as a trial run.

The writer must have had some inside information, for he goes on to say:

Ground has also been cleared for a complete switch next year to a production payment instead of the present purchase-to-keep-the-price-up method.

There is more to the article, but I will not take the time to read it just now. But that is the word that is going out among those who have sponsored this legislation, and who are responsible for it. They say this is just the beginning, and if they can get the Pace-Brannan bill enacted this year, they expect to have the whole program next year.

Had I the time, I could quote from a number of papers which are published by labor organizations in which they interpret the Brannan plan. At this time I will limit myself to an article on the Brannan plan professing to expound it and explain it, which appeared in the Agricultural Supplement of the League Reporter, the publication of the American Federation of Labor League for Political Education. This article appeared in the issue of April 18. It is long and I cannot read all of it, but I quote from it as follows:

In presenting the new program to Congress, Secretary Brannan did the following:

1. To farmers generally he offered an over-all Government-guaranteed and Government-subsidized income at the attractive levels of wartime.

2. To consumers and labor he offered lower prices for meat, milk, fresh vegetables, eggs, butter, and other perishable farm products, that represent the major part of the consumer's cost-of-living items.

3. To southern cotton and tobacco growers he offered a Government-guaranteed and Government-subsidized program for cotton and tobacco that would give farmers who produce those commodities a better income than that provided by the so-called 90-percent-of-parity formula which they have been demanding.

4. To the midwestern Corn Belt he offered increased Government-subsidized and Government-guaranteed price support levels for meat animals (and most corn is marketed in the form of meat).

5. To producers of fresh vegetables and fruit he offered for the first time a real and permanent place in the Government-guaranteed, Government-subsidized price-support system.

I now skip down to two further paragraphs which will be all that I will have time to read.

Here is the new part of the program: The perishable commodities account for 75 percent of farm income—meat, milk, butterfat,

butter, eggs, poultry, fruits and vegetables—and here the Truman-Brannan plan would allow prices to fall to a free market level. Then the Government would pay the difference in cash directly to the farmer. This would give the farmer a somewhat higher income than he gets under the present Government-subsidized and Government-guaranteed price-support program. The consumer, on the other hand, would get a break, because he could buy these perishable commodities at much lower prices than at present.

I call your particular attention to the next paragraph, because that has reference to the OPA and the British system of food subsidies:

The new program is a direct payment to the farmer and lower prices to the consumer is similar to the system used during the war under OPA and is similar to the British system which also uses direct payments of tax money to the farmers.

There you have the ultimate of the Brannan plan as seen by those who are its sponsors and defenders.

On that last point regarding the return of the OPA, I wish to call attention to the testimony of three labor representatives who appeared before the committee in favor of the Brannan program. We had a host of witnesses at these hearings but aside from Secretary Brannan and representatives of the farmers union there were only three who appeared in favor of the program. I want to read just what they said about this idea of a new OPA or price-control program.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Not at the moment. The gentleman always asks enlightening questions and I am always glad to have his opinions and views, but I should like to proceed for a while before yielding in order to read what these witnesses said before the committee. I am reading now from the statement of Homer Ayres, who appeared before the committee representing the Farm Equipment Workers' Union. His statement reads as follows:

Past experience shows that when livestock prices rise sharply the price of meat in the butcher shop jumps up along with it, but when the livestock market falls, the packers and the retail butchers are very reluctant to pass livestock prices on to the consumers. We know that although wheat has dropped, the price of bread has not gone down any. Therefore, to prevent the food processors from pocketing what the consumers should get in the form of lower prices there should be some teeth put into the Brannan law in the form of price control.

The same view was expressed by Lyle Cooper, research director of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, CIO, where in the hearings, part 5, page 821, he states:

This whole question of margins calls attention to a potential danger that might easily undermine the otherwise well conceived program of Secretary Brannan which seeks to achieve income parity for the farmer and, at the same time, adequate supplies of food within the reach of the low-income consumer.

This is the problem, as I see it. Secretary Brannan's plan, in effect, assumes that lower livestock prices—irrespective of whether or not they fall below the support levels—will automatically be passed on in lower prices to the consumer. Our examination of the

record on marketing margins for meat during the past few years raises a serious question about the validity of any such assumption. . . .

Consequently, the case for the exercise of control by the Department of Agriculture over marketing margins is much broader than that of the extremely important area of marketing the Nation's meat supply. I respectfully suggest that this committee thoroughly look into this whole problem of margins. For there exists here a probable weakness which could easily endanger—or even wreck—an otherwise admirable program.

And then a statement filed by Russ Nixon, Washington representative of the United Radio, Electrical and Machine Workers' Union of America, CIO, also discusses this question. Among other things, Mr. Nixon says the following:

This means there must be some way to regulate prices and profits of processing corporations and other middlemen, meat packers, dairy producers, manufacturers, flour millers, cotton ginners, chain stores, etc., so that lower costs and prices at the farm level are passed on in full to the consumers.

Mr. Chairman, that represents the view of those who are sponsoring this legislation. To me it clearly indicates that they do not think it will work, and I doubt myself if it will work from the standpoint of passing on to the consumer these lower farm prices which we are supposed to have under this program. If we adopt the Brannan plan, the next thing you are going to have confronting you will be a demand for price controls all the way down the line to make the program work. I do not think there is the least bit of doubt about it.

The philosophy of the Brannan plan, as it is expounded by those who speak for it, is a high income to the farmer and cheap prices to the consumer. That sounds, of course, like magic, but it is not. Somebody is going to have to pay the bill. No one knows how much it is going to be. A little bit later I want to give you an estimate, however, as to how much it will be, because, in my mind, there is no question but what the cost of the plan will be ruinous and it constitutes a direct threat to the entire price-support program for agriculture.

We have seen what the program on potatoes, which has cost so much money, has done in the way of incurring a loss of public confidence of any price support program. But if we had a support price program on potatoes like the Brannan plan this last year (1948) it would have cost twice as much as the \$225,000,000 that it did cost. In making that statement, I am using figures furnished by the Secretary of Agriculture in a statement which he made for the International News Service recently. In this statement he stated that if the Brannan program had been in effect in 1948 the price of potatoes to the consumer would have gone down to \$1 per bushel. I think that is right. We had an enormous crop of 445,000,000 bushels, very largely induced by the high support price and the price would easily have gone down to \$1 a bushel to the consumer. He did not say what it would be to the producer, but when you count freight and all of the middleman's margins, I would say it would not be any more than 50 cents a bushel to the producer. But, let us say

75 cents to be conservative. Let us say then that the price to the producer would have been 75 cents. The support price was \$1.75 a bushel. That would have meant payments to producers at \$1 a bushel for 445,000,000 bushels, and in addition there would have been the cost of administration. So that the cost could not have been less than \$450,000,000, which is exactly twice what it cost to support the prices under the program that was in effect. And yet that is the program which would be put into effect by the Pace-Brannan bill.

My distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the committee, spoke about the cost of the egg program. I am not sure I can recall the figures, but I think he said it cost \$84,000,000. As I understand it, that is the cost for 3 years. That is what we have lost in the egg-support program. That is quite a lot of money even in these times. But I want to call your attention to how much more the Brannan payment program would have cost.

I want to read now from the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture in reference to this question and from the testimony of Leon Todd, secretary of the Northeast Poultry Council. He stated, in speaking of the Brannan program:

The cost of administering such a program would be tremendous. In 1948 there were produced in this Nation 3,936,750,000 dozen eggs. If a direct subsidy of 3 cents a dozen would have been paid to farmers in 1948, the total paid out would have been \$118,102,500. If the producers received a 5-cent per dozen subsidy it would have meant a lay-out of \$196,837,500.

Now, that is compared with a 3-year cost for the egg program under existing legislation of approximately \$84,000,000. So, do not let those who are arguing for the Brannan plan tell you that you can carry out that program for less money than you can carry out the old program. You cannot do that. Let me say this, that you can carry out either program more cheaply and economically if you have controls in effect, and if we are going to have any program of this kind why eventually, of course, we are going to have controls, the very tightest kind of controls, upon everything that the farmer produces. But, if you are going to have controls, you can operate just as well under the kind of a program provided for in the Gore bill as you can under the kind of a program in the Pace bill.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. The gentleman from Kansas is an able and effective friend of agriculture. Does not the gentleman fear that the cost of this program ultimately will be so exasperating to the people of this country that there will be an attempt to overthrow the entire farm-support program? Does the gentleman have that in his mind?

Mr. HOPE. That is one of the very grave fears that I have.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman said there would be necessity for controls. If you had controls and reduced production, the consumer would not have any benefit of it at all.

Mr. HOPE. If the sponsors of the Brannan program, the labor political leaders, have their way, of course, there will be abundant production and very low prices in the market places. What I have read and what you have no doubt read and heard over the radio by the sponsors of this program all points to that. Of course, the alternative is, if we run out of money, and surely we will some time, would be the very tightest kind of controls over all the agriculture of this country.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. We, being city dwellers, are concerned with food prices and all that. I would like to have the gentleman answer this question: Does the gentleman feel that taking it over-all, storable, and perishable commodities, that the cheapest way for the city dweller is the flexible price support plan contained in the Hope-Aiken bill rather than these other two alternatives, the rigid 90-percent support, or the so-called Brannan plan? How does the gentleman feel on that point, taking these three alternatives?

Mr. HOPE. I will say this to the gentleman, there are features that are common to all three bills, so far as that is concerned. But it is true that the higher the price-support level, the higher the cost is going to be, that is, providing you do not exercise such controls as to limit production to a point where supply and demand would bring the price up. I would say as far as the consumer is concerned, that a program which embraces price controls at a moderate level, especially upon the nonstorable commodities, would afford the consumer the greatest possibility of an abundant supply at a reasonable price.

The bill includes potatoes. Because so much has been said about potatoes, let me call attention to how the 60 to 90 percent price support program on potatoes is working this year, and I quote from a statement by the National Potato Council, which is an organization representing the potato producers of this country. They are contrasting the program this year as far as cost is concerned with the program last year.

The National Potato Council reported today that the cost of the farm price support program for potatoes is running at only one-fifth of the cost of last year's program.

This sharp reduction in the cost of the program, the Council reported, has been brought about by a lowering of the support price from 90 to 60 percent of parity, and to a sharp decrease in acreage under the present farm program.

As of July 14, 1949, the Government's purchases under the support program totaled only 3,215,000 bushels at a cost of slightly more than \$4,000,000, as compared with purchases on the same date in 1948 of 10,700,000 bushels at an approximate cost of \$18,500,000.

While this is not the ultimate answer we do know that with a price support of 60 percent of parity this year and an

estimated production of 55,000,000 bushels less than last year, the potato program cannot cost anything like it did then. Let me say that this program in effect this year under the same provisions contained in the Gore substitute is eminently satisfactory to the potato producers. They have repeatedly so testified before the Committee on Agriculture this year.

We have been talking about supporting the price of eggs. Let me say that the egg producers and their representatives have been before the committee. They do not want the Brannan payment program.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. May I correct an impression that I think my good friend from Kansas is perhaps leaving with this House, to the effect that no farmer appeared before the committee in defense of the Brannan plan or urging its adoption in any way. If the gentleman will take the report of the subcommittee and turn to page 1104 he will find beginning on that page of the report a 4-page statement by me. I am a farmer, and when my work is done in this House, if you want to find me you will find me down south of Kansas City on the farm.

Mr. HOPE. I apologize. The gentleman is a farmer, and a good farmer. If he appeared for the Brannan plan, I will certainly have to take back the statement I made. Of course, I am amazed that as good a farmer and as intelligent a legislator as he, would appear in favor of the Brannan plan, and I am not going to try to explain that.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I take it the gentleman has already made it clear and that we all understand that the Gore amendment continues in full force and effect next year the plan under which the farmers of this country have had more prosperity and generally better prices for their products than ever before in the history of the country.

Mr. HOPE. That is absolutely true. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The Gore amendment does a little more than extend the present program. It suspends over the head of the farmers of this Nation the Aiken bill, does it not?

Mr. HOPE. It suspends the Aiken bill for 1 year.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, that is right.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. ABBITT. The gentleman has expressed his views to some extent on the Aiken bill and has expressed a preference for the Gore bill stating further that the farmers have gotten along well under the present program and are satisfied. Would the gentleman not think it advisable then to support an amendment to the Gore bill whereby the Aiken bill would be repealed, thus continuing the

program that he has stated is so well suited to the farmers?

Mr. HOPE. I do not want to go into a discussion of that at this time because I assume that such an amendment will be offered and I expect to speak on that amendment at that time. But I am agreeable so far as I am concerned to a 1-year postponement of the Aiken bill for the reason that that will give us another year in which to work out a substitute program for the Aiken bill. I will say that if we cannot do that in another year then I certainly would be in favor of a measure to repeal the Aiken bill.

Mr. ABBITT. The only fallacy I see there in suspending the Aiken bill is to hold a hammer over the House so that when the year 1949 has passed we will have to do something more than merely accept the Aiken bill, which none of us are in favor of, then the House will have to pass some legislation, and we will be plagued by the Aiken bill.

Mr. HOPE. All I am saying is predicated on the idea that we will pass legislation in this next session of Congress which I hope will be satisfactory. I am not saying that the Gore bill in its present form is exactly the bill that we want for a long-time program. I think we are learning through trial and error and experience. It may be a long time before we work out exactly the farm bill which the farmers of this country want and the economy of the country can stand. I certainly think we have not found the answer yet, but I think we have found an answer for the next year if we adopt the Gore bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman may be interested in knowing, which I am sure he does, that my district, which is the Second Congressional District of Kansas, is industrial and agricultural in character and that a widespread poll has indicated that among those living in the city and the farmers, almost 50 to 1 are against the Brannan plan.

Mr. HOPE. I am not surprised.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me once more, I want to say I have a pocketful of telegrams here from the Farm Bureau Federation membership from all over the State of Tennessee. I have not had a single farmer anywhere in Tennessee, from one end to the other, express himself in favor of this Brannan plan.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I merely wish to confirm the position of the gentleman from Kansas, as he has outlined it here with respect to the Hope-Aiken bill, and to state that it is thoroughly consistent with the position that he took at the time of the conference a year ago. At that time he stated he was in favor of the Aiken bill so that we might have a bill and have some assurance of some price support if the Steagall amendment were not continued or if we could not work things out by long-range legislation.

Certainly the situation in the year ahead will be comparable to the year be-

hind, if we extend the present program. As far as I am personally concerned, I would be willing to vote to suspend the Aiken portion of the bill indefinitely or repeal it, until we get substantial agreement on a long-range program.

But certainly I do not want to see the assurance which is offered in the Gore substitute that for this coming year, until we do have a clearer conception of a long-range answer, we will have the protection afforded by the present program.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. DOYLE. I take it that because of the emphasis which the distinguished gentleman has placed upon the fact that periodicals of organized labor were supporting the Brannan plan, which I believe the gentleman designated as the sponsors and defenders thereof, that the one reason you are opposed to this Brannan plan is because these periodicals have made certain comments about it. Do I understand that the gentleman is inferring to me, as one who is seeking the facts, that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], have collaborated at all with the leaders of organized labor in writing this committee bill?

Mr. HOPE. I am not expressing any opinion on that because I have no information on it.

Mr. DOYLE. I take it the gentleman would know that. I take it the gentleman would know whether or not that is a fact, and I would like to know if that is the inference that the gentleman is trying to get across to the House.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I am a little astounded at the gentleman's reply, because the gentleman was in the subcommittee and knows the bill was written by the subcommittee and amended 20 times in the subcommittee, and nobody but the subcommittee wrote the bill and the gentleman himself had a good part of the job.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman does not mean that Members were not handed a draft of the bill when the subcommittee met?

Mr. PACE. I certainly do. I certainly do. I thought the gentleman was well informed that counsel for the committee and I drew the initial draft, and it was amended in the committee at least 15 times before it was reported out by the committee.

Mr. HOPE. There is no question about that.

Mr. PACE. But I do not like the idea—the gentleman knows me and has been in Congress with me for 13 years, and he knows I have not sat down and collaborated with anybody except the members of my committee on this bill.

Mr. HOPE. I said I had no knowledge at all that you had collaborated.

Mr. PACE. I know the gentleman said that, but it was the way in which it was said.

Mr. HOPE. If the gentleman feels hurt because of the way I made that statement, I wish to say to him now that I apologize to him, because I did not want

to leave any impression that the gentleman had collaborated with anyone. However, I do not think it is any crime to collaborate with the leaders of organized labor.

Mr. PACE. I do not either. I did not want to leave that impression, but neither organized labor nor the Secretary of Agriculture, nor anybody else except the subcommittee wrote this bill, to which the gentleman gave his very able assistance.

Mr. HOPE. That certainly answers the question and I yielded to the gentleman so that he could answer the question.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I understand the gentleman to propound an inquiry seeking to ascertain whether or not the farm leaders of the country had participated or had been heard in connection with the preparation of this legislation. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that during these hearings the president of the Farm Bureau, the master of the Grange, and every other single farm organization in America was heard or given an opportunity to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Very extensive hearings were held on general agricultural legislation; on the Aiken bill and on the Brannan proposal. Then the committee went into executive session, and this bill is the result of the executive session. There has been no hearing had at which the farm organizations or others were heard on the Pace bill.

Mr. PACE. The reason for it is this—

Mr. HOPE. I am not complaining about it.

Mr. COOLEY. We started these hearings on farm legislation in January, and we continued them until the time this bill was introduced. This bill was introduced after it had been considered by a subcommittee and after a report had been made to the full committee. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], at the request of the committee, introduced this bill. In making its determination, the subcommittee had the full advantage of the testimony of all farm leaders who desired to be heard. We know that the Grange is against it. We know that the Farm Bureau is against it.

Mr. HOPE. I do not think there is any dispute about that. The hearings speak for themselves. If I have given any impression to the contrary, I want it distinctly understood that there were hearings on the whole field of farm legislation, but let me say this, in view of what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has said, I do not want to be left in any false light. There was handed to me and other members of the subcommittee, at the time we came into executive session, a bill in typewritten form, which I assumed was prepared by the gentleman from Georgia. I had no reason to think that it was prepared by any-

one else. However, I was not present at the time it was prepared. But I assumed then that it was prepared by the gentleman from Georgia, and he assures us now that it was, and that settles the question as far as I am concerned.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think the RECORD will show tomorrow that the gentleman from Kansas did not make the statement that anyone else wrote the Pace bill except the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. What the gentleman was talking about was the Brannan plan. I think the RECORD tomorrow will substantiate that statement.

Mr. HOPE. Of course that is exactly true. May I have the attention of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE]: What I have said here, as far as the sponsorship of legislation is concerned, is sponsorship of the Brannan plan.

Mr. DOYLE. May I say to the gentleman from Kansas that as I recall his statement it was that he either read or stated of his own knowledge that this Pace bill contained 75 to 80 percent of the Brannan plan. Now, definitely, I got the impression from the gentleman's remarks that one of the main reasons he was opposing the Pace bill was because it did contain 75 to 80 percent of the Brannan plan, and because organized labor had made certain comments about the Brannan plan; and I merely wanted to know whether or not my inference was what the gentleman intended to get across; because I certainly have doubt that my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] or the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture would to any extent cooperate with organized labor in writing the bill. They tell us on the floor of the House they did not.

Mr. HOPE. There certainly is no difference of opinion here about that question. The gentleman from Georgia has prepared a bill; the committee has prepared a bill which contains some features of the Brannan plan. I did not say that it was 75 or 80 percent; I said it had considerable of the Brannan plan. Whether it is 75 or some other percentage, it is essentially the Brannan plan. The only reason I brought in the labor organizations and quoted from labor papers was that I regard them as the sponsors of the legislation. I think what they say about it is very important in helping us interpret what it means and what the program is and what the ultimate end of it will be. I could not quote from any of the farm organizations like the Farm Bureau, or the Grange, for they are opposed to the bill. I went to those who sponsored it and I quoted from them as to their understanding as to what the legislation meant.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as many Members are asking me to yield, I will take five additional minutes,

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair points out to the gentleman that he has already consumed 59 minutes. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I simply want to say to the gentleman that I wrote the bill myself.

Mr. HOPE. I could not believe otherwise, I may say to my distinguished friend from Georgia for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration and with whom I have worked on the Committee on Agriculture for so many years.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not think anybody will dispute the fact that after all these many months of hearings there was a unanimous agreement amongst both Republicans and Democrats on the Committee to adopt the principles of the Gore bill and to suspend the Aiken Act.

Mr. HOPE. That was my understanding.

I desire to conclude now simply by saying that the Committee on Agriculture held hearings all over this country during the past 2 years. We went into New England, we went into the South, we went into the Middle West, we went into the far West. We heard hundreds of farmers. We did not go out looking for farm leaders, we went to the farmers themselves. We traveled by bus and we stopped at individual farms; we talked to farmers along the roadside, and I think we got a pretty good idea of what the farmers of this country want in the way of farm legislation. We found there were two things they emphasized repeatedly: One was soil conservation, in which they were immensely interested. The other thing was that they wanted a continuation of the price-support program. We gained that opinion from interviewing hundreds and hundreds of farmers all over the country, and as a result last year we reenacted the program that had been in effect during the war. That is still the kind of program farmers want, and that is the reason I think this House should adopt the Gore substitute and send it on its way to the Senate so that it can be enacted into law before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I want it to be definitely clear to this body that the statement I made when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], of the Rules Committee, yielded to me, was a statement that was straight about the issue presented to the House. In no way do I want the Members to think that I favor extension of the present program. I favor repeal of the Aiken law and I favor the Pace plan. I made that statement in debate on the rule for one purpose. Everyone here, with the exception of the two Republicans who stood up in favor of the Aiken bill, feels that the Aiken bill is unsatisfactory. Even the gentleman from Kansas has repeatedly stated in the Committee on Agriculture

that he is against the Aiken bill. Every member of the Committee on Agriculture, on both the Republican side and Democratic side, with the exception of one member, has said that the Aiken bill is no good. I want it to be clearly known that the reason I put that proposition up is because I want the House to decide in an orderly manner what the farmer will get, whether it will be the program existing today, with repeal of the Aiken bill, or whether it shall be the Pace bill.

I hope the gentleman from Tennessee, my distinguished colleague for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration, will accept my substitute and not even offer his, because last year he voted against the Aiken bill as did every other Tennessee Democrat in the Eightieth Congress. We have studied this Aiken bill line by line, word by word, section by section, ever since January. We had the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture explain it to us and interpret it for us, and we have come to the conclusion that it will, if permitted to go into operation, mean slow starvation for the farmer.

Personally, I am interested in the farmer and I do not want him to starve to death by hanging this club over his head because next year we might get into difficulties and the Aiken bill might go into effect if we kill off this Pace bill or if we adopt the Gore bill.

Let us see what the Pace bill does, and I would like to direct these words to Members representing agricultural districts not only in the South but in the West. How can you as a Member of Congress representing an agricultural section go back to your people and say to them: "Well, I had a chance to get you \$1.46 a bushel for your corn but instead I voted for \$1.41."

Under the Pace bill corn will be supported at \$1.46; under the Gore bill corn will be supported at \$1.41.

How can you go back to your district and tell those farmers: "Well, I had a chance to guarantee you 49.6 cents a pound for your tobacco under the Pace bill, but instead I voted for 41.1 cents per pound for your tobacco. I cut you 8.5 cents a pound on your tobacco."

How could I go back to my tobacco section and tell that to my farmer friends? How could I go back home and tell my friends who raise hogs: "I had a chance to get you \$19 a hundred for your hogs under the Pace bill, but, no, I did not want you to have that much money, so I voted for the Gore bill under which you will get \$16 a hundred. I cut you \$3 a hundred."

How can I go back to my cotton farmers in the State of Tennessee and say to them, "Well, I had a chance to guarantee you \$67.50 a ton for your cottonseed under the Pace bill, but I did not vote for it; I voted for the Gore substitute, where you get no protection whatsoever."

How can I go back into the State of Tennessee and tell those farmers, "I had a chance to guarantee you \$16.80 a hundred for your beef cattle, but I did not do that. I did not give to you, \$16.80; no, that is too much money for you. I voted for the Gore substitute where you get no support whatsoever."

How can I go back into the State of Tennessee and say to my good farmer friends who are not corporation farmers, they are individual farmers, dirt farmers, the best farmers in the country, and tell those great tried and true farmer friends of the Volunteer State of Tennessee, "I had a chance of getting \$18.40 support price for your lambs, but I did not want to do that; it is too much money for you. I voted for the Gore substitute and you get no support whatsoever."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is it not true that beef does not have support prices?

Mr. SUTTON. Beef does not have support prices at present, but under the Pace bill you will get \$16.80 guaranteed. My friends, that is true, or maybe the figure is \$16.96.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Under the committee bill, cotton would be at about its present level of 27 or 28 cents and under the Aiken bill, if it ever goes into effect, it will come down to 19 cents.

Mr. SUTTON. Right. And how can I tell my farmers, "I just wanted you to get 19 cents for your cotton?"

My friends, this is it. There are only 6,000,000 farmers in the United States of America, with 140,000,000 people. The farmer is the backbone of the universe. He is the spinal column of the United States. You cut the price to the farmer and you throw him into bankruptcy. How can the great State of Tennessee exist? Not only that, the great city of New York, the great city of Chicago, the great city of Detroit, and all the other great cities of America—how can they exist with the farmer going bankrupt? The gentlemen to my left want to bring in politics. They brought it into this bill. One of the gentlemen on the Republican side, a member of the subcommittee, voted for this bill to come out of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make a stump speech on this proposition, but I do want to do a little reasoning with you and bring out some facts and figures.

In the first place, as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] said the other day, when speaking before the Democratic caucus, "I do not want to do this in a bragging way, but I do want to give you some information about myself so as to qualify in order that you will have some idea that I should know what I am talking about."

I have spent my life in the handling of commodities, mostly in the buying and exporting of cotton. In addition, I have also farmed cotton and grain and some other commodities to quite an extensive degree. Further, I am at the

present time processing and storing about one-sixth of the California cotton crop, and California ranks fifth in the production of cotton in the Nation this year and will probably be second or third next year. In addition, I spent 6 years in the textile business. Further, I am a former member of the New York Cotton Exchange and the Chicago Board of Trade. So whether I do or not, I at least should know something about prices and the effect of legislation on farm prices.

A great many of the Members of Congress, I have found, particularly from the large cities, are not too clear on why we should have price supports on farm products at all. Inasmuch as price supports have come into such bad repute through the potato program and the egg program, it may be in order at this time to defend support prices in general in order to see if I cannot get a little sympathy for some of these ideas that have been injected into the price support program which are new to the program, and I refer specifically to the production-payment plan as advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In order to get the idea before you, of why price supports are necessary, let us go back a moment to the time when this Nation was first founded. At that time 95 percent of our people were engaged in agriculture, and almost every family was an individual, self-sufficient unit that grew all of its own food, spun its own clothes off the backs of its own sheep, and cut down trees to build its own house. So it was truly a self-sufficient, independent economic unit.

But what has happened over the approximately 170 years of the history of our Nation? We have had through the invention and adaptation of labor-saving machinery in agriculture a gradual transition from a nation of self-sufficient independent farmers to a nation of specialists in agriculture because of these machines. Today instead of 95 percent of our people being in agriculture we have only about 19 percent, and every farm family, instead of raising all its own food, produces only one or two commodities, because they have to have a lot of machinery to do it, and therefore they buy most of their food and clothing in town.

So you can see that we have been transformed into a nation of interdependent family units instead of the old self-regulating economy that we had in the so-called good old days.

The point is this: In the so-called good old days the farmer, in order to know how much crop to plant, how much acreage to pitch, just counted the mouths around his table, and he had to plant only enough to feed them. But today the farmer does not know how much to plant, for two reasons. First, he does not know what the demand is going to be, and, second, he does not know what acreage his neighbor is going to plant. So even though you call it socialistic, whatever you want to call it, we cannot help it, we are in this fix through no fault of any of us.

I do not like regulation. I am a farmer. But I prefer regulation to bankruptcy. That is what you get when you do not regulate. Many of the gentlemen on my

left here have fought this program for years, ever since Franklin D. Roosevelt first introduced it. They call it regimentation. That is an ugly-sounding word which does not fit. Just as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri said a while ago, it should be called cooperation. We all know that the farmers themselves cannot get together on a voluntary deal and that we have to work through the Government. That is the only answer. We have a similar situation in the field of traffic. Let us go back a hundred years or so when our predecessors trod the ground where they chose around this Capitol in the good old days. But today we have the traffic lights with red and green lights which tell us when we can cross the streets. Those things are for our own good. Why has that regulation been brought about? It has been brought about through the advance of science and machinery, through the introduction of the automobile, a labor-saving machine, if you will. The comparison is identical with what has happened in the agricultural field. So I say, gentlemen, it is not socialism that we want; it is regulation that we have to take, or we will get communism as a result. We all know that just as surely as we get a serious decline in prices, then that is a depression. When you get a depression, that is when the Communists or the Fascists or any other group takes over. There is where the danger lies in knocking out farm price supports.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. The question comes up then on the basis of the gentleman's argument that if one element of the economy is depressed, we then should give relief of a certain kind, even if it introduces a certain type of socialism although we try not to brand it as socialism. Does your argument extend to that point, that if we have any element of the country which is depressed, such as the railroad freight car business, or any other type of business that can be pointed out, and if it has been depressed over a period of time consistently, then we should have the same kind of program as we have for agriculture?

Mr. WHITE of California. Not necessarily. My theory is that if we regulate the production of the basic necessities of life and stop there, that protects the backbone of the country. I think it is generally accepted that the national income is seven times the farm income. That is where the circulation of the dollar starts from the farmer. If agriculture is prosperous and we have a minimum wage with the proper wages-and-hours regulations, then there is going to be purchasing power in the hands of labor, and the economic cycle is going to continue to turn. But when you have a fall in the general price level as we did in 1932, as shown in this chart, the warehouses are bulging with food and nobody can buy it. The city people say "We should have lower prices so that our people too can enjoy some prosperity."

That is a snare and a delusion. The city people do not necessarily get more food by lower prices. They are put out of jobs and they are not able to buy any

food. That is the situation which prevailed in 1932. The most essential thing in the life of any democracy is a stable price level. I submit to you that you cannot have a stable price level in the agricultural field unless you make some attempt to regulate the supply in relation to the demand.

Do not tell me that the weather will throw you out of balance. I have had one of the bureaus over here work up some statistics on it, and we have the figures on exactly how much the weather has to do with it. It is 11 percent on the average over the past 25 years. Furthermore, that can be corrected during the following season. That has been one of the arguments which has been made for a long time against any regulation whatsoever.

This chart, which I have here, shows what happened to us immediately after the First World War. We had no price controls of any kind following the First World War.

In May 1920 we had a break of 40 percent in agricultural prices. What did it do? It not only bankrupted the entire agricultural part of our economy but it also dragged down all the rest of the business. The only thing that saved us temporarily was the lending of money to Europe, the same thing as we are doing at this time. When we began to loan money to Europe in the early twenties, then we started to have this little increase in farm prices represented by the line on this chart. That held on until the money ran out abroad in about 1930. When that temporary relief subsided, you see what happened, with no regulation. Our prices went on down until 1932, when everybody was broke, the banks and everybody else. Who got the first relief? The banks, the insurance companies, and the railroad companies, backed up by the RFC. They got the relief first, and then the little people got it later on. It finally got around to the farmers. If you will look at the lines on that chart, you will see that ever since this regulation and farm price support business was started in 1932 the farmers and the rest of the country have prospered continuously. Of course, we had a war in the meantime that boosted prices up too high, and it has made a terrific problem, which the Marshall plan, thank God, has helped to solve. If we had not had the Marshall plan, we undoubtedly would have had a collapse, just as we did in May 1920. It would have bankrupted the whole country. But the Marshall plan is going to run out. People are getting sick and tired of paying out this money to Europe when they can see what might happen in our own country.

So I say to you, if you do not want a collapse such as we had in 1920 and 1932, you had better stick to these farm-price supports. If you do not, you will get a depression in which communism will take over in this country; not communism from Russia, but it will be right here in this country. That is what I am afraid of.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of California. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman used the term "price control." Do you mean price control or price support, or do you term price support as price control?

Mr. WHITE of California. Well, they are one and the same thing, except maximum price controls, like we had under OPA.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think our present farm program is price control. I think it is a floor under the prices of farm products.

Mr. WHITE of California. I think everybody knows what I meant. I meant price supports. I thank the gentleman, and I do not yield any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE of California. I want to make plain that there are two issues on this bill now before us. First, shall we take the fixed price supports of the Pace bill, as compared to the so-called flexible supports in the Aiken bill? Let us get rid of the Aiken bill completely. The Republicans keeping the Aiken bill and saying they do not want it but merely postpone it makes me think about the fellow who was courting two girls. He could not explain to his steady girl why he wanted the other one around. She said, "If you do not love her what do you want her hanging around for?" So I say that about the Aiken bill to the Republicans. Why do they want it hanging around? Let us repeal it; not extend it.

As far as the production-payment idea is concerned, I do not think I am out of order in revealing this. It is going to be put on a trial basis for 2 years, and limited to three commodities which will be named. Certainly there can be no harm in trying that out. I say it amounts to this: That we are not throwing out the old at all. We are keeping the old provisions on the perishable commodities, but this production-payment idea on these three crops is like giving a violinist another string for his bow. The Secretary does not have to use it unless he wants to. He has to find it is the most practicable and the best method to use. In case there is no place to store these perishables, this is the only plan he has to fall back on. So I say to give him that authority; it can certainly do no harm, and it is only 3 commodities as against 300. Some Members were talking a while ago about what percentage of the Brannan plan is in this Pace bill. It is 1 percent; that is all it is, 3 commodities against 300. There is your percentage of the Brannan plan in the Pace bill right there. The important thing is to distinguish between this so-called flexible price support and a fixed price support. A flexible price support is no good; it is like offering a one-legged man a rubber crutch and saying, "Here, walk on this"; he would fall down, of course. A flexible price-support plan is an uncertain thing and would produce a collapse in farm prices and a depression. We should give the Secretary of Agriculture a chance to implement his program by passing the provision dealing with the trial run on production payments. So the thing to do, my friends, is to vote

for the Pace bill and against the Gore amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, regret that politics have been injected into this debate. I am very happy in my assignment on the Committee on Agriculture and deem it a rare privilege also to be a member of the Pace subcommittee. We have had the finest kind of understanding deliberating on the various phases of a long-range farm program during the months since the convening of the Eighty-first Congress, and I want to say that from the very beginning there was no politics injected into our discussion of the long-range program until the Brannan meeting at Des Moines, Iowa, early last June. At that meeting instead of having our farmers discuss their own welfare we found the leaders of the Democratic administration holding a political meeting in our leading agricultural State. Among those present were the Vice President of the United States, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the Secretary of Agriculture, and a delegation of Members of Congress from the majority side, not members of the Committee on Agriculture. This group of politicians told the farmers what they were going to get. They were not asked what they would like to have.

There is no clamor for this legislation. I have just returned from Iowa. If there is any place in the world where you will still find the independent farmer it is at the crossroads and at the grass roots of the Midwest. They do not know who thought up the Brannan proposal. Some say that it is the creature of the Farm Union and the CIO; but, regardless of that, the fact remains that it was not written by the farmers of America, nor were they consulted.

Reference was made a few minutes ago to the extensive hearings held by the Committee on Agriculture throughout the length and breadth of the United States during the past 2 years. We held 12 regional meetings, and in every single one of them, without exception, the interested people, a majority of the farmers, the men most affected, said they were satisfied with the present law and wanted it continued.

That is exactly the position taken by the minority members of the Pace subcommittee. I do not think I am divulging any committee secrets when I say that before the Brannan meeting at Des Moines, there was unanimous agreement in the subcommittee that we would not consider the so-called Brannan bill, but that in lieu thereof, we would extend the 90-percent parity program for 1 year, and suspend the Aiken bill for 1 year. That was also the position taken by the minority members of the full Committee on Agriculture at the time the Pace bill was reported out.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to pay tribute to the distinguished gen-

tleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I want to compliment him on the courageous position he has taken in presenting his substitute bill. He had something to say about the Pace bill and the Brannan plan. I would like to quote his words:

The farmers are not for the Brannan plan. I think it is fuzzy, befuddled politics to think that we, the Democrats, can make political hay by force-feeding the farmer something he does not want.

Remember these words were spoken by a Democrat, generally considered an administration stalwart.

Mr. Chairman, the Pace bill simply gets the camel's nose under the tent. To show you how desperate they are to get the camel's nose under the tent, the Washington Post of yesterday stated that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture would propose a revised version authorizing a trial run on potatoes, eggs, and shorn wool. That compromise is being offered in an effort to head off a threatened defeat of the Pace bill. In their desperation they might even settle for a trial run on onions.

The American farmer is a notorious skeptic. Any proposition to raise his income and still keep down consumer prices is bound to strike him as having a flaw in it somewhere. The average farmer is still independent. He thinks for himself. He does not forget that he is also a taxpayer. Although the program whereby he is assured of a guaranteed income, and the consumer can have low-priced goods is rather appealing, both must realize that in the last analysis both the farmer and the consumer, as taxpayers, will have to pay the bill.

What about the cost of this program? The Secretary of Agriculture cannot even venture a guess as to what the program will eventually cost. It has been variously estimated to cost from 3 to 10 billion dollars a year. Up to this very moment the Budget Director has refused or has failed to submit a budget estimate as to the cost of the Brannan program.

There has been talk of having a trial run on hogs. I notice, however, that the other body has pigeonholed that proposal. Let us see how a trial run on hogs would actually work. A man sells a load of hogs on the market. Does he get paid immediately when he sells those hogs? Not on your life. First it will have to be determined that the farmer actually sold his hogs. No doubt he will have to make out an affidavit that he sold a load of hogs on a certain day. Then it will have to be determined that someone purchased the hogs and someone else will have to determine what the market price was on the day the hogs were sold. Eventually the papers will get to Washington. Well, knowing the way red tape works in Washington, the farmer may possibly receive the check for his hogs some 3 months or 6 months after the hogs were sold. I wonder how he will like that? Today, under our free-enterprise system, the farmer can still take his load of hogs to market, get his check, and take it to his home bank and put it on deposit. The farmer is thinking about those things. If prices are once driven down on hogs, or other commodi-

ties, I ask you very frankly how will those prices ever rise again? I asked the Secretary of Agriculture about that and he was not able to give a satisfactory answer.

The worst objection to the proposed Brannan plan is that in order to get his guaranteed income it will make the farmer subject to the whim of each succeeding Congress as to whether or not the necessary appropriations will be forthcoming. This would keep him in the anxious seat from one session of Congress to the next.

It is my impression that the American farmer would rather continue with a program he has worked with and understands rather than to embark on an experimental program with all its uncertainties.

I fear that the vast expenditure of money which the Brannan plan would entail will ultimately jeopardize the entire farm price support program. The constant drain on the Federal Treasury may reach the point where the taxpayers of the country can no longer stand the burden. When that happens, the entire farm price support program will fall. That would be a tragedy which we still can prevent.

Let us keep the farm problem out of politics and approach the entire matter in a sane and sensible way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I have the power to express just what I think about this measure. I want to try to convince this House, if there are any skeptics here, that a healthy agriculture is the key to the prosperity of the whole Nation. I want to speak from experience.

Like many other Members of this House, I lived through the first depression and was engaged in the farming business. No regimentation had been accomplished in 1932 and 1933. There were no restricting laws on the statute books to interfere with free enterprise and free enterprise did do as it pleased. But at the end of that period of 1933 we woke up one morning and found the entire business system of this country suspended. What we had known before as our way of life had come to an end, and we were met with foreclosures on every hand, so many of them, that as high as 70 percent of the farms in many counties in my State were foreclosed upon. You talk about a farmer wanting independence and liberty. Is it independence, is it liberty, when the sheriff chases the farmer off his land into the highways of the country?

There were at one time 16,000,000 people tramping the streets of this country looking for a job. I never had a chance to have any money here in Washington when I was a member in those days, because women with children, leading them by the hands, would come to the office begging for something to eat, and unless you were made of stone you would give them something to eat. That was the condition all over the country.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. We still had all our liberties, though.

Mr. BURDICK. Oh yes, we had the full liberty to starve; we had the full liberty to be dispossessed of our lands; we had the full liberty to stand and wonder what would come next; we had full liberty to wonder what had become of our free-enterprise system; we wondered if it were not possible to change "our way of life."

The prosperity of the farm is the index to our national prosperity. On this question we do not have to guess, because most of us in this House lived through the depression from 1920 to 1934. During that period it got so bad in 1932 and 1933 that wheat in North Dakota was selling for 26 cents per bushel, oats for 6 cents, and corn had no market at all. Foreclosures were rampant and dispossessions of farm people were commonplace.

The farmers became bankrupt and all business in the United States followed in turn. Buying power disappeared and the stocks of manufactured goods piled up but there were no buyers. With the exception of a dozen banks in North Dakota all went to the wall. Manufacturing plants in the East had to close because they could not sell their products. Labor was forced out of work and at one time 15,000,000 people walked the streets of this country looking for jobs. The financial situation became so utterly ruined by 1933 that a depositor in a bank could not draw out his own money. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was set up for the purpose of stopping the downward plunge. Money was loaned to banks, railroads, and insurance companies on the theory that money put into the top of the Nation's business would drip down on the people and assist them. It did not drip, and the hordes of roving unemployed people roamed the streets and countryside.

The administration changed, and our policy changed. The banks were not permitted to open until properly checked, and when they did open, they opened under a new law of the guarantee of bank deposits. That stopped the hysteria about runs on banks, for it is a fact that any bank can be closed by a continuous and senseless run on the part of the depositors. The Securities Exchange Commission was set up, protecting the people against the sale of worthless bonds and spurious securities. The roving jobless were put to work that was planned by the Government and the people ate again. Much complaint has been registered since against the inefficiency of this Government work, but it had to be done as private business had testified that they could not put these 15,000,000 to work in private industry.

The farmers in the Dust Bowl were loaned money for feed and seed and were given work on projects planned by the Government. Others were given outright grants, but the farm people ate again. More liberal interest rates were offered the farmers—and longer terms of

payment. Added to this the weather changed and these sand-drifted farms came back to produce food for the Nation; food for Europe and flood the Treasury Department with farm income taxes. This happened because the farmers were getting somewhere near the cost of production for their products. Manufacturers started up again, labor was employed and the whole cycle of business in the United States turned to activity.

The means by which this dramatic change in affairs was made had many objectors; those whom the new plan helped the most were in turn the most bitter against the system. It was regimentation, it was socialism, it was communism—as this new term had come into our language more recently. It was "changing our way of life." It surely was. The last charge was correct. Our way of life had been to see the farmer driven off his farm; to see the millions idle in the country because there was no work; our way of life had been to see every bank close in the United States; our way of life had been to permit billions of worthless bonds to be sold in the country annually. It was our way of life to see farm products selling for less than the cost of harvesting them.

Remember that this situation developed before any New Deal was ever heard of; there was no legislation on the books to prevent business from going ahead in its own free way to carry on the business of the country but nevertheless, with this wholly free enterprise system working with no restrictive laws, the whole business of the country collapsed. Was not it time to change our way of life? Is there anything so precious about our way of life that we dare not change it in the face of disaster?

There is no politics in trying to keep this country right side up. All parties should know by this time that a depleted agriculture means a national depression and devastating losses that follow in its wake. It is just as much our patriotic duty to keep this country prosperous as it is our duty to fight in any way we can when this country is at war—no matter if war came over our protest.

Will history never make a dent on the minds of the Republican Party? Will they always shut their eyes to what can be plainly seen around them? The party was defeated last time because of two factors and two only. First the Eightieth Congress started tinkering with price support and came out with a sliding-scale program. This scared millions of farmers right away from the Republican Party, for the farmers believed that under this sliding-scale program they would slide right back to where they were in 1933. The next error was to drastically change the labor laws and make men work by injunction. The labor people thought they would lose all the gains made in the past half century and were as a body alert and fighting the Republican Party. Our candidate was all right, but no Republican candidate could have overcome the errors committed by the party here in Congress. No party can now win an election in the United States that has the full opposition of the farm and labor people.

This bill is an insurance against a depression, which every businessman should buy and be willing to pay for. The plan proposes to keep the Government out of the grain business. The products will be sold on the open market, but at the end of the marketing year, if there is a loss to the farmers on their parity price, the difference will be made up by the Government. That means the general taxpayer will have to contribute, if there is a loss. What does the taxpayer say? He howls and wants to know why he must support a bunch of farmers? Well, the taxpayer can take his choice. He can let the Farm Belt drop back into a period of ruinous prices, close the plants of America, put labor on the street, and suffer his own destruction. If this taxpayer is wise enough, he will support this program and preserve the stability of the entire business system in the United States. Does anyone in America—farmer, labor, businessman, or anyone else—want a return to the days of 1933? This is an important bill—important to every man, woman, and child in the United States if we wish to retain a fair measure of prosperity. Every voter should be willing to favor this insurance against a depression, for through it he can save himself.

I am glad to support this measure, even though the leadership of my party is against it. They are not always right—I sometimes am. I do not want anyone to lose the earnings of a lifetime in a depression, as I did in the last one. When war clouds threaten and this country has to be strong, every voter should favor it because here we have a chance to demonstrate to the world that democracy still works in the United States.

I would be in favor of the Gore bill if it would repeal the Aiken amendment, but I do not want any situation like Edgar Allan Poe's Pit and the Pendulum, so as to have this law swinging over the heads of the farmers to stop for 1 year and then let it continue again. Let us repeal it altogether. If that is all that this Congress can do, namely, repeal that law and leave us under the operation of the old law as it was before you tinkered with it in the last Congress, you will go a long way in again establishing confidence in the membership and leadership of the Republican Party in the West.

I do not think there is anything wrong in trying out a few products under the Pace program. It is not going to cost this country anywhere near the amount of money you say it will. And if this Pace proposition comes before the House for a vote I will support it for the reason that the President of the United States went before all the farm people in the country in the last election and promised them a change from the Aiken law. This is the bill the President is behind. He won. And the people look to this Congress to carry out the program of the President. I am not going to be pointed out in North Dakota as a Republican who did everything in his power to stymie the work of the President in his program to help the farmers of this country. That election was a referendum and the people by their votes clearly indicated their approval of the President's program. I say this is the

most important question that will ever come before this House. If you want to avoid a depression you must contrive some means to sustain those farm prices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most crucial debates that the Congress has engaged in during this session and I think a quorum ought to be present.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Anderson, Calif. Hall,	Richards
Arends	Edwin Arthur Rivers
Barrett, Pa.	Hall,
Bishop	Leonard W. Sasscer
Bonner	Hays, Ohio
Buckley, N. Y.	Heffernan
Bulwinkle	Herlong
Burke	Hoffman, Ill.
Cannon	Johnson
Celler	Kennedy
Chatham	Lodge
Clevenger	McGrath
Coudert	McGregor
Davenport	McGuire
Davis, N. Y.	Macy
Dawson	Morrison
Dingell	Murphy
Dollinger	Noland
Dolliver	O'Brien, Mich.
Eaton	Pfeiffer
Ellsworth	Joseph L.
Engel, Mich.	Poulson
Fellows	Powell
Gilmer	Rabaut
Green	Rich
	Scott,
	Hugh D., Jr.
	Shaffer
	Sikes
	Smathers
	Stanley
	Stockman
	Taber
	Thomas, N. J.
	Thomas, Tex.
	Thornberry
	Towe
	Velde
	Vorys
	Vursell
	Walsh
	Whitaker
	Wigglesworth
	Wilson, Ind.
	Withrow

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5345, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 362 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we will all agree that we should have a full understanding of the pending measure before we undertake to vote. Therefore, I would be most grateful if you would be patient with me for a few minutes and give me your close attention. There is a rather important issue involved here.

Some statements have been made that are not entirely accurate. Of course not because of any intention, but because of lack of information. As you all know who have served with me, I have spent the greater part of my service in Congress trying to be helpful to those who provide the food and fiber for this Nation. It is natural after that effort and after long study one should reach some definite conclusions. I learned that agriculture has an important part in the economy of the Nation. The record shows that agriculture leads the way up or down. I have

learned that one of the greatest assets to a prosperous agriculture is for the people in the towns and cities to be prosperous; the farmer has no hope of finding a market for his commodities, unless there is someone in town with money in their pockets to buy them.

But that is not all. I have learned and I know that to have a prosperous, stable agriculture the Government must step in and give to the group which buys in a protected market, comparable protection. I have learned that when we provide such a price-support program for the farmers we must consider the interest of the taxpayers and consumers of this Nation. And I have also learned that any support-price program must be sensible and it must be sound, if it is to remain on the statute books.

There is but one issue before the House of Representatives today. I repeat, there is but one issue before the House of Representatives today. That is whether or not the farmers of this Nation will long enjoy a good support-price program. That is the only issue here. That is the issue presented by the pending bill.

Let me put it another way, if you please. How long will this Congress, how long will the American people support a price program which spends hundreds of millions of dollars for the purchase of surplus food, and burns it or lets it rot on the ground or feeds it to the hogs? How long?

It has been mentioned here that we have a good 90 percent of parity support price program. Do you realize you did not have anything but 52 to 75 percent of parity supports before the war? Do you realize that 90-percent support is war born? Do you realize that throughout the war and up until a few months ago the 90-percent support was on a rising commodity price—going up, going up, going up, and that rarely, if ever, were the supports necessary? You understand that, do you not? Do you understand that farm prices have leveled off, and do you realize that we are now faced with declining farm prices? Those of you who want to go back to 50 percent of parity support prices, vote against the committee bill. You should. If we have lost hundreds of millions of dollars in the last 3 years under the present support program, will someone please rise in his place and tell me how many billions we are going to lose in the next 4 or 5 years under the present program? Would you do that for me? We have heard the fantastic figures given this morning about what the committee bill may cost. I challenge every Member who has made that charge to stand up and announce the fantastic figures that the support program contained in title I, which it is proposed to extend, is going to cost in the next 12 months. You cannot measure it by the past. Why? Because, as I said, in the past your support levels were never needed except in isolated cases. Now you have reached that period, I regret to say, when your support level is going to be your market price, and you know it.

Next, I want to answer one question. The question has been asked, How much

of the Brannan plan is in the committee bill? Some of my distinguished colleagues cite as their authority publications, labor journals, statements by columnists in the press, yet, with all kindness, those who cited those authorities know exactly what is in the bill.

Of the Brannan plan, to be exact, there is in the bill a new formula recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture, which I will discuss in a few minutes. There is, in addition, in the bill, an experimental program of production payments on three commodities for a period of 2 years.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Of course I will yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman does not mean that the bill at the present time puts any limitation upon the favored commodities in the program, does he?

Mr. PACE. No; but I thought my distinguished friend understood the announcement of the chairman of the committee that we proposed to offer an amendment to limit the experiment to 2 years.

You know, they call it the Brannan plan. Do you know who first recommended it? Oh, not first, but who recommended it before the Secretary of Agriculture? Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand the hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture when what is known as the Aiken bill was under consideration. As far as I have been able to find, this is the first recommendation of the production-payment plan made to that committee. The witness was Mr. John Davis, a very fine, outstanding, able, and honorable gentleman. Mr. Davis had been testifying about the support prices on basic commodities. This is on page 100 of the Senate hearings; that is easy to remember. He had been talking about the basic commodities enjoying such a good support price.

Mr. Davis said:

At our meeting last week, when we were talking about long-range policy, this was pretty much the sentiment—that if a long-range agricultural policy is to include support prices for basic commodities, then our members think they are going to be driven to the position that all segments of agriculture should have somewhat similar treatment.

I subscribe to that myself.

Senator ELLENDER. Can you offer any suggestion as to how it can be done?

Mr. DAVIS. Just this: That we want a study made of the feasibility of using a compensatory payment program for some of the perishable commodities. The problem is that you cannot store such commodities; they have to be moved immediately.

Listen!

If the Government is to take title, then the Government becomes the market—

Irish potatoes, eggs, wool.

We would like to avoid that. The alternative it seems to some of our people is to let the products move in the market at some price, since they are perishable, and then compensate the farmer.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PACE. Briefly.

Mr. GATHINGS. Would the gentleman state to the committee who Mr. Davis represented?

Mr. PACE. I thought I stated that. Mr. Davis is the executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Now, let us see about the Brannan plan. I do not want to be unkind; I do not believe in that. Somebody had the idea they had something here that they could damn because it happened to come from the lips of Charlie Brannan.

Let us see about that. I am going to prove to you that the National Farm Cooperatives not only suggested it, Senator AIKEN accepted it and wrote it into the bill, but the American Farm Bureau then approved it and they approve it today. And may I repeat that? I shall show to you that the Farm Bureau approves this bill today and refuses to agree to knocking the word "payment" out of the Aiken bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, Members are getting all sorts of telegrams here from the officials of the Farm Bureau to vote against the committee bill. All right. You ask me, "Mr. PACE, if that is true, why are they sending those telegrams?" Before I read the evidence I want to say to you, "I do not know." But I am going to leave a question with you.

The Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE and I in the committee both questioned Mr. Kline, the president of the National Farm Bureau, about payments being in the Aiken bill. We both asked him if he did not want to strike it out in the Aiken bill. He said he did not. And that is the Brannan plan complete.

Mr. Allen Kline testified before the Senate Agricultural Committee last week. He made nine recommendations of changes in the Aiken bill in the form of amendments and then he spent 10 minutes damning the Brannan plan but did not suggest that the Brannan plan contained in the Aiken bill be stricken out.

Could it be that the Farm Bureau wants the Aiken bill and wants everything killed that would in the slightest endanger the going into effect of the Aiken bill? I am a Farm Bureau member. I think I had a little part in building up the Farm Bureau down in Georgia, and I shall continue to try to build it up, but they have at this hour placed themselves in an inconsistent position that will never be understood by the farmers.

Let me give you the evidence. Refer to page 616, part 3 of the hearings, and you will find the testimony of Mr. John Davis, of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, who recommended what we call the Brannan plan to the Senate. He was before our committee a short time ago. Here is a question I asked him:

Do you or do you not approve the Secretary's production-payment proposal?

Here is the answer:

We would approve it on an experimental basis.

That is the committee bill. He not only suggested that this payment plan be put in the Aiken bill but he has recommended to us that we try it out, and that is all that we are doing, as I will discuss in a moment.

Now turn to page 565. This is Mr. Goss of the National Grange now talking. Mr. Goss is a fine man. As all of us will remember, his principal recommendation to the committee was that a board be appointed to work with the Secretary.

He discussed a straight subsidy, and said that that might be necessary, but that if it were necessary he would like to see the funds raised through some system of price insurance.

It was not a question of subsidy; it was a question of how we are going to get the money.

He recognized that there may be emergency conditions where it might be necessary, nevertheless.

Now, that was the Grange. Compare that with the mimeographed letter which he mailed you a few days ago.

Now let us go to the Farm Bureau, so turn to page 465, and I want you to hear this, because the principal one fighting this bill is a man named Kline, because the Aiken bill is his baby.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. One of the pledges of the Democratic Party is to repeal the Aiken bill.

Mr. PACE. Yes. Every Democrat on the floor that night voted against it and every Republican, but two or three, voted for it, and most of them wish they had not.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The President signed it, however, a few days later, did he not?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not true that the President stated that he was doing so reluctantly, and that but for his signature we would not have had a support program in 1949?

Mr. PACE. I am sure he is at present for the committee bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that but for his signature to that bill we would not have had a support program for 1949, that is, this year?

Mr. PACE. Well, we would only have had a 50- to 75-percent program.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman not think that was a good and persuasive reason why the President should sign the bill, because the Aiken aspects of it were objectionable?

Mr. PACE. I think it was the compelling reason under the circumstances.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have here the official directive of the President issued on December 31, 1946, when, by Executive order, he killed the support

program and said the war was over so far as the farmers of the United States were concerned.

Mr. PACE. Well, he declared the emergency at an end.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. So far as the farmers were concerned.

Mr. PACE. Let us get rid of the Farm Bureau now. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee—and there never lived a man of greater ability and integrity—asked Mr. Kline this question. Listen to this, and then make up your own minds about the attitude of the Farm Bureau:

Do you favor continuing in the Aiken bill, if it continues to be the law of the land, a provision for payments?

Mr. KLINE. It is a matter of record that we aggressively supported the act with that provision in it. It is further true that the support of prices for nonbasic commodities, which we are also for, is an extraordinarily difficult proposition, and that there is, therefore, in our testimony, a clear-cut attitude that this may be necessary, but simply pointing out that it has these dangers for farmers inherent in it. Further, it is true that we have proposed some amendments to make effective the act of 1948 and that we have not made any suggestion with regard to the elimination of this provision. In fact, we do not suggest it.

Do you understand, the gentleman from Kansas, after calling to his attention the provision in the Aiken Act that authorized production payments, which was what the Secretary of Agriculture had just recommended to our committee, asked Mr. Kline:

Knowing it is in there, that it is going to be the law, do you suggest that we knock it out?

Mr. Kline's reply was:

We do not suggest it.

That is all I am going to say, except this, that those gentlemen have exactly the same views as do the majority of this committee in reporting this bill.

We took the position that the basics are pretty well protected, my cotton, my corn, my wheat, my rice, my tobacco, and my peanuts, and we took the position that as far as their livelihood is concerned, there are farmers producing other commodities who are entitled to equal treatment. We think they, too, are entitled to a support price. That is right. But what else did we decide?

It has been mentioned here that the first day of this session I introduced a bill to continue title I and repeal the remainder of the Aiken Act. I did. That is right. I was then concerned and I am concerned today about the Aiken Act going into effect. But since that was done I have worked in that committee day after day, morning, afternoon, and sometimes at night, and for 6 long months day in and day out we have been studying this problem.

We found that during the last 3 years your Government under title I, which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] now proposes you extend, has bought \$408,000,000 worth of Irish potatoes. It has burned them, it has let them lie on the ground and rot, it has fed them to the hogs, and the American people and the American taxpayers did not get one of them.

We also found that under title I, which supports eggs at 90 percent of parity, which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] proposes to extend and continue things just as they are, your Government has lost \$48,000,000 and now has \$84,000,000 worth of powdered eggs that they cannot even give away.

I tell you what I decided, I tell you what the 17 Democrats on our committee decided. We decided that we could not long live, we decided the farmers could not long live, and we decided the American taxpayers did not intend to live long with a program that did that for perishable foods.

All right; what was the issue, then? If a perishable commodity is entitled to as much protection as my cotton is entitled to, and I claim there is nothing sacred about cotton or corn or wheat, if there is nothing sacred about them and they are entitled to these supports, then what should we do?

It is mighty hard to get it clear in your mind if you do not understand the present farm program, if you do not understand the Aiken Act, and if you do not understand this bill. You see the difficulty. Under the present law as to cotton and corn, storables, and as to Irish potatoes and eggs and everything else, there are but two ways the Secretary of Agriculture can carry out the support program. He can make loans on those commodities that are storable without loss, such as cotton, corn, wheat, and tobacco. There are some six or eight of them—I do not recall exactly how many loans can be made on. Those can be kept, but what do you do with all the others? Under the present law there is only one thing the Secretary of Agriculture can do and that is to buy. That is the reason he bought the Irish potatoes. That means we tell the Secretary, "Mr. Secretary, you go out and support X commodity at a dollar." When we have said that, the Secretary announces to the farmers, "I am going to support the price on this commodity at a dollar."

Then let us say you have a surplus of the commodity you have applied your support to, and the price begins to break. The minute it gets close to \$1, the support price, what does the Secretary do? What can he do? He cannot do anything but assemble buyers and say, "Go out yonder to the market and buy up X commodity, and buy and buy and buy." So they buy the surplus to keep that price at a dollar in order to keep our promise to the farmers. That is all he can do. The present law authorizes nothing but loans and purchases. Do you understand that now? Do you understand that all the Secretary can do is to make a loan on the commodity if it can be stored and will not deteriorate and if the storage is not too much and that the only thing he can do is to purchase the surplus?

Now, the question you have to decide today, and that is all, is whether or not you want to continue title I and require him to buy potatoes and burn them up, whether you want him to continue to buy eggs and let them rot, or whether, when there is a surplus, instead of doing that, the Secretary can let the commodity find its market level and then protect

the producer by a small payment and let the people of this country eat that food instead of letting it rot or be destroyed. You say that does not make sense? Well, I do not know what would make sense. It was charged here this morning that under this the Secretary can just turn them loose and let them produce a billion bushels and let the price drop down to 10 cents. He cannot do any such thing. Nobody who has read the bill is justified in making any such statement. Listen to me, please—here is the bill. If you turn to page 7 of the bill, you will find that in carrying out the provisions of this section, "compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices as prescribed by the Secretary, may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support," and then turn back to page 5, section (c), and you will see that when the Secretary fixes the support level on Irish potatoes and eggs, what must he do? He must take into account the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand and the producers must be willing and able to limit their production or marketings within reasonable limitations. What did the Secretary say? You know Mr. Brannan is nothing particular to me. But I believe he is honest—I know that. I believe he is sincere. And on the last day of the hearings on his proposal I questioned him on his proposal. You can find it on page 349 of the hearings.

I questioned him the last minute of the hearings. I wanted to get an idea of what this could cost, where these production limits were to be put. Here is what I asked him:

Mr. PACE. Could it be said that you would in the administration of this program seek an ample supply of food for all of the people, on a good diet, at reasonable prices?

Secretary BRANNAN. That is right.

Is there anybody here who wants to rise up and object to that?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes. I object—

Mr. PACE. Very well. I will hear you in a minute.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. You do not want to hear me.

Mr. PACE. I think I can say the farmers do not object. They want to produce enough for the people to eat. That is what the Secretary said—an ample supply for the people. In fact, if you will look at section 1 of the original Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, it is made mandatory on the farmers of this Nation to produce an ample supply for the consumers.

The consumers are not going to object. Certainly they want the farmers to produce enough food for them to eat. Certainly the farmers do not want anything but a reasonable price. I know very well the consumers do not want to pay anything more than a reasonable price. Now, who is going to object? The Secretary, in the administration of Irish potatoes next year, in the administration of the egg program next year, will ask them to produce a supply ample for all the people at reasonable prices. I hope our distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] will get time to tell why he objects.

Now I am taking too long. Let me hurry along, please. I think I should discuss the committee bill and the Gore bill, because we will have little time after it has been offered.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. If you will just let me finish I will be glad to yield.

The Gore bill, to extend title I, will continue the egg program as is, with no limitations, and with all the losses we have had in the past. Do you know what the Secretary is doing now? He is buying millions of eggs every day. The Gore bill would keep him in that business next year. It will continue the potato program just exactly as it is today. Not a single change. Extend title I. It would support chickens at 90 percent of parity, when all the chicken people came before our committee less than 2 months ago and said, "We do not want it. It is too high. We do not want any fixed support price. We want it left to the Secretary to work out with us on the basis of the supply and demand."

Another thing, under title I you support all wool. Did you know you were supporting prices for the packers of this country—when they buy a lamb they have a way of pulling the wool off? Did you know that you are now guaranteeing them 42 cents a pound for that old greasy wool? We do not think that ought to be done. Under the bill we have limited the support price to shorn wool, to the man out there who takes the sheep and ties him down and clips off the wool. Then we provide that he shall sell it in the market, rather than the Government buying every pound of it at 42 cents, paying the buyers, paying the classers paying the storage, paying the sellers, and then selling it in the competitive market. Will somebody tell me what is the difference in making the Government buy and sell the wool or letting the producer sell it himself, when the cost would be somewhere between 25 and 50 percent less when the producer sells it?

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] expressed the desire that I say something about the parity formula. If it were left to me individually, and you ladies and gentlemen would put farm labor costs in the old formula, I would rather have it than anything. But I have tried 10 years now and you have not put it in. If anybody will turn to page 17 of the committee report and look at the support price you are going to get under the Aiken Act formula, no Representative from a farm area would ever approve of it. What did we have in committee? We had a sound, constructive, practical proposal from the Secretary of Agriculture. We now have one based on 1909-14 prices. The Secretary's formula was far superior to that contained in the Aiken bill. For that reason it is written into this bill. Here is how it works: The Secretary's formula, instead of using the prices the farmers received in 1909-14, provides that all of the prices added up—the total cash farm receipts for the last 10 of the last 12 years, that you shall take those and apply the parity index to each year and determine its purchasing power; add up the 10 years and divide it and get your

average. Then he uses the current parity index to determine what those cash receipts should be at the present time; that is determined. Then after getting that total it has to be broken down to a price support for each commodity. He does that by multiplying the current parity index by the average price each commodity has brought during the last 10 years. For example—I see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] looking at me—the average price of cotton during the last 10 years has been 22 cents. Multiply that by the index of 1.25 and you will find the parity price of cotton is 27.99 or 28 cents. That is the way it is determined.

I say to you in my place that we did not know how the first parity formula was going to work when it was recommended by President Roosevelt in 1933; I say to you in my place that for the next 5 years, in my judgment, this parity formula is as good as the present formula and many, many times better than that in the Aiken Act; and 5 years from now you can look at it again and see if any changes are needed.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I trust my colleagues will let me proceed for the short time allotted to me to discuss one of the most fundamental issues that has been before the Congress during my tenure in this body without interruption.

I think I should be quite presumptuous if I, alone, after a few weeks' study, came before this body seeking upon only my own endorsement to write a whole agricultural policy for this great country. That I do not.

I know we have a great Agricultural Committee. There is not one member of that committee who is not my warm personal friend. I have no criticism of them—none whatever—nor do I impugn the motives of any of our great labor or farm organizations or any of the opposing parties to this issue.

This is a fundamental issue, a fundamental departure from the orthodox practice of our economy. It is something upon which, I trust, all of us can have honest disagreement without questioning anyone's motive. You have heard the debate. How many of you know more about the bill that is before us—very much more—than you knew before it started? It is a very complicated subject and apparently not many Members are anxious to explain how the bill will work.

The controversy we have had over the Aiken bill for the last 12 or more months, the lack of understanding and the confusion about the present bill, proves what? It proves that we cannot afford to run the risk with the farmer's welfare, and the farmer's welfare being tied to the country's welfare, by taking this leap in the dark and throwing overboard a program that has been built out of 16 years of experience and farmer cooperation.

I do not think we should take this leap in the dark, nor do I think we should permit the Aiken bill to go into effect on January 1 next. We do not have to

let either happen. There is an easy but a good alternative.

What is it? It is the substitution, not of my judgment for that of the committee, not at all, it is the substitution of the agriculture program that has been built by these men, by you and by others who have passed on from this body, for 16 years. I confess I thought we had a pretty good program. I have been voting for it for 11 years now and up until last year I never saw any partisanship in the building up of that program. I have been out and I have talked to the farmers. I sort of patted myself on the back that I had been up here and voted for it. In fact, I offered a few amendments that I thought helped build this program. I thought the farmers were pretty well satisfied with it.

I wonder what got so wrong with our farm program so quick. Surely I have been misled. I put on my buckler and shield last fall and, taking sword in hand, campaigned against the Eightieth Congress for tinkering with the great farm program we had been building through years of Democratic administration under the leadership of the late President Roosevelt. Someone should have given me a tip. Honestly I did not know we were running on the Brannan plan. The campaign was over before I heard about it. And think of it. Somebody forgot to put it in the Democratic platform. I wonder how many of you were left in the dark, too. How many of you campaigned on the Brannan plan? I admit I never heard of it until—I believe it was in April. And then almost suddenly we are asked to abandon the parity-price approach to a fair exchange value of farm commodities in the market place that has gained such wide acceptance, asked to endorse a cluster of delusionary promises of food both cheap and expensive at the same time, asked to approve a policy that would make the farmer dependent upon appropriations from the Treasury for a large part of his pay for what he produces. All of this in so short a time and with such inadequate consideration.

By what high mandate are we called upon to endorse this fundamental departure from basic Americanism? By party convention or platform? No, there has been none. By referendum of the people? No, not the people. Have the farmers petitioned that their farm program be changed? I have received no such entreaties. Who, then, wants this plan? All I know is that it is Secretary Brannan's plan. The farmers claim no part of it. In fact, they do not think it is or ever will be a farm plan.

There are other mistakes in the bill to which reference has already been made in preceding debate, but the big issue before us is food subsidies. With this issue I am unwilling to temporize or compromise.

We are told that this subcommittee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACEL] is chairman, unanimously voted to extend this program another year, only later to change its mind. Yet I have heard several suggestions from this well today questioning the loyalty of one certain gentleman

from Tennessee to his party. Why? Because I advocate extending a program for which everyone of you who were here in any Congress before this one have voted.

Now, let us come to this bill. I want to take up first the level of price supports. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia pictured what was going to happen; what great catastrophe might happen with the extension of title I. Do you find in his bill any withdrawal of supports on basic commodities? Not at all. You find the list increased and the support levels upped. Even though they now propose an amendment which will make it impossible to have a subsidy-payment program on hogs, do you know what his bill will do? Read the report. The bill increases the support price for hogs from \$16 to \$19. This \$3 per hundred raise on support levels for hogs alone would amount to over \$500,000,000 on the hog crop already predicted by the Department of Agriculture, to say nothing of the increased production that is bound to result from the artificial disproportion which the Pace bill would establish in the corn-hog ratio. Do you know what the support price for corn is in the Pace bill? It is \$1.46. And \$19 for hogs. I will tell you what I can do, and I am a practical farmer, having fed hogs almost every year since I was able to carry a sack of corn. I could rent a city block in Washington or New York and truck corn from my farm in Tennessee and feed hogs at that ratio and make money doing it. Let me ask you if you want to perpetrate that on this country? It might make last year's potato fiasco look like a molehill.

Bug-a-boos can be raised about the present program. I have never suggested that it was a perfect program. It is not. From time to time new circumstances have developed and we have had to make modifications and changes. But what is wrong in that? That is how we build programs in America. We learn from experience.

Now let me right there talk about this potato program. The Secretary has built his whole appeal on this fiasco on potatoes last year. Well, what is it this year? What is it this year? You know, he says that he can handle potatoes better by a subsidy program. What has happened this year? The potato program this year is working quite more satisfactorily. We have learned by experience, by limitation of production, by marketing agreements developed with farmers that potato price supports are working. What is the result? Through July 14 we have bought only about one-fifth as many dollars worth of potatoes as we did by the same date last year. But, that does not mean it is going to cost one-fifth as much. Why? Because the Government can come much nearer getting its money back, and putting into useful purposes, \$4,000,000 worth of potatoes than it can with \$18,500,000 worth of potatoes. Thus far this year, it is a success story and the Secretary of Agriculture is to be complimented. I talked with the man handling the potato program in my State and he tells me that this year not one bushel of potatoes has been destroyed. They have been put to good purposes; to the

school-lunch program, to social institutions and some, perhaps, to potato flour. Yes, the potato program this year is working. And, what does that prove? It proves that this program that has been time tested through the years can be made to work; in fact, we have learned to handle the most difficult circumstances through and with it. Why, then, I ask you, must I be branded as disloyal to my party because I want to extend it? Why, I ask you Democrats?

Now, I want to talk for just a moment to my friends from highly industrialized districts who have been looking askance at me. Some of you have asked me why I am against the Brannan plan. Some of you asked why the farmers are against the Brannan plan and others have asked why it makes any difference to the farmer where he gets his money as long as he gets it.

Well, let me turn the proposition around and apply it to some of your constituents and then I will let you be the judge as to whether you think they would like it.

Suppose we have a bill up in Congress to establish a policy of giving cheap automobiles to the people and paying the difference in the wages the workers are paid and what we think they ought to be paid by an appropriation from the Treasury. Suppose we say to the automobile workers, "Now, fellows, we are going to have a policy of giving cheap automobiles to the people. We are going to produce an abundance of automobiles and let them find their levels in the market place, as Mr. Brannan says we ought to do with farm products. So do not you fellows ask for any higher wages. Do not you be bothered about wages, anyway. We have a policy of giving cheap automobiles to the people. Of course, the manufacturers will have to cut your wages, but now do not you be bothered about what you get in wages. We are going to pass a bill in Congress to appropriate enough money out of the Federal Treasury to pay you the difference between what you get and what Congress thinks you ought to get."

Do you think the automobile workers would like that? Well, if you do not think so, how come you think the farmers would like it any better?

Now let me go back to this bill. Let me speak of one other price-support level that this bill would establish. This bill would arbitrarily, without any request from anyone, without any justification, without it even being wanted, raise the support price on burley tobacco \$9 on the hundred. I have here in my hand a telegram from the Burley Tobacco Producers Association saying they do not want it; it will raise the supports too high. They want to continue the present program. The wire is from Mr. F. V. Browder, president of the Tennessee Burley Tobacco Growers Association.

It would raise arbitrarily and without request the dark-fired tobacco support price \$6 on the hundred. I do not know how much you people know about tobacco, but dark-fired tobacco is one type for which we have almost no domestic market except in snuff. We depend on the foreign market to dispose of it, and

they say this \$6 would price them out of the market. Let me read you the wire:

We do not favor the Pace-Brannan bill, but we do favor present law.

PAUL RUDOLPH,
General Manager, Eastern Dark-Fired
Tobacco Association.

They say they do not want it, yet by this bill we would give it to them unsought, unwanted, unneeded, and unsound.

Let me read to you another telegram from a friend of every one of you who has served in any Congress before this. It is addressed to me:

As one deeply interested in American agriculture I want to keep the American farmer from becoming a charity patient in the Government hospital.

What the farmers want and are entitled to is a fair price in the market place and not a Government hand-out or dole. And all that labor asks is a fair wage. The paymaster for the products of the soil should be the consumers of those products and not the Treasurer of the United States.

While the Brannan plan preaches a philosophy diametrically opposed to the American philosophy of government it is, I am afraid, not only a destructive but a seductive philosophy, with plenty of sex appeal, in that it holds out to the American farmers high prices and to the American consumers low prices, thus putting the hands of both the farmers and consumers into the pockets of poor old Uncle Sam for a livelihood.

Hoping that your amendment is adopted, which means that further study will be given the problem, I am sincerely yours,

JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

For the benefit of new Members, I should like to identify Mr. Flannagan as the Democratic leader of the Committee on Agriculture just prior to this year. He retired voluntarily the first of last January.

Now I want to talk about eggs. My distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee, said we have 60,000,000 pounds of dried powdered eggs. Do you know that you can powder eggs more cheaply than you can put them in cold storage? Do you know that 60,000,000 eggs is only a drop in the bucket? How many eggs do you think were produced last year?

I am going to tell you how many eggs were produced in dozens—not just the number of eggs. Four and one-half billion dozens of eggs were produced last year. Do you know how many people sold eggs last year? Four million seven hundred and sixty thousand people, mostly women.

Now the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina is going to offer a motion, or so he has announced, to eliminate hogs from the payment program, leaving, however, this artificially created disproportion in the corn-hog ratio. But in that respect the gentleman jumps from the skillet into the fire, in my opinion—to put under the payment program, of all things, eggs. Eggs that are produced by 4,760,000 families.

The marketing of this huge production involves literally millions of sales to hundreds of thousands of buyers located in every county of the United States. The paper work that would be involved in checking sales records to determine the amount of payments due individual farmers almost defied comprehension. Eggs are sold, not only to regular produce

buyers, but also to grocery stores and consumers. Thousands of farmers sell eggs on a retail basis—one or two dozen at a time—to passing motorists or to consumers along more or less regular delivery routes. The problem of verifying sales to regular produce buyers and grocery stores would be difficult. Even with an army of inspectors it would be impossible to verify farmers' reports of sales to consumers. Some padding of these reports undoubtedly would occur. What would keep farmers from selling their entire production and buying back eggs for home consumption in order to acquire the sales records which would qualify them for subsidy payments.

How, I ask you, would Secretary Brannan calculate, estimate, or guess how many eggs 4,760,000 American women will sell, to whom, and at what price? To pay a subsidy to every American woman or man who sells a dozen eggs would require the winding and rewinding of a million miles of red tape. Remember OPA? It was necessary during the war but not now.

In many American homes today much of the household money comes from the chickens and eggs which the women raise. When they go to the country store or the county seat on a Wednesday afternoon or Saturday they frequently take a basket of eggs and maybe a chicken or two and with the income from that produce they bring home a pair of shoes, or some print, or a pair of overalls, or some sugar and flour. This practice is not an isolated case, but, I dare say, in rural America the usual case.

I have been trying to figure out just how we would go about keeping all these records and making all these 4,000,000 subsidy payments. So I sent over to the Library and I called the embassies and I got all the books and pamphlets I could about how the program was operated in Germany, in Argentina, and in Great Britain. I find that it has been a rather difficult problem for them, too. Of course, as I said earlier, it has grown far beyond the chicken and egg stage for them. I hold here a pamphlet put out by the British Ministry of Agriculture. I find many things interesting in here. Producers are required to keep receipts, the purchaser is required to keep receipts from the people to whom he sells.

I hold here, too, an analysis of the experience of Germany in this program. You might be interested to know how they handled the egg program. Every person who sold eggs was required to get a receipt in triplicate, one was to be sent to the Department of Agriculture, one was to be safely kept by the chicken raiser, the other was to be filed with the purchaser. After reading this I first thought that the method was pretty bad, but upon second thought, it occurred to me that it might be the most practical way to keep up with an egg subsidy program. If 4,760,000 egg producers averaged selling eggs just once a week that would be 247,520,000 receipts in triplicate.

How are you going to do this? We are responsible for it if we adopt this mess. I am telling you it is utterly unworkable. If you put this thing down the throats of the rural people of America and happen to go down into my district in 1950,

you will likely meet one of these industrious chicken raisers going to town with a basketful of receipts—in triplicate—to get her subsidy, to make up to her what she should have got for her eggs, when she sold them, but did not. If so I advise you not to irritate her. She might be dangerous. For goodness' sake, do not say it is a Democratic program. Say it is the Brannan plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I know the members of the House Committee on Agriculture regret very much that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] did not find it possible to attend at least one of the very great many hearings which we have held. Since the gentleman did not volunteer to appear as a witness on behalf of agriculture—

And since our committee now has the power of subpoena, perhaps whenever we have a hearing again we should subpoena the gentleman from Tennessee to come and give us the benefit of some of his great storehouse of information.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. No, I decline to yield. I respectfully decline to yield.

Now, the gentleman finds himself on the horns of a dilemma. He went out and embraced a monster of tremendous proportions. You have heard that old story about the man who had a bear by the tail. The gentleman from Tennessee has a bear by the tail, and because of the fact that he has collaborated so much, he finds it impossible to turn loose the bear. Now, what is the bear? It is the Aiken bill, which was handed to him, lock, stock, and barrel, in this Republican proposal to suspend that serpent above the heads of the farmers for another long year. It looked for a while that he was going to run out on his new-made friends, but apparently he has not indicated any intention to abandon the baby which was placed in his arms. His colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] stood here in a forthright manner and expressed the hope that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would accept his amendment, which would have the effect of killing or repealing the Aiken bill. But the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], our beloved agricultural expert from Tennessee, could not accept Mr. SUTTON's amendment. So the fight goes on, and we will face that issue here, whether you prefer the proposal by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] to kill this snake, or Mr. GORE's proposition to breathe a new breath of life into it and keep it alive.

Now, let us look at this bill. If our good friend had spent as much time reading the bill and the report and the hearings as he has in preparation to defend an indefensible position, I think he might have made a greater contribution to the cause of agriculture. Notwithstanding the fact that we have announced that when the proper time arrives we will name the three commodities upon which the Secretary may conduct his experiment—and any good lawyer knows that the enumeration of some things is con-

sidered the exclusion of other things—under this bill, with that amendment, the Secretary cannot experiment with hogs, about which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] seems to like to talk. The fact is he has talked about growing hogs here on Capitol Hill. Under this bill the price of hogs is fixed at 19 cents, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] evidently did not think it wise to give you this language in the bill:

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, if the Secretary determines that the parity price for corn, wheat, milk, butterfat, and hogs are not in such proper relation as to permit the maintenance of desirable feed ratios, the levels at which such commodities are to be supported may be adjusted by not more than 10 percent on any such commodity to levels which the Secretary determines will reflect desirable feed ratios.

What is wrong with that? He can adjust it 10 percent and bring the price of hogs down to about where it is now or perhaps half a cent a pound above its present level.

He makes another point; he says that someone in the burley section sent him a telegram saying that they did not favor the bill because it was going to put the price of tobacco up. Now, that just is not the situation; this bill puts tobacco just about where it was in 1948. I know that the tobacco people in my section and in the district of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] do not want tobacco prices brought down any lower than those that prevailed in 1948. Can you imagine a tobacco farmer facing the highest cost of production he ever faced in history sending a telegram to a Congressman saying: "Pray God, don't put my prices up"? It is the most ridiculous proposition I ever heard of.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] brought out another thing, the telegram from our beloved former colleague, Mr. Flannagan. I respect him and love him, but unfortunately Mr. Flannagan did not attend a single solitary hearing by either the subcommittee or the full committee.

I think that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] must have impressed this House with his great sincerity when he stood here and frankly told you that when he came to Washington fresh from Georgia in January that he introduced the proposition that is now being sponsored by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] in the honest belief that it was the proper thing to do. He told you that at that moment he did not know what the situation really was, but for six long months STEVE PACE, night and day has studied this problem from bottom to top. Then in July he introduced this bill after the most extended hearings our Committee has ever conducted. Talk about holding something open to study. All during the Seventy-ninth Congress our Committee studied the subject at length. During the Eightieth Congress we again studied the agricultural problem, and we took a bus and blasted the trailways throughout all of America and went into every agricultural district of this great country. We actually did not conclude those hearings until after the last general election,

we concluded the hearings in Fresno, Calif., in December. Then do you think that we should go back into the cloistered halls of some study and sit down with a lot of statistics and try to bring out a farm bill? For 6 months we worked on this, and we bring it to you without apology; we bring it to you in the hope that you will at least consider it with intelligence and with patriotism; we know you will. You have the choice to make. Do not be swept off your feet by this coalition that has sworn to defeat and to repudiate the House Committee on Agriculture which has an enviable record in the Congress, and to repudiate this little part of the present Secretary of Agriculture's program and to continue with a program that becomes more costly every day we operate it. I say to you that this is a reasonable, sensible, sane, and sound proposition; and I commend it to the careful consideration of this House in the earnest hope and belief that the Members are intensely interested in doing the right thing.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, everyone who has ever studied law recalls the stock illustration used to show that alternative, inconsistent pleadings are permissible. It was alleged that a culprit "did steal, take, and carry away one brass kettle to the value of 12 shillings." The defendant answered: (1) That he did not steal the kettle, never saw it, and it never came into his possession; (2) that he found the kettle; (3) that the kettle was given to him; (4) that he bought the kettle; (5) that the kettle was iron, not brass; (6) that it wasn't worth 12 shillings.

The proponents of the Brannan plan and of its forerunner, the Pace bill, now before us, must be familiar with that system of pleading.

They claim: (1) That the Brannan plan will give the farmer the same income he has enjoyed during the last ten boom years; (2) that it will give the consumer low-cost food because the farm produce will be allowed to sell at the price it will bring and the Government will pay the farmer the difference out of the Treasury; (3) that it will not break the Treasury because farm production will be curtailed by crop control; (4) that it will not enslave the farmer because he will have a chance to vote in a free election whether he wants his crop controlled; (5) that he will vote to have it controlled because if he does not he will not be given any price support; (6) they further claim that the Pace bill is merely a harmless "trial run" of the Brannan scheme to see how it will work.

Let us test these claims.

First, this bill is not a "trial run." It is an entering wedge for the whole Brannan plan. History has shown that farm price support is a one-way street. From the 50 percent to 75 percent of parity of the early thirties support has risen gradually to the 90 percent of World War II. The Steagall Act extended this for 2 years after the war as a cushion for the farmer during the tapering off of prices. No one contemplated that the present 90 percent of parity would be continued permanently

in time of peace. Time has proven, however, that the farmer, even though he is by nature an independent and self-reliant individual, is only human like the rest of us, and when he has become accustomed to receiving a Government subsidy he does not want it reduced. So, when he was told before the last election that under the law soon to come into effect there might be a reduction of price support, he responded with a thundering "No."

The Pace bill cannot be a mere trial run because it establishes a new and higher standard of price support.

Once the Brannan plan of production payments and guaranteed high income becomes effective under this bill for a few commodities, producers of other commodities will insist upon sharing its benefits, and it will be impossible to retreat. The Pace bill came into this House as permanent legislation, permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to put his scheme of production payments into effect on any three commodities that he might choose, subject to certain criteria. It was generally understood that hogs would be one of these commodities. Support of hogs would be a multi-billion-dollar program and would probably strike a staggering blow to producers of beef cattle and other livestock, therefore, a wave of opposition arose. Whereupon, proponents of the bill agreed to limit its effect to 2 years and limit its application to potatoes, eggs, and wool. Let us not deceive ourselves. If the bill were limited to 3 months and affected only onions and parsnips, the camel's head would be in the tent and the Brannan plan would be the inevitable result.

Let us apply our test, therefore, to the Brannan scheme, of which the present bill is merely a forerunner. What will it do for the consumer? What will it do for the farmer? What will it do to the taxpayer?

First let us consider the consumer.

When Mr. Brannan unveiled his scheme, it was to be a great boon to the housewife and meant low-cost food. He talked about it, labor leaders talked about it, and a flood of propaganda was loosed to woo Mr. John Q. Public with this promise. Recently all this talk has suddenly hushed, and there has been a cavernous silence regarding this feature of the plan. Why? The Brannan scheme cannot benefit the consumer for two reasons: First, because it must be accompanied by crop control or break the back of the taxpayer. Crop control means curtailed production of foodstuffs and curtailed production means continued high prices to the housewife. Second, the consumer cannot benefit materially unless a rigid system of price control is added to price support. History has shown that when the farmer gets little for his produce the retail price is still comparatively high, and the difference is absorbed by the processor and the middleman.

There it is, Mrs. Housewife. If you are ever to profit by the Brannan scheme, you must take the OPA back to your bosom with it, and even if you do that you would still not profit much, because under the plan food production must be limited.

Now let us consider the farmer. The Brannan scheme will make the farmer forever the poor relation at the family table of the Nation. He will be given lip service and kind words but he will be reminded constantly that he is dependent upon public charity. His great worries have always been the vagaries of the weather, but he will find those worries were bliss compared with the anxieties that will beset him when he becomes dependent upon the whims of the Appropriations Committees of Congress for his livelihood.

The Brannan scheme means Government-administered farm prices and farm income, with absolute control of all land and production. We have heard much in the past months about a "slave-labor law." Make no mistake. If the Brannan plan is ever enacted into law—and the Pace bill is the first step—we will have a "slave-farmer law." The Secretary of Agriculture will become a complete czar, in control of every acre of every farm in the Nation. Oh, yes, proponents claim that the farmers will have the chance to vote on accepting marketing quotas and that acreage allotments will be used only as a last resort. That is so much prattle. If the farmer does not vote for control, he does not get any price support. Thus he has the privilege of voting whether he shall eat or starve. This is like the "free elections" that were held under Hitler.

The Brannan scheme would place a ceiling on opportunity in agriculture. The farmer could never again sit on his porch at sundown and look across his meadows and plan what he would do with his own the coming day or month or year. His pride of ownership and his sense of independence and security would be forever lost. His standard of living would no longer depend upon his efficiency in producing because once again, as in the days of Henry Wallace, he would be paid for not producing.

No effort has been spared to sell this plan to the farmer. The long arm of the Department of Agriculture has reached out to every community and farm in the Nation with its hand filled with pamphlets and propaganda. But the farmer is awakening to his danger. The Farm Bureau, the National Grange, and other organizations are fighting desperately against it.

Now let us forget the consumer, the farmer, or any other individual or group and consider what the Brannan scheme means to the Nation as a whole. The implications of this measure, both political and economic, are more far reaching than any proposal Congress has considered since it voted to declare war. Its staggering cost to the taxpayer and its effect on the farmer or the consumer are of minor importance compared with the new philosophy it presents.

Fundamentally, the Brannan plan is a scheme to form a political alliance between labor and agriculture to bring about a socialist-labor government in this country and to create a welfare state like the one which flowered so beautifully and is withering so fast in England. I do not question the sincerity of many of its proponents, both within and without this Chamber, but I am convinced

that they are unknowingly the tools of those who seek to seize and keep the reins of Government and to make that Government supreme over the rights of men.

Those who doubt this statement should heed the words of former Secretary Byrnes:

Too many people are trying to transfer power to Government. * * * Power once transferred to Government is difficult to recover. Power intoxicates men. When a man is intoxicated by alcohol he can recover, but when intoxicated by power he seldom recovers.

Those who are beguiled by the glittering promises of this legislation should consider his further words:

Beware of the Greeks bearing gifts. Beware of those who promise you something which does not belong to them and which can be given to you only at your own expense or the expense of another who may not produce to make the promise good.

Those who do not appreciate the true significance of the decision before us should hear him further:

We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up, no one can tell, but if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted, there is danger that the individual—whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state.

Finally, those who believe that the gadgets and supposed safeguards in this bill protect our liberties, should heed the recent words of General Eisenhower:

I firmly believe that the army of persons who urge greater and greater centralization of authority and greater and greater dependence upon the Federal Treasury are really more dangerous to our form of government than any external threat that can possibly be arrayed against us.

I realize that many of the people urging such practice attempt to surround their particular proposal with fancied safeguards to protect the future freedom of the individual. My own conviction is that the very fact that they feel the need to surround their proposal with legal safeguards is in itself a cogent argument for the defeat of the proposal.

These are some of the reasons that I am opposed to the Brannan plan and to its stepchild, the Pace bill. I have no quarrel with those who do not wish to let the Aiken law, so-called, take effect the first of next year, because while I subscribe to the fundamental intent of that law, which is to provide a flexible price support within certain limits sufficient to protect the farmer from disaster but not high enough to bring on the evils of control and regimentation, I believe that that law is defective in that it places in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture nearly, if not quite, as much power as he would have under the Brannan proposal.

I hope that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, continuing for the time being the law now in effect, will be adopted. Certainly this is only a temporary expedient, but so is the Pace bill as described by its sponsors. The Committees on Agriculture of the Congress should have the time and opportunity to study thoroughly and prepare carefully a long-range agricultural program. There are many constructive proposals yet to be

considered, such as: A system of insurance to which the farmer contributes for protection in times of falling prices; the encouragement of new industrial uses of farm products; a two-price system to dispose of food surpluses abroad; and, a coupon system to make such surpluses available to low-income groups in our own country.

Let us not act in haste. We are not in such desperate straits that we need to stifle the producing capacity of American agriculture by placing it in the vise of economic distastefulness. I believe that with time and determined effort we can provide a plan for the American farmer that is within the pattern of our Constitution.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to attack or support either one of the bills. I should like to have some questions answered. Is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] in the Hall? Is there anyone else who would volunteer to give expert answers to some questions?

I am rather disturbed about some of the features of this bill. I appeared before the subcommittee and I was interested to know who it was that requested that potatoes be incorporated in this bill as an experiment. I do not find anyone requesting that potatoes be used as an experiment. I would like to know when the price of potatoes is to be fixed. I am serious, gentlemen. I would like some member of the committee to answer these questions if you can answer them.

I would like to know if the price is to be arranged for an area or for a State or for the Nation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, if the gentleman has the answer.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The price is to be fixed by the Secretary at somewhere between zero and 100 percent of parity, leaving it to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like to know if the price is going to be fixed for an area or for a period, or for a particular sale, because an individual farmer could very easily sell his potatoes on the opening market for \$2 per hundred and then the price fall and if another farmer happened to come in the off-area, or off time so to speak, he would get probably \$1.50, yet the average would be \$1.75, and if the support price was \$1.70 the \$1.50 farmer would have no protection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I would not undertake to answer for any member of the committee, but I would like to read one sentence from the bill which would give the Secretary authority to remove all these little farmers from the supports that you are speaking of. I will read from page 9, line 18:

Production payments need not be made with respect to any commodity or any producer thereof if the Secretary determines—

I would like to digress there to say that I am omitting some 20 specific grants of authority in the bill—

if the Secretary determines that the total amount of production payments which would be made to the producers of the commodity is too small to justify the administrative cost of making such payments.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman, but I happen to represent a great potato-producing district. I happen to recall for the last 3 years we have appeared before officials of the Agriculture Department and last year before the Secretary of Agriculture begging the Department and the Secretary to change the type of administration of the potato program. Yet they persisted each year in doing a perfectly foolish and asinine thing. Then the Secretary and his assistants, Mr. Smith, Mr. Trigg, and Mr. Woolley, want to point to the potato program and say how terrible it is. And on top of this the Secretary apparently wants to use it as a guinea pig. Certainly the potato industry is opposed to it. The present program would work O. K. With the right kind of administration the Department of Agriculture does not need more power or law covering potatoes; they and the potato farmers need a better administration of the present law.

I see the gentleman from Georgia on the floor and hope I will have time to go over these questions again.

Will the gentleman from Georgia answer this question? Who requested that potatoes be put in this bill?

Mr. PACE. Who requested it in the testimony before the committee?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. PACE. I do not think it was requested by the producers.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman recalls our appearing before your committee?

Mr. PACE. Oh very clearly, and very pleasantly.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman will recall the complaint we have had for 3 years as to why the potato situation has gone bad?

Mr. PACE. We hope to have a bill ready next week.

Mr. BARDEN. But there is no word here that corrects the inequity and injustice that has been perpetrated on the potato people during the last 3 years?

Mr. PACE. We could not put it in this bill, but a bill will be before the House next week or the week after that which we hope will correct that.

Mr. BARDEN. May I ask the gentleman this question: In setting the price for potatoes, do you set it for the season, for the year, for the quarter or for the month?

Mr. PACE. Do you mean as to the payments?

Mr. BARDEN. That is right, as to your support price.

Mr. PACE. It will be set just as it is now, I presume.

Mr. BARDEN. You presume—I do not want to presume on my potatoes.

Mr. PACE. That is not changed in the bill. That is all I can say.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I have some more time?

Mr. POAGE. We cannot give the gentleman any more time. We only have 69 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARDEN. I am not going to get ugly about it, but I will say to you gentlemen that you are going to give me more information about the potato situation than I have been able to get, otherwise you are not going to find me so friendly to your bill. I tell you that now.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, as most of my colleagues know, I have long contended that the proper way to effectively and permanently solve the agriculture problems is to start from the soil. In order that such a program might be carried out, I have introduced a soil-conservation bill, H. R. 2368, which would take land out of production which is now producing surplus crops, and put that land in soil-conserving crops, and thus balance production. I recently explained my bill before the Subcommittee on Agriculture of which the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is chairman.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. May I say to the gentleman that the subcommittee is giving most sympathetic consideration to the gentleman's bill, which is very meritorious.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to read into the Record my testimony before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

Mr. PACE. We will now hear from our distinguished colleague, Hon. BEN F. JENSEN, of Iowa.

STATEMENT OF HON. BEN F. JENSEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee and be of any help I can in providing a few thoughts on what you and I consider the greatest problem facing our Nation today. Needless to say, the whole welfare of our economy, agricultural and industrial, weighs heavily on the decisions this committee reaches in regard to effective farm legislation.

The Nation is sadly in need of a sound approach to the economic problems that beset it today. Since directly or indirectly approximately 70 percent of our labor is employed in the production, processing, and distribution of farm products and the services incident to such activity, the destiny of our Nation's economy rests on the leadership and legislation you gentlemen and the other Members of Congress provide.

It is regretful that practically all of the help offered this committee by well-respected, and rightfully so, national agricultural leaders has been based on economic tangents and monstrosities irrelevant to the basic causes of our agricultural problems. They deal totally in trying to control effects.

Far too many of our agricultural legislation proposers ignore or forget that there is a bottom to the taxpayers' appropriations barrel. We would never have any economic problems if there were a limitless supply of

dollars to cure our economic maladjustments. But we know that the Nation's Federal business structure is very similar to your family's or mine. We have to live within our income and cannot constantly overspend without irreparable disastrous results.

It seems obvious that if our people aren't interested in using more cotton—the fact is clear. If our people are not interested in eating more and more potatoes and consume all the farmers wish and can produce—that fact is also clear. The same is true in regard to certain grain crops. The Government does not have the right or obligation to force our people to utilize everything agriculture produces, or to force our people to pay through taxes sufficient money to make it profitable for our agriculture to continue the production of certain unwanted crops. Our people are interested in more food; but they want it in such items as more and better meat, milk, cheese, and other high standard of living foods. They do not object to using a reasonable portion of their income for food purchases. But they dislike spending part of this income for the production of unwanted commodities as they are now doing through taxation.

That may sound like a peculiar statement since I represent a farm area. But I know that the people I represent want a truthful answer to our farm problems. They want legislation that will work and that will not bankrupt our Government. After all, our farmers have just as much stake in a sound, effective Government and economic system as does the city dweller.

Our farmers realize that their security is no stronger than their ability to produce the types of food the consumer wants to buy. They have no security when their affairs and production are manipulated by one or two people at the Washington level.

I have considered at length these farmer and consumer interests and problems in regard to farm legislation. As a result, I introduced H. R. 2368 earlier this year. This legislation is not a cure-all—it is just a beginning. It will start our Government on a constructive and nonbankruptcy path to helping farmers bring their production in line with consumer food demands, and at the same time will encourage more and more farmers to conserve and make better use of their soil resources.

We should first recognize what took place on our land to produce our 1948 crops. Of the nearly 351,000,000 acres harvested in 1948, approximately 148,500,000 were used for intertilled or row crops, 129,000,000 for close-growing or small-grain crops, and 73,500,000 acres for meadow or hay crops, as part of a soil conserving and building rotation.

A close analysis of 1948 row crop and small grain production shows that at a very minimum approximately 43,500,000 acres which were used for row crops and 28,500,000 acres for small grain should have been in meadow or hay crops for a minimum soil-conserving rotation. (Estimates based on study material used to compile testimony for Long Range Agricultural Policy Hearings, House of Representatives, March 10, 1948).

It is very conservative to say that 1 out of every 4 acres in row crops or small grains in 1948 should have been in a meadow or hay crop for a minimum soil-conserving rotation. Likewise, we would not have a serious maladjustment to agricultural production today if our land were being properly used.

It should be possible through payments, as outlined under H. R. 2368, to reduce the corn acreage 5 percent, the wheat acreage 13 percent, and the cotton acreage 20 percent in this country by Federal payments not to exceed \$200,000,000 the first year. This could be done on the basis of converting 20,000,000 acres of land that had been, for the previous two or more years, in corn, wheat and cotton to grass and woodland at the average rate

of \$20 per acre, the Government paying \$10 per acre or one-half the total cost. Let me point out that a reduction of so large an acreage of these three crops the first year would very largely, if not entirely, eliminate the possibility of surpluses occurring in the production of these crops.

In the sixth year, at an annual cost not to exceed \$200,000,000 per year, 10 percent of the present corn acreage, 25 percent of the present wheat acreage, and 40 percent of the present cotton acreage could be retired to grass or trees which would undoubtedly eliminate any further possibility of temporary surpluses occurring in the production of these crops. I should like to insert in the record a simple tabulation indicating what an annual Federal payment of \$200,000,000 could do under the terms of H. R. 2368.

Mr. PACE. It may be inserted in the record at this point in your statement.

(The statement above referred to is as follows:)

Acreage of grain and cropland that could be converted to grass or trees with a governmental payment of \$200,000,000 per annum as provided in H. R. 2368

	Millions of acres	Percent of cost	Cost per acre	Total cost
First year.....	20	50	\$10	\$200,000,000
Second year.....	20	20	4	200,000,000
Do.....	12	50	10	200,000,000
Third year.....	32	20	4	200,000,000
Do.....	7.2	50	10	200,000,000
Fourth year.....	39.2	20	4	200,000,000
Do.....	4.32	50	10	200,000,000
Fifth year.....	43.52	20	4	200,000,000
Do.....	3.59	50	10	200,000,000
Sixth year.....	46.11	20	4	200,000,000
Do.....	1.56	50	10	200,000,000

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It shows that 47,670,000 acres of land now in soil-depleting crops could be converted to soil-conserving crops; also, as I pointed out, it would eliminate this trend in a surplus which is bringing about a condition and a threat of acreage allotments.

The retirement of grain and row-crop acreage under this provision of my bill is assumed to be at the rate of \$20 per acre. That is, an acre of cropland could be retired to trees for an average of considerably less than \$20 per acre. Similarly, an acre of cropland could be retired to grass, where no lime and fertilizer were needed, at somewhat less than \$20, but if the farmer needed lime or fertilizer in order to encourage good grass pasture or range, it would take somewhat more than \$20 per acre to obtain it, so an average of \$20 is assumed.

Historically, reduction of crop acreage has not necessarily reduced production of the crop except temporarily. That is, the record shows that the attempts in the thirties to reduce the acreage of wheat, corn, and tobacco did not reduce total production. There was some reduction in cotton production as a result of acreage allotments. The reason for little or no reduction in production through crop acreage allotments is that land is only one of the resources of production at the farmers' command. In earlier attempts the farmer used more labor, fertilizer, and other resources on the land he had in crops and thereby produced greater yields per acre. My recommendations in H. R. 2368 would give the farmer the opportunity of using these extra resources, including his labor, to produce grass or trees, enhance his production, and produce animals and animal products for which there is likely to be a greater demand than for the grain.

As an initial move to help farmers bring their agricultural production and land use more in line with consumer demands. Congress should discontinue appropriating any funds that foster soil destruction by supporting overuse of our soil resources for the production of certain row crops and small grains.

We are appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars for this purpose every year.

One of the great travesties on the agricultural scene today is that we do not know actually what the Nation's soil resources are, their condition, or what treatment a vast portion of our land needs to keep it productive. In many ways it's ironic for Congress to legislate for agriculture when it knows actually so little about what our soil resources are.

Except for the work of the Soil Conservation Service in the Nation's soil-conservation districts, farmers have no way to obtain information on the capability of their land for best use and production on an acre-by-acre basis, to learn the condition of their own agricultural food factory. In many places these factories are crumbling—saved temporarily by tremendous uses of fertilizers—but nevertheless washing and bleeding away. In other places tremendous use of fertilizers hides from the farmer's eyes what is actually happening to his land. We need the completion of a Nation-wide land capability survey of our farms, ranches, and woodlands to determine the productive capacity of land conservation needs of each acre. This information should then be furnished to each farmer and rancher, so that he could know what is happening to his food-producing factory, and what his farm needs to keep its productive capacity permanent.

I believe that if all farmers and ranchers of our Nation knew what was taking place on their land, such as when they bypass minimum soil-conserving rotations, we would see one of the greatest changes in land use imaginable, and within a period of a couple of years, I am convinced that when a farmer really knows the truth about his land, he becomes one of the greatest champions for effective soil and water conservation, which in itself would remove most of our present agricultural problems.

In H. R. 2368 I have provided for an early completion of a Nation-wide survey of our soil resources and for furnishing this information to every farmer and rancher.

Nor is this all this legislation provides. There are provisions for a national land policy, a conservation timetable, and special measures to help landowners add sufficient acreage to their farm to complete a profitable farm, and thus reduce much land overuse resulting from uneconomic-sized units. This legislation provides technical assistance for soil- and water-conservation farming for all farmers and ranchers of our Nation who are not now located within a soil-conservation district. There are conservation payments, part of which I described a few moments ago, which will provide for lasting soil conservation. Also, the legislation strengthens the system of farmer control of his agricultural affairs and fosters the organization of soil-conservation districts.

No new agencies are called for, but the Secretary of Agriculture is given the power to join more closely the work of the Soil Conservation Service, conservation programs of the Production and Marketing Administration, and the Extension Service for concerted action on problems which confront this committee today.

It is obvious that a balanced agricultural production that can demand a rightful share of our national income depends on proper use of our soil resources. The sooner we help farmers to use their soil resources properly, as is done by all farmers who have effective soil- and water-conservation programs, the sooner we can ease the economic problems that confront our people today.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope I am not taking too much time.

Mr. PACE. No, indeed. May I say here that is one of the most sensible statements I ever heard on the point of the conservation of soil.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know you have always been very interested in the problem of soil conservation, as well as all other problems so important to our Nation, and I want to compliment this committee now, each and everyone of you, for sitting in these hearings so long, to learn just exactly what is needed and what is best for this Nation through a good agricultural program.

I can't minimize the importance of the job you have to do.

I would just like to express my ideas relative to the different types of programs that have been proposed for agriculture.

I would like just to read a letter which I have been sending out to my people who have asked me how I stood on the Aiken bill; and I think I can give you a clear picture of what I think we should have in the way of an agricultural program.

I might say that the bill which you gentlemen passed in the House in the Eightieth Congress, original bill, the House bill, which this committee brought to the floor of the House and which was passed, was, in my opinion, as good a bill as can be written, as could have been written at that time, for agriculture; and I recommend today that when you write the bill which you will no doubt bring out in this session of Congress, that it will not be too far away from the provisions of the bill which this committee approved and which the House approved during the last session of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. PACE. Which is now title I?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read this letter. It covers about a page in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—it is a little less than a page; but in so doing, you will note that I am not only telling you folks here, this committee, what I think about the Aiken bill and some other things in the agricultural field, but you will also note that this is what I tell the people who hire me to come down and represent them in Congress, the people of the Seventh District of Iowa. The letter reads as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1949.

DEAR FRIEND: Regarding the 90 to 60 percent slide-down scale for basic farm crops, versus the 90-percent support prices now in effect on such commodities, in order that you will know just why I am for the 90-percent support price, I will give you the background of what brought about the 90 to 60 percent provision which goes into effect January 1, 1950, as provided in the Aiken bill.

You know, of course, that the labor leaders made a lot of noise about high cost of food long before the last Presidential campaign got under way. They knew, of course, that it would be popular with most members of the trade-unions to do so, but they did not tell their members that their food bill was costing them a less percentage of their wage dollars than it had during any peacetime period of full employment in the history of our Nation.

The New Deal Party has constantly worked overtime in their great desire to prove to labor that they were the champions of high wages and cheap food while out of the other corner of their mouth telling the farmers they were for a high price for his products. Hence the New Deal have received a great majority's of labor's votes. However, in the last campaign they felt it would be necessary for them to further prove to labor that they were still for cheaper food in order to hold the labor vote. So here is exactly how they did it.

The labor leaders collaborated with high officials of the Department of Agriculture in writing the so-called Aiken long-term agriculture bill. One of the provisions in the bill was the 90-60-percent slide-down scale for basic farm-crop supports. And between the New Deal campaign strategists and the labor

leaders the Aiken bill was sold lock, stock, and barrel to the topmen of our farm organizations.

The bill came to the Agriculture Committees of the House and the Senate very late in the last regular session of the Eightieth Congress. The House Agriculture Committee turned thumbs down cold on the 90-60-percent provisions. The bill came to the House with the full 90-percent provisions in the bill and was passed by the House in that form.

The Senate Agriculture Committee also held hearings on the bill and inserted the 90-60-percent slide-down-scale provision. The bill was then taken to the floor of the Senate at about 2 a. m. one morning during the last week of the regular session of the Eightieth Congress, where Senator AIKEN, from Vermont, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, put the bill through the Senate with very little debate.

After which the Senate and House conferees met in almost constant session for several days and nights to thresh out their differences in the bill. The 90-60-percent slide-down-scale provision inserted by the Senate versus the 90 percent House provision was the main point of contention between the two Houses. These conferences between the House and Senate were held during the very last few days of the regular session. The House Members held out for the full 90 percent of parity until about 4 a. m. on the morning of June 20, the very day Congress adjourned. However, a compromise between the Members of the two Houses was effected, and the 90-percent support provision to remain in effect until January 1, 1950, after which time the 90-60-percent slide-down scale was to go into effect. Then the compromise report was brought to the floor of the House about 30 minutes thereafter. The bill was passed by the House and the Senate within a very few minutes thereafter, and in due time the bill was signed by the President.

It is noteworthy that the very next day after the bill was passed prices on most all farm products began to drop and have been on the decline since, and from that day on the unemployment rolls have mounted. Now I am thoroughly convinced that until we repeal the 90-60-percent provision in the bill prices on farm commodities will continue to slide down and unemployment rolls will continue to mount proportionately. Not only will grain prices tumble further but hog, cattle, and poultry prices will go right down the toboggan with them.

Let us not forget that farm prices were 66 percent of parity on an average in 1931-33, and that during those times not only the farmer but the businessman, the laboring man, and everybody in America were in a serious predicament. I need not remind you of this, I am sure, for I know you are old enough to remember it. There was on an average of 14,000,000 American people who were unable to find work during that era for the very simple reason that the farmer's buying power was almost nil. Now certainly that should be a lesson we dare not forget, regardless of our politics, faith, or vocation.

Ever since my first year in Congress I have cooperated very closely with common-sense economic analysts and many Congressmen, most of whom are from farm States, in search of facts and figures to guide us in the right direction to avoid, if humanly possible, another depression, and possibly the complete destruction of our system of government and everything worth while in our blessed land.

Here is what these many years of research has brought to light: For the past 20 years the records of the Department of Commerce, which are compiled from the records of the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, and from other accurate sources in Government records, show that whether it be periods of peace, depression, war, or postwar prosperity such as we now have, the national income has

been and is now approximately seven times the farm income. The postwar prosperity which we have enjoyed since World War II has held up mainly because we have had a high farm income due to the fact that basic farm commodities have been supported by our 90-percent parity law.

If you will remember, it was less than 2 years after the close of World War I that farm prices took such a terrific drop which brought about a national depression in 1920. And during the several years thereafter many farmers lost their farms and a lot of business houses closed their doors for the very simple reason that the farmer's buying power was almost nil. I remember that era only too well, as I was at that time running a lumber yard in Exira, Iowa, dealing with farmers most exclusively. Certainly that horrible experience should be a lesson to all of us. It must not happen again. I am thoroughly convinced, after much study, that the 90-60-percent slide-down support scale on basic farm prices will bring about a repetition of a like condition during the era which I have just described.

Doubtless you have heard the argument it is necessary to reduce the price on farm commodities to avoid great surpluses from piling up, which the Government would have to buy and store in greater quantities than would be possible for the Government finances to stand. That argument falls flat with those who have made a deep study of what causes surpluses to pile up, which is, when the buying power of the people is not sufficient to purchase the goods they need for the high standard of living we Americans want and expect. The facts are that a greatly reduced American standard of living will very surely be brought about by a great reduction in prices of farm commodities, since all wealth springs from Mother Earth, and because as I said before, the national income each year is approximately seven times the farm income; so, unless we maintain a high farm income sufficient to generate a high national income, and thereby assuring high consumption of all goods, Americans will be in serious trouble, and you can bank on that.

Here is something else to think about. Who in America would expect the good Lord to continue to bless us with such abundant crops as we have enjoyed the past 8 years? I am sure, you, like I, will agree that that would be too much to expect of Him who runs nature's business. We are bound to have crop failures in some degree most any year now, and should it become our lot to suffer, say even a 25-percent crop reduction on an average for a period of 2, 3, or 4 years all over America, below the average of the past 8 years; how, I ask in all sincerity, would we feed and clothe the American people the way they like to be fed and clad, let alone help to feed the world, when now we are exporting only about 3 percent of our farm production?

You will also hear the argument that unless the Secretary of Agriculture is given the authority to reduce support prices as is provided in the 90-60-percent slide-down provision, that surpluses will pile up to such a degree that acreage control will again be necessary. That argument also falls flat when we know that it was cheap farm prices that brought about acreage control in the AAA bill of the early thirties. And the result of that program was that the farmers so fertilized and mined their allotted cash-crop-producing acres, that they produced more than ever, and were obliged to do so to meet their bills.

The 90-percent support-price program on basic farm products, corn, wheat, tobacco, cotton, peanuts, and rice has not cost the American taxpayer one thin dime to date. It has actually made a profit to the United States Treasury, to say nothing about the great benefits to the farmers of America and to our whole economy, and for these reasons I certainly will not be a party to a program

which I honestly believe will be destructive to not only the prosperity of our Nation, but also to the peace and progress of our Nation and the world.

You, no doubt, also have heard the argument about the potato situation. I agree that potatoes, which are perishable and cannot be stored for any definite period, should not be supported at the full 90 percent of parity. The facts are that the Potato Growers Association of America suggested to Congress that the support price on potatoes be materially reduced. And the provisions in the Aiken bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to do so. Hence, that argument made by the sliding-down-scale advocates also falls flat.

If our national income is drastically reduced the American market, which is the only stable and good market of the world today, will lose its buying power, and when that time comes we will neither be able to pay our own way nor help foreign nations with loans or free dollars with which to buy our goods or other nations' goods, or to ward off communistic aggression any place in the world, America included.

Records of the past 20 years also prove that for each dollar of gross farm income, labor (which includes all kinds, blue denim, white collar, and professional) receives an income of over \$4, so the laboring people have a mighty big stake in keeping the farmer's income on a high level, the source of all wealth. Regarding the businessman's interest in this proposition, I am sure I need not explain to them the need of keeping a high farm income for they know that is the only thing which will insure good profitable trade for them.

A \$42,000,000,000 annual Federal tax take from the American people means that each American family pays on an average of over \$1,000 per year in direct and indirect Federal taxes. Add to this around \$300 which each family is paying per year in local, county, and State taxes, it makes a total outlay in taxes per year for each family of over \$1,300. This being a fact, we must surely do two things, keep our national income at the highest possible figure and stop wasting the taxpayers' dollars.

I hope this will explain my reason for opposing any law which will reduce farm income.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to know what the gentleman's response was from the people who received that letter.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say I never had anything but complimentary responses. Those who were for the 90-60-percent slide-down-scale provision either did not write me or said, "Thank you for your explanation; it makes sense."

Now, gentlemen, I have taken too much of the committee's time.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I was very much interested in your discussion of your proposed bill, H. R. 2368, I believe. There are problems that worry me quite a little in regard to it and I would like to have your comment on the matter of soil conservation crops. First, would we run into the danger of many farmers having to go out of cash crops so that they would not have enough such crops to make a living for their families?

Mr. JENSEN. No, because the acreage reduction would be small for each farmer. But as you know it is that 5- to 10-percent surplus which depresses farm prices.

Mr. ALBERT. And would the 50 percent from the Government be inducement enough for them to do the job?

Mr. JENSEN. In answer to your first question, my bill is not mandatory, if anyone does not want to get in the program that is their own business. However, you say you would rather if they would have sufficient cash

crops. Well, of course, now when you only transfer 10 percent of an average farm, and that is about what it would be, to balance your agricultural production—10 percent converted from soil depleting to soil conserving would certainly be a benefit not only to the farm itself, but to the farmer who would be building up his soil. He would be cooperating fully with the soil-conservation program, which I think all of us want. He would also be contributing to flood prevention, which is one of our big problems, for you know what flood control costs this country. Flood prevention is carried on in soil conservation. That is flood prevention because you hold rain where it falls and keep the mud and muck and trash out of our streams.

Mr. ALBERT. I think your proposal deserves a lot of consideration by this committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you. My bill provides that we pay 50 percent the first year, and then in order to induce them to keep that land in grass or woodland, we pay them one-fifth of the first cost, or \$4 of the first year's cost, for the next 5 years.

It is truly and fully a soil-conservation program in effect, but while we are doing that, we are also taking out of production those crops that are in surplus production. If the program which I recommend is put into effect there will be very little need, if any need, for acreage allotments, or for a reduced parity support price on farm crops, so it serves a threefold purpose.

The things facing us today are the problem of conserving our soil and the problem of keeping the farmer prosperous, for he must be kept prosperous in order to keep the Nation prosperous, as I am sure every one of you will agree.

The whole thing is that we do need a leveling out of our agricultural production. We produce too much of one thing and not enough of another. I don't like this acreage allotment thing and the farmers don't like it. They don't like to be told how they can run their farms. They would like to do it voluntarily and they can do it I feel certain under my bill H. R. 2368, if we will make the 90-percent parity supports permanent.

I have given this a lot of thought. I have worked on this problem constantly during my services in Congress. I am now in the eleventh year, and I know you folks, many of you, have done likewise. I have talked this matter over with many members of this committee, with Mr. PACE, with Mr. HOPE, with Mr. POAGE, Mr. ANDRESEN, Mr. HOEVEN, and most of the members who have been here during the past 11 sessions.

Gentlemen, I am sincere about this thing and I want you to know it, and I think my testimony proves there is no politics in it with me. Anyone who plays politics with this proposition is playing politics with a thing that is the most important to the progress, the peace, and the prosperity of America, and I might say the whole world.

Mr. PACE. Thank you very much. You have given us a very excellent statement. Mr. GRANGER wishes to ask a question.

Mr. GRANGER. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman. I think he has given emphasis to soil conservation, as he indicated in his statement, and he played down acreage control and price support. I believe if we spent \$1,000,000,000 in soil conservation for the next 25 years, it would cost us less in the long run than what it will cost us for price support, and for flood control, which will become more expensive every year. I certainly agree with you. We need a formula however to put in effect your recommendations.

Mr. JENSEN. I think we could spend \$1,000,000,000 here and be justified, if we had the money to spend, but I brought it down to a very sensible and proper figure, commensurate with what I think we can spend under present conditions.

I am not asking this committee to appropriate too much more money in addition to what we already appropriate for soil conservation, and compliance payments. The amount is up to the committee; but I do feel, gentlemen, that we have an opportunity, if we take hold of it, to stop all these silly plans, including the Brannan plan and the Aiken plan, and a lot of other silly, unworkable, un-American plans that have come before this committee.

We can head them off, they are not necessary if we carry on a good, common-sense soil conservation and balanced-agriculture program for the American farmer as I have outlined.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I know there are other witnesses to be heard this morning and so I shall not ask any questions at this time. I simply want to compliment my colleague for the great interest he has always shown in the welfare of agriculture and the conservation of soil.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose at this time to convey my feeling by reciting to you the excellent service rendered American agriculture by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

When the gentleman from Georgia came to this House he was assigned to the important Committee on Military Affairs. He served on that committee for some 2 or 3 years, after which time the Democratic majority of the Committee on Ways and Means saw fit to place him on the great Committee on Agriculture. Since that time he has rendered to his district, his State, and the Nation most meritorious service. He is courageous, able, painstaking, and thorough in his work.

I would like to pay tribute to a great legislator and a great American, STEVE PACE, who has worked so diligently to bring before this body this bill which bears his name. This really is not the Brannan bill, even though I have received innumerable wires from Arkansas, and from my district particularly, asking me to vote against the Pace-Brannan bill. That is inspired mail. If they just knew what was in this Pace proposal they would not have wired me as they have.

If title I of the Agricultural Act of 1948 is continued the whole support price program is threatened and there is grave danger of its failing. That is because of the tremendous cost.

I have been asked time and time again about the cost of the Pace bill in comparison to the present program contained in title I. Let us compare, just for a moment, what would happen if the Pace bill does not go into effect and title I is continued for another year. What would be the situation? Under title I the Secretary of Agriculture can only do one thing on perishables and that is buy and buy and buy and stack the commodities up in great surplus quantities where they would be destroyed and not put into channels of trade and not converted to such admirable uses as the hot-lunch program in our public schools. There is no doubt in my mind, not the least doubt in the world, but that under the provisions of the Pace bill the cost would be greatly reduced. It would be approximately half, perhaps. Let me read the

language which was referred to by my friend from Georgia on page 7:

In carrying out the provisions of this section, compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices as prescribed by the Secretary may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the distinguished ranking minority member and former chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. HOPE. If the gentleman thinks that this will save so much money, why does the gentleman want to limit it to three commodities. We have many other perishable commodities so why not turn loose and support all commodities?

Mr. GATHINGS. That is what the Aiken law would do and I am bitterly opposed to it. I think the Aiken law should be repealed. I say to the gentleman that we want to have this trial run and want to do it on these three commodities for a limited time. The provision of the amendment which has been agreed to by the majority of the Committee on Agriculture limits it to three commodities for a limited period of 2 years. We should try it out. Let me ask this question of the gentleman: Under title I there is no earmarking, there is no mandate. The Congress is not speaking to the Secretary of Agriculture as to just what he can do specifically. Title I does not limit production of a given commodity. It was written at a time of scarcities and not a time of overproduction.

Mr. HOPE. If the gentleman is so confident as to what will be saved, I would think he would want to have the trial run apply to all commodities, instead of limiting it simply to three. I got the impression from what the gentleman said that he was so sure that we would save money.

Mr. GATHINGS. I am.

Mr. HOPE. As I was saying, the gentleman seems to be so sure that we would save money on this production-payment program.

Mr. GATHINGS. Absolutely.

Mr. HOPE. I am unable to understand why the "trial run" should be limited to three commodities. Why not try it on all of the perishable commodities?

Mr. GATHINGS. Let us try it out on three commodities as contained in the bill. We can come back later and expand it after it has been tried.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman keeps mentioning perishables and these three commodities. When did wool get to be classified as a perishable commodity?

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to tell the gentleman that shorn wool, was placed in this bill, as the only exception, because the Secretary of Agriculture came before the committee and asked that wool be included, that wool be named as one of the commodities he would like to make a trial run on. So our committee placed wool in the paragraph along with

perishables upon which production payments would be authorized.

If the Pace bill is not enacted we would be right back here next year where we are today. The Committee on Agriculture has worked tirelessly on this legislation. Every phase of the problem has been studied. I hope that the committee bill will be agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, one of the peculiarities of this world is that it does not stand still, but is constantly changing. If our legislative programs are to be effective, they must meet the changing times. They must be realistic.

The face of agriculture has been altered since 1910 to 1914—by new machines, new crop varieties, new methods of farm management, increased productivity, and an increased dependence on other than local markets. Because of the tremendous changes that have taken place it doesn't make sense to support levels today on parity-price relationship that existed 35 to 40 years ago. And so it seems clear to me that we have to make the change contemplated in H. R. 5345 to bring support-price relationships up to date.

In a complex economy in which all parts affect all other parts, there must be a point below which it is not in the public interest to let farm income fall. That point, as envisioned by the Agricultural Act of 1949, would be, for the year 1950, a level of cash return which would give farmers as much purchasing power as they had on the average from 1939 to 1948, inclusive. Thereafter, the base period would move forward, always consisting of the first 10 years out of the past 12. Such a base period has the advantage of offering a reasonably current relationship. It is therefore much more realistic than the old parity base.

Since the beginning of the national farm legislation of the depression years we have had many statements of farm income objectives in farm bills. But, until now no one has proposed legislation that would really be effective in maintaining farm income as high as it ought to be for the good of our whole national economy.

Last year farm prices averaged well above parity—which might lead one to conclude that farmers were well off in comparison with nonfarm people. But when we check the actual income of persons on farms, we find that their per capita income totaled only \$909 as against \$1,569 for nonfarm people.

Let us put side by side—the bill we are now considering and the Agricultural Act of 1948—and see which would best serve all of the people. Let us examine them to see which gives more promise of preserving farm purchasing power—of encouraging abundant production and consumption—of protecting our basic land resources.

Title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948 would make price support available at levels ranging from 90 percent down to 60 percent of parity, depending upon the supply of the particular commodity.

The philosophy behind this legislation, in other words, is that lowering the sup-

port price will bring about a decrease in production. But the farmers of Utah and of the whole Nation know better than that. They know their agricultural history, and they know that some of the biggest crops in the last two decades were also accompanied by the lowest prices. Time and again falling prices have caused production increases. The basic philosophy of title II runs contrary to the economic facts of life.

But this is only part of the picture. The legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress assures support only for commodities accounting for about one-fourth of gross farm income. It assures support on only one perishable, potatoes. It even prohibits the Commodity Credit Corporation from supporting other perishables.

That is the kind of program with which the Nation is now supposed to defend agriculture and the entire economy against the danger of a collapse of farm prices. Does it seem realistic or adequate?

Now let us take a look at H. R. 5345.

The first objective of this bill is to place a floor under farm purchasing power that will prevent it from falling below the point of danger to the whole economy.

In 1950 this income floor would be a goal of slightly more than twenty-six billions—about 15 percent less than last year's dollar income—and about equal to the purchasing power that agriculture had in 1942.

Let us point out, however, that this is not, as many farm-program opponents have said, a proposal to guarantee farm income. It simply sets up a logical farm-income objective as a starting point.

Instead of restricting support to potatoes and a few storable commodities that bring in about one-fourth of total farm gross income, H. R. 5345 makes full support mandatory for corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, peanuts, hogs, milk, butterfat, and shorn wool. These commodities account for a much larger proportion of gross farm income.

Which of the two measures is more likely to protect farm buying power? And which of the two programs is more likely to further abundant production and consumption of farm products?

The purchase method of support of perishables gives the consumer no price advantage when we have surpluses and therefore no incentive for greater consumption of commodities in surplus. Loans and purchases work well for storable crops. But for perishables we need a different method.

Under H. R. 5345, prices of three or fewer perishables could be supported by the Secretary of Agriculture through production payments. Market prices of these commodities would be permitted to fall to whatever level they would reach under the normal operations of supply and demand. Payments would be made directly to farmers to compensate for the difference between the actual average market price of these perishables and the support level. Thus consumers would have the benefit of temporary surpluses in the form of lower prices. Not only is this approach more realistic, it gives the taxpayer far more for his money.

Moreover, support through the production-payment method would make it possible to encourage larger production of some of the foods that consumers particularly need and want.

Finally, let me say a word about conservation. Despite the remarkable progress that has been made in conservation there is still much to be done before the Nation's future food supply may be considered safeguarded, and agricultural raw materials for industrial uses assured.

It takes good farm income to build and preserve soil resources. Though Government assists farmers in conservation, the biggest part of the burden inevitably falls upon the tillers of the soil. They cannot give their land the care and attention it needs, unless their returns from the land are adequate. Under title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948, farmers have no assurance of realistic income protection. They have a much more convincing assurance under H. R. 5345.

In the present situation no farm price support program is acceptable that does not provide adequate and realistic protection for farm purchasing power—the means to encourage abundant production and consumption of the food and fiber needed for its national health and strength—and finally, effective conservation of our basic land resources.

On every one of these points, H. R. 5345 is far more adequate and more realistic than the farm legislation passed so hurriedly a year ago.

Mr. Chairman, in this debate today I am not angry with anyone. I simply want to emphasize again some of the points I have already discussed, and to state that so far as the West is concerned the support program has been more theoretical than real. As a matter of fact, they have been almost entirely confined to other sections of the country. I want to give you the reason why I think this bill should be passed and what I think is the most essential part in it, as far as I am concerned and as far as western Members of Congress are concerned. It has been said, Why change something that everybody understands? I would like to ask any Member of Congress who has been here for a number of years talking about parity and 90 percent of parity to give me a definition of what parity is. The stock answer of it is that it is a formula adopted back in 1909-14. That was supposed to be the time when the earning capacity of the farmer and his dollar was about equal to the dollar he paid for the things he had to buy. Everybody understands it about that far. The farmers do not know any more about it than that. Nineteen hundred and nine was 40 years ago. Automobiles were then just coming into use. Tractors and power equipment were not known on the farms at all. We had not had any experience with fertilizers. In the cattle industry, the longhorn Texas steer was just going out of existence. What happened since then? Great amounts of money have been expended to improve both the production of crops and the production of livestock. It has been revolutionary. We do not do anything now as we did then. Who is to stand up here today to say that that relationship is in balance at all? We claim

it is not. That is the difficulty we have here today. It is a difficult thing because whenever you advocate something new it takes 10 times as much argument and persuasion to get a new idea over as it does to chase down every objection. That is the difficulty we are having in explaining this bill. I am sure that if this committee understood what the bill is, we would have no difficulty.

As I say, that old formula never suited the West. It never did suit the wool people. It was never favorably looked upon by the stockmen. We have been trying to change it for the last 10 years, because it was not a fair parity formula for those commodities I have named, and many others.

Now, what does this formula do? I want my friends from the West to pay attention to this, and Members generally. We have complained bitterly that this old formula did not have any of the elements of labor in it. I have heard people condemn it because it did not have that feature in it. What does this new formula do? It simply brings the thing up to date. The formula is just as simple to understand as the old one. It says, in effect, "Mr. Farmer, you are going to have your fair share of the national income." The farmer can understand that just as well as he can understand 90 percent of parity. Whether he understands it or not is beside the point. What he is interested in is getting the price for his commodities.

This new formula we are talking about changes the emphasis from price and puts it on farm income, not 40 years ago, but today, making the relationship what it should be as compared between farm income and income for labor and industry.

Now, it is generally thought that during these times farmers are prosperous. The facts are today that he is not getting anywhere near what he should get. Do you know what his actual farm income is? Nine hundred dollars. What is the average income of all workers in the Nation? Fifteen hundred dollars. That is the difference.

Why are we here as farmers condemning a new formula that will put the farmer on a parity with other segments in society? And this bill will do it—it changes the formula, and it includes labor. They talk about labor—hired labor is included as it should be—it includes all hired labor. That is something to think about. That is something we have complained about all through the years, and that is one reason, if for no other, that I think every one of us ought to be for this bill, in order to establish a formula that will be fair to the farmer and to the consumer as well.

Now, about the whole bill. As I said, we are trying to convince people who have their minds closed, and it is a difficult thing to get anybody to rationalize over anything new, and this is a new thing. It is difficult to understand, but I want to say to you, and say it most humbly in the presence of my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], that I have not agreed with him on everything but we have been wrestling with

this problem not to do injury to anyone, not to make a political football out of farm legislation. I deny anything of the kind. But he has worked all of us to a "frazzle." Day and night he has worked, and might I add—he is an intelligent worker. He has been most critical of everybody who came before the committee. He has not taken Mr. Brannan at his word, or anybody else; they have all had to show him. Any suggestion that he or the committee is fuzzy in their thinking does not exalt themselves in my estimation. He has convinced himself that this was the program that would be in the interest of the American farmer, and I agree with that. If this bill is not passed, if we do not have this bill that we are considering today, I renew my prediction that you will have nothing other than what you have today. The Aiken bill will come into existence, and I believe there is not one of us representing farming areas who wants that. So I plead with my southern colleagues. This primarily is their baby, we have in it cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts—these I have always been willing to support, and I shall fight on the floor if any attempt is made on the part of anybody to take any one of those commodities out of this bill. Each is important in the economy of the country, and I think they should be kept in as they are today. There may be those who wish to add other commodities and perhaps some should be added, I do not know, but as far as I am concerned I am opposed to any amendment to this bill no matter for what purpose it is offered. Whether it be the Gore bill, the Sutton amendment, or anything else, I am opposed to it. As far as I am concerned, win, lose, or draw, I am going to go down swinging and fighting for the bill that this committee has considered, a committee whose work has been done intelligently, for this is a bill which we can go before the country and the farmers and defend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. FOAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am a farmer. I have had the opportunity of working on these agricultural programs; I have seen how some of these programs have worked, and I think I know something about them. I also think I know something about how my neighbors feel. I would also like to say that I am a member of the Farm Bureau, and I know that there are a lot of Farm Bureau members in my State who are in favor of the program which has been proposed by Secretary Brannan. I know some of these people are going to be disappointed if the program Mr. Brannan has proposed is not put into effect. The program would be stronger, in my opinion, if more of the proposals he has made were put into effect; nevertheless, I am going to support the Pace bill because I think it is one of the soundest pieces of legislation that we have considered in connection with agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes we are a little inclined to overlook a few plain, simple facts. We talk about 16 years of experience with the agricultural program.

My farmer neighbors and myself understood that when the war started we had a job in connection with the production of food. In order to produce this food, incentive payments were given to the farmers to get necessary food production. The farmers responded magnificently. From the experience of World War I some farmers expressed themselves as being reluctant, so the Government said: We will see that these price supports are extended for 2 years after the war to give protection to those who expanded their production.

My farmer neighbors and myself responded and we produced more food, in spite of an acute shortage of help and a shortage of machinery, a shortage of everything, than was ever produced before. We feel that the Government has lived up to its obligation.

We are convinced, however, that we are coming into a different period now, a period in which the world is not going to require all the agricultural production that we have had in the past. Perhaps the country will not require it. We are concerned about the consumption of our agricultural products. We want the products of our farms and factories consumed. We know that unless we can get consumption of those products we cannot produce fully on our farms. My farmer neighbors and myself want to produce to the utmost, we want to market our products, we want to put our products into the hands of people who consume them. That is why we are favorable to the proposition made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

I know that when our food goes into the market place that food must be consumed. Let me tell you the situation with which we are confronted, so far as eggs are concerned. We take eggs into the market and are repeatedly told—at least I have been told when I have taken eggs up to the market—by our local merchant, "We do not know what the Government is going to do in regard to the purchase of eggs." The people who deal in eggs in this country in the past few years have not dared deal in eggs the way they used to. They fear lack of stability in purchase programs. This affects the market. There have been many times when the support price that has been set on farm products has not been the minimum price but has been the maximum price.

Let us put free enterprise back into the agricultural program. It is purely and simply that. Anyone who has dealt in perishable commodities of any sort has been rather reluctant. My good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. REID MURRAY, speaks of cheese, I might cite an example in connection with cheese. I have stopped at a number of cheese factories and they tell me they do not dare to properly age their cheese to make it as palatable as they would like to have made it. Why? Because they did not feel that they could depend on the Government to step in and purchase through a purchasing agreement everything that they needed to support the price of their product.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of H. R. 5345, known as the Pace bill, there comes to my mind two basic questions which I think should be answered by the proponents of this legislation.

These questions are: First, just what is so wrong with our present farm program—and by the present farm program I mean the farm program in effect in this year 1949—that it should be considered necessary at this time to enter into a new field which may prove to be dangerous to our agricultural and national economy in the future? My second question is: Suppose that Congress does go along with Mr. Brannan's ideas as to production payments—which today the consuming element of our population will of course welcome—and suppose that the Congress is requested to pass an appropriation of anywhere from \$2,500,000,000 to \$8,000,000,000—then will the same consuming element of our population give like support to that appropriation as they are today giving to the Brannan plan, feeling that cheap food is in the offering?

Let me reiterate: Just what is wrong, basically speaking, with our present 1949 price-support program? Just why cannot correcting amendments be made to iron out difficulties in that program? Why discard it now?

Mr. Chairman, a year ago last January—along with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], I introduced legislation which provided for the reenactment of the current farm price support program. I was also one of the few who stated on the floor of the House last June that I could not vote for the Aiken bill as it promised less than 90 percent support. It was pleasing to hear the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], make the statement, under the rule, that his position coincides exactly with what I have proposed in H. R. 5279—introduced during this session. My bill simply reenacts today's program and discards the Aiken provisions. Let me remind the House that we have today the following types of price supports: We have one type of price supports for the so-called basic commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice and peanuts. They are being supported now. The level is at 60 percent of parity in the case of dark-air-cured tobacco and 92½ percent of parity in the case of cotton; the others at 90 percent of parity.

Then there are the so-called Steagall Act commodities—named after the late Henry Steagall, author of the act: hogs, chickens (more than 3½ pounds live weight), eggs, milk and milk products, potatoes, turkeys, edible dry beans and peas of certain varieties, soybeans and flaxseed for oil, American Egyptian cotton and sweet potatoes. Here again the support level is generally 90 percent of parity.

Then there are the so-called other commodities. That is a broad term. Wool is the main one but last winter this program covered dried fruit, winter cover

crop seed, range grass seed, alfalfa seed, grain sorghums, oats, barley, rye and the so-called naval stores which are the resinous products—tar, pitch and turpentine. With regard to these other commodities, the Secretary of Agriculture is allowed considerable leeway in establishing support levels.

Then there are the so-called section 32 funds—which require that 30 percent of the gross receipts from customs duties each calendar year shall be set aside and given to the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage the exportation or domestic consumption or utilization of American agricultural commodities, especially those injured, price-wise, by imported competitive agricultural commodities. This program is especially important to our great perishable fruit and vegetable industry.

Important too, is another support program—the school lunch.

In addition to all of these, we have given the Federal Government broad authority to set up marketing agreements and other programs with the direct intention of influencing or maintaining prices. Milk, tree fruits, tree nuts, and vegetables are the commodities most affected by this program.

And lastly we have the sugar program conducted under the Sugar Act. This is a subsidy program which allows sugar-beet producers about \$2 a ton. We have heard gentlemen make statements on the floor of the House today, which I know they cannot back up, as to the cost of our present farm price support program. They do not quote figures, but to hear them speak, our price supports have cost the taxpayers of America enormous sums. Let us look at the record.

During the hearings before our subcommittee on appropriations for agriculture this past spring, the question was asked by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER]:

With reference to your statement regarding the receipts received from the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the record, I would like to know whether or not it is operated at a profit all the time since it was created by an act of Congress.

See page 92, part I, Hearings on the Department of Agriculture bill for 1950. Mr. Roberts, budget officer of the Department of Agriculture, replied:

Mr. STIGLER, on the regular Commodity Credit Corporation loan and purchase programs, for which CCC was originally created, they have operated at a profit over the years. You will remember, however, that during the war years, the Commodity Credit Corporation was called upon to pay out funds in connection with what might be referred to as consumer subsidy programs. Those payments were not made for the benefit of farmers, they were paid primarily for the benefit of the consuming public and had the effect of keeping the retail prices to the consumer stabilized. On those programs, there were net loss of \$2,104,000,000. On the regular CCC programs, over the life of the Corporation, there has been a net surplus of 205.5 million dollars.

Mr. Roberts also testified that to restore the impairment of the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Congress provided for the cancellation of CCC notes held by the Treasury to the extent of \$1,563,000,000 during the fiscal year 1947. That represented

losses of \$921,000,000 for the 15 months ending June 30, 1945, and \$642,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1946, principally on the special wartime subsidy programs which were not a part of the regular price-support operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In view of this statement of the budget officer of the Department of Agriculture, certainly no fair-minded man or woman will charge against the price support programs the bulk of the subsidies of \$2,104,000,000 required to be paid out by the CCC to help give the consumers cheap foods through the war period. The total cost of what we term price-support operations is scarcely one-half billion dollars over a 10-year period, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman. The average for each of these 10 years would not be \$50,000,000 per year. This is peanuts compared to what may be required under the Brannan plan. So, Mr. Chairman, I again ask the question, just what is all the fuss and furor about today—why do away with our present price-support program which, in my opinion, has worked well for over 10 years and certainly should not be discarded for a purely political, vote-getting device, such as is embodied in the Pace bill—the trial balloon of the Brannan plan.

Now let us come to the second basic question, which I asked when I first obtained the floor, no one knows how much it will cost to put Mr. Brannan's program into effect—to subsidize the consumer—and have the general taxpayers of the Nation pay part of his grocery bill. We do know that this subsidy will be charged up to agriculture and will always be thrown up to us in that light. I have asked you—suppose we do adopt Mr. Brannan's plan—where and how are we going to get the money to keep faith with the farmers of the Nation after we have made them dependent for part of their income on a check from the Treasury of the United States?

My voting record in Congress shows that I for one am exercised about the threat of our stupendous national debt. I have voted against the reduction of taxes in times of prosperity. Most people who know anything about the subject will estimate that the fiscal year which ends June 30, 1950, will show our Treasury in the red to the extent of at least \$4,000,000,000, and remember that is without the money needed to put into effect the provisions of the Pace bill—much less the provisions of the entire Brannan plan. How will the people of America react next spring to the Secretary's request for funds out of the Treasury to make good the amounts necessary to cover whatever three commodities upon which he decides to experiment. Will my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] then support an appropriation for whatever amount is required to keep faith with farmers of the Nation—under the provisions of the law which Congress would enact if it followed Mr. Brannan's theory. Would you ladies and gentlemen representing consumers districts support such an appropriation? The question is not so much—would, as

it is, could we appropriate the money—in the face of a possible \$4,000,000,000 deficit. The farmer would hold the sack. Public reaction would be so strong against such an appropriation, in my opinion, that the Congress would have to turn its back on the farmers and refuse to give the money necessary to keep production payments in effect. The Brannan plan would then collapse of its own weight, along with agricultural prices. Mr. Chairman, I hope to see the present price-support program reenacted for an indefinite period of years. Remember, the Congress, in its wisdom, can at any time amend that act. Secondly, I hope to see the Aiken provisions—titles 2 and 3 of the 1948 Agricultural Act—repealed.

As has been said on the floor here today, if there are any friends of the Aiken section of that act, they are not very evident in their defense of its sliding-scale provisions which I personally always opposed. Why not repeal it entirely and keep in effect the present price-support law which the Congress, at any time, amend and improve. We as farmers, and I am one of them, have prospered under our present price-support program. Just because Secretary Brannan, a lawyer by education, advocates a program carries no weight with me particularly. He may be right, but I believe he is wrong.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, the Pace bill has been and will be fully presented to you. I feel that I should in the time allotted to me discuss with you now some of the recent big criticisms of the Brannan plan, and endeavor to explain what the Brannan plan really is, as I view it.

At the outset, in order to keep the record straight, the people of the Second Nebraska Congressional District have voted in favor of the Brannan plan 5 to 1 to date, which is contrary to what my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] claimed earlier today.

In a newspaper article which appeared in the Washington Star on Sunday, July 10 last, a writer by the name of Gould Lincoln made this statement:

The Brannan bill gives the Secretary of Agriculture dictatorial powers over the farmers.

Secretary Brannan could, if he believed it necessary, cut a farmer's crop in two. Quite a power to place in anyone's hands.

Frankly, I do not believe I can recall a piece of legislation about which there has been so much incorrect information circulated as there has been about the so-called Brannan plan. In the first place, under the production payment provision of the Brannan bill, the Secretary of Agriculture cannot force a farmer to do anything. Let us get that straight. The Secretary cannot force a farmer to do anything. Of course, if a farmer did not comply with the Secretary's production goal, that farmer would not receive the so-called production payment which would be received by farmers who did comply.

Now is there anything dictatorial about that?

Maybe our newspaper friend had marketing quotas in mind when he said the Secretary could cut a farmer's crop in half. If so, he is wrong there, also, because marketing quotas are voted by two-thirds of the farmers themselves.

It should be pointed out that the so-called production-payment plan in the Brannan bill is especially designed to apply to the perishable crops. Mr. Brannan has stated repeatedly that he has no intention of disturbing the time-honored method of handling price supports in the so-called basic crops of cotton, corn, wheat, and so forth. Under the present law price supports are provided through Government loans on these storable commodities. But so far as the perishable crops are concerned, the Brannan bill is the best proposal that has ever been put before Congress, consistent with at least some freedom of action on the part of the individual farmer, and it deserves a fair trial.

The production-payment plan surely cannot fail to be an improvement over the Irish potato program of the past 2 years, which Mr. Brannan had no part in bringing about, except that his Department was not superhuman enough to foresee the heavy increase in the per acre yield of Irish potatoes and the doubling of rows of potatoes with increasing the acreage.

Mr. Brannan has asked for a trial run for his production-payment plan, on a few commodities. Let us give it to him and see what happens. It certainly is better than doing nothing and bankrupting the farmers and the Nation for sure, as we did in 1932.

The only alternative is to fix by law minimum prices and production controls on the perishable crops. This would not cost the taxpayers anything, in the way of production payments, but certainly would be dictatorial, although no more dictatorial than a traffic light at an intersection, which, in effect, says to the motorist: "Since you get protection through me, you must comply with my mandates."

However, since the American farmer is apparently not willing, at least at this time, to accept such rigid controls, let us give the Brannan plan a fair trial.

The Omaha World-Herald, on June 23, last, stated: "Brannan's ag plan is a monstrosity," etc.

It is an old truism that the persons who know the least about a subject generally argue the most vociferously against it, and in the instant case that certainly is exceedingly true.

This is what I have to say about the Brannan farm program, and in so doing I shall not go into the matter of the mechanics of the different formulae under which the farmers shall receive payments but will consider the general theory of same only.

In theory, to my mind the Brannan plan is a proper and a correct program to those who study it rightly.

My way of visualizing the Brannan farm program may be a little out of the ordinary, as most things that I do are, but I believe everyone who can or will listen to or read what I am about to say about it can also not only understand it,

but can carry it with them, and be able to relate it to others, and if need be controvert the claims of extreme right-winged, bad, big business and others.

Just sit down in your room and look up at the upper right-hand corner of the wall which you face. That is the place which agriculture occupies or should occupy—not up in the air, like it is now, but in a highly preferred position in our country's economy. Agriculture should be placed and maintained in a most favorable position. Our national economy is geared to agriculture and not to anything else. When agriculture prospers, the whole country prospers, and when agriculture has a depression, the whole country has a depression.

So, for the sake of the economy of the country the farmer must be provided with good, adequate, steady income for his efforts. He must be given not sporadic, but a steady flow of purchasing power, so that he may not only buy the necessities of life but also the comforts and conveniences of life, even the better things of life, and in fact all of the things which make farm life livable and preferable. In this way the farmers will stay on the farms instead of rushing to the cities, particularly during depression periods, and creating an irresponsible and gullible large labor pool to the detriment of city workers, and to the extreme delight and satisfaction of the enemies and enslavers of organized labor. Thusly you succeed in getting city labor stabilized to a degree by avoiding a glut of manpower in employment areas away from the farms.

Most farm homes are not up to date in comparison with city homes. If farmers had the purchasing power they, I am sure, would bring their homes up to the standards of city homes, and purchase all the necessary conveniences and make the improvements necessary in the home and farm site which would make the farms more enjoyable and livable. This would tend to keep the young folks on the farms and away from the cities, and remove the drudgery and hard work and hard living from the lives of farm wives and farm women.

Now fix your gaze at a point midway between the upper right-hand corner of the room where we have placed the farmer, and the upper left-hand corner of the room. Under the Brannan plan I think that is where industry would be, which is not just up in the air, but on the contrary in a preferred place in our economy. If the farmer has the purchasing power he will be the greatest market for the products of industry. The farms would be an almost virgin sales field for industry. The purchasing power given to the farmer would make the wheels of industry spin for a long time. A large share of the money of the farmer would pass to the left to industry and make it prosperous too and give it also purchasing and particularly employment power.

Now move your gaze to the upper left-hand corner of the room. That is the place which labor would occupy—not up in the air, as it is now, but also in a highly preferred position. I feel that this is the

place where the Brannan plan would put labor, and industry would pass a part of the farmers' purchasing power which it had received to labor and labor could thus enjoy steady employment at high wages and this would give labor purchasing power also to buy the products of industry and agriculture. It is to be seen readily that a part of this purchasing power given to the farmer would go to industry and a part of what industry received would go to labor and not one but three large groups, the farmers, industry, and labor, would enjoy the benefits of the money guaranteed to the farmer under the Brannan plan. These three groups I believe compose the majority of the people of the United States. Every mill-run, fair-minded, thinking farmer, regardless of his political faith, should see and knows this. Every mill-run, fair-minded, thinking laborer, regardless of his political faith, sees and knows this. However, smart American extreme right-winged big business cannot seem to see and understand the advantages and the benefits which both little and big industry could have without the asking, without any effort on their part, from the Brannan plan. I think sometimes extreme right-winged, bad big business really wants to keep the farmers and the laborers divided and enslaved and keep the farmers rightful profits flowing into their ignoble one-way pockets.

Extreme right-winged big business just closes its wild eyes, flails the air with both fists, and kicks with both feet, and voids in both ways, and squalls like a spoiled child, and sheds copious tears, and hysterically cries out in a 7-pronged voice, it's communism, it's socialism, it's statism, it's paternalism, it's against our free-enterprise system, it's bad, it's a monstrosity, and it enslaves and regiments the farmer when that is just what extreme right-winged, bad big business has done and has tried to do since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. It is afraid to say which one of the seven the Brannan plan is, because then most any fool could reduce the contention to an absurdity. Mass production has thus been brought before the American people in the form of the most senseless, silliest diatribe ever indulged in heretofore and big business screeches and wails and sets up a senseless patriotic fuss and nonsense through the false leaders of the Republican Party, and a few apostate Democrats and hopes to win the day. Bad big business is unmindful of the truism, When reason is lost, the cause is also lost, and all things human and divine are also lost.

It whines and wails for new markets but it does not want them at home. It has an ocean-going mind. It wants to sell its manufactured articles to ECA. It wants to feed starving Europe and the rest of the gaunt and hungry world abroad, with washing machines, wringers, electric irons, hair curlers, wash tubs, farm machinery, monkey wrenches, and all of the hundreds of other articles which it manufactures. When the people are crying for bread in those most desolate lands, its advanced designing mind wants to give them ironmongery instead of the biblical stones. If I did not have any

better business mind than that I would quit assuming an erect posture and would drop down on all fours and like the pen-sive old King Nebuchadnezzar, in his penitential mood, eat grass like an ox.

Now, right on the floor of the room in which you are sitting, that floor may be used to illustrate another great group in the economic life of our country recognized under the Brannan plan, and that is the consumer. You and I and every other person belong to that consumer group. Under the Brannan plan, with agriculture, industry, and labor stabilized, the prices of food products could seek their own proper level without in any way harming either agriculture, industry, or labor. Prices could and would come down, and everyone would welcome that sort of a happening.

Heretofore the only way that the price of food or other commodities could be reduced was by either cutting down the price of agricultural commodities or the wages of labor. In the three-horse hitch, agriculture, industry, and labor, never once has the profits of industry been reduced in order to reduce prices. Poor agriculture was most generally the victim and sometimes labor was also. Do you not see that the Brannan plan provides the decent way to reduce prices by giving the farmer the so-called subsidy, and that has never been done or thought out before, and bad big business is sorely sick, I guess, because the Republican leadership did not think of it first.

In the past, extreme right-winged big business has never played fair to either agriculture or labor, or to small business, or to the country generally. It has always endeavored to amass huge profits at the expense of agriculture and labor and small business, and its prime purpose other than making inordinate profits has been to create chaos and ruin in agriculture and in labor and in small business. It has falsely tried to wear the diadem of a creator of all things good, and it has never created anything at all but ultimate ruin for others. Agriculture and labor and small business have now and have always been the real creators—the real builders of this Nation. Extreme right-winged big business in America has just been an ill-mannered, selfish, bawling, whimpering, thoroughly spoiled, overgrown boy, and it is high time for it to wake up, and grow up, and assume a manly mien and manly decency also. I am sure that it will do just that, because it has seen come into being nationally a Four Club, Eight Club, Sixteen Club, and Twenty Club, and there will be a Twenty-four Club, too; and if 20 years of the rule of the people has not convinced this recalcitrant and erring group that they have pursued the wrong course, then their cause is hopeless.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I say that the majority of that Committee on Agriculture has presented to the Congress the Pace bill, which repeals the Aiken law. This legislation contemplates putting into effect right now a better farm program; and in order to work out the mechanics, or formulate a correct procedure for the Brannan plan to follow when it is enacted ultimately into law, there will be a trial

run made on the three farm commodities—wool, eggs, and potatoes—and after that trial run has been had on these three items, we will all know whether the splendid theory of the Brannan plan can be worked out in practice, the approximate cost of same; and if it is demonstrated that it is workable and not too expensive, the road-block type of Republicanism will pass into the political discard forever, and I fear that the great Republican Party will be dragged by these road blockers to its death also, a thing which I would regret greatly, because this Republic contemplates two strong political parties which have the welfare of all of the people of the Republic at heart, and not the financial welfare of a favored, un-American few.

The Pace bill will do away with Government purchases on the open market in order to keep the prices of farm products up, which in the past has proved to be very bad, as our experiences in the purchasing of potatoes where \$408,000,000 has been spent, and for eggs where over \$128,000,000 has been spent, and for wool where about \$80,000,000 has been spent. Still we do not know how much more will have to be spent on these programs and yet our opposition wildly cries out, "What will the Brannan plan cost? Tell us, please?"

Of course, in the making of purchases, the Government, like every other proper buyer who desires to hold these products for a while, buys the best. This leaves the inferior or lower grades of potatoes and eggs for the consuming public, and will also, if followed out, in the future bankrupt the Nation and lead to the eventual destruction of the whole parity system for agriculture. Who wants to throw agriculture to the extreme right wingers in that fashion? I am sure I do not.

The Brannan plan would eliminate the middlemen who farm the farmers.

The right wingers have captured the national offices of every farm organization but the Farmers' Union. They have captured the national offices of the Meat Producers' Association and defiantly are using these organizations against the best interests of the farmer members of all of these organizations. Do not let them fool you by their present attitude toward the Brannan plan.

The Pace bill and the Brannan plan would pay a farmer for producing and throw aside all of the old wrong theories about paying agriculture to destroy growing crops and livestock or pay farmers for their idleness or for keeping their lands unplanted.

The Pace bill is a good bill for agriculture and the unselfish of the Nation, and should be enacted into law.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5345) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOURLY MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Frank Murphy, late an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and the Supreme Court and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

DO WE TRUST IN THE LORD?—WE DO NOT TRUST OURSELVES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, because we did not trust ourselves nor our ability to defend ourselves, and listened to world-renowned statesmen, we gave to Britain and others, including Russia, dollars, munitions of war, supplies of all kinds, depleting our national resources and finally sacrificed to the Old World the lives and welfare of hundreds of thousands of our young women and our young men.

All because we swallowed the sophistry that our first line of defense was to the east of the Atlantic Ocean; that we were dependent for our national existence upon what other nations did, just as though there was any nation in the world which would not take advantage of us if the opportunity offered.

Now we have the atomic bomb and our bombers, which, our own experts are telling us, are so powerful that any enemy nation, any country, could be destroyed in a few short hours.

So what is now proposed by Mr. Truman and the State Department? That we give the secret of the making of these atomic bombs and a store of the bombs themselves to Britain—Britain, which, during and ever since World War I has been safeguarding her own interests, no matter what the effect on us; which has been privately trading with Russia and with every other nation where she could strike a deal, even though her actions were detrimental to our national welfare.

It would seem that, if we cannot trust ourselves to safeguard the secrets which enable us to make and stock pile the atomic bomb, there is no reason why we should trust Britain.

If we have reached that stage where we no longer trust ourselves and are so foolish that we give to others the secret of our national defense, we have indeed become the world's most foolish people.

The President, the State Department and the Senate propose to commit us to fight in any war which may be started by any one of eleven weak, irresponsible nations.

Common sense would indicate that we retain some of the secrets, some of the

ability and some of the material which might enable us to preserve our national existence in such a conflict.

Nor would there appear to be any necessity for turning over to Britain the secrets which enable us to make the atomic bomb. Indications are that there are still enough Judy Coplons and Alger Hisses in the State Department and in the present administration to make sure that Britain, and Russia, for that matter, will obtain all the secret information they desire to enable them to match our war power.

Therefore the security of our own country should be our first thought.

ALL ON THE PAYROLL, NONE LEFT TO TAX

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the Government needlessly continues on its course of reckless extravagance, and nowhere is this more evident than in the ever-increasing Federal payrolls. An official report advises us that in the month of April 1949 civilian employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government increased at the rate of more than 350 a day. When we consider that the average Federal pay is approximately \$3,000 a year, this means that we have increased our payroll at the approximate rate of a million dollars a day.

The increase in the Federal payrolls goes on its merry way 4 years after the war is over.

In the executive branch of the Federal Government in April 1949 there were employed 2,122,710 persons, an increase, incidentally, over the preceding month of 11,453.

The Department of the Army, which already has so many civilian employees that they are practically packed together shoulder to shoulder, added 3,560 more.

The Post Office Department continues to add new thousands every month.

Veterans' Administration, which recently made a great to-do about efficiency and was promising, as I recall it, that they were going to reduce employment by 8,000, showed a new increase in employees in the month of April.

Mr. Speaker, a recent tabulation shows that during the last 20 years the upward trend in Federal costs is as follows:

Bureaus, departments and civilian employees have grown four times.

Federal Government costs have risen 10 times.

The average family share of Federal debt has risen more than 12 times.

Since it is entirely useless to expect the heads of the executive departments to do anything whatever about this, I again respectfully suggest that the Appropriations Committees take drastic steps looking toward the orderly reduction of this horde of Federal employees. If the trend is not checked, everybody will be working for the Federal Government and there will be no private enterprise left to tax—and just think how uncomfortable the Administration would be if it found nobody left to tax!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. Blackshire from the magazine Home and Garden.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3829.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include an editorial.

Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. HARDEN asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PLIGHT OF THE OIL-PRODUCING INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the producers of oil in my district and in my State are deeply concerned by the ever-increasing volume of imported oil.

While the market at home is shrinking, imports of crude petroleum and its products are increasing every week and every month. During the period from 1936 to 1940, the average importation of crude oil and refined products was 153,000 barrels per day. During the war period the average imports amounted to approximately 200,000 barrels daily. Then after the war they began to increase.

In 1946 the daily import was 370,000 barrels; in 1947, 437,000 barrels. In 1948 the average importation of oil in this

country reached 513,000 barrels daily. During this year importations have steadily increased. We now import oil and refined products amounting to almost three times as much as they were during the war period.

During the first quarter of this year, the United States permitted the importation of 580,000 barrels per day, and during the month of April, importations reached an all-time high of 593,000 barrels per day.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of the 15 counties in my congressional district produce oil and gas. Some of them have a large daily yield, others in a lesser degree. All are of consequence in our community life. The local economy is benefited by the income from the sale of crude oil and gas. This is a section of oil-producing territory in which independent operators are at home. It is an old producing area as age is reckoned in the oil industry of the midcontinent region, but new discoveries of oil are made year by year.

By reason of the excessive importation of crude oil the market is shrinking at the present time. Last December the daily average production in Kansas was more than 300,000 barrels. In contrast the daily production of crude oil in my State for the week ended July 9 was 246,000 barrels, or a reduction of 20 percent under that 6 months ago.

When we speak of production we mean the amount of oil that is sold from these wells. Producers under a State proration law are permitted to sell only a small percentage of the production of these wells.

The condition to which I call attention is not confined to Kansas. The national average daily production is also down more than 20 percent. Producers of oil over the country are worried. They are confused. They are totally unable to remedy the situation in which they find themselves.

In my State of Kansas I find a reflection of national anxiety. I am sure other Members from oil-producing areas are aware of what has happened and will continue unless the Federal Government provides a remedy. It certainly does not make sense that our own producers should be restricted more and more in production while a few large importing companies increase their imports to the United States. I think everyone understands that sole and exclusive jurisdiction over interstate and foreign commerce is under control of the national administration. It is a serious and personal matter when an important segment of your economy is threatened with destruction. If you hear a tornado has destroyed a town that you have never seen you feel an abstract sympathy. If it is your own community your anxiety is great.

The thing I am trying to get across to the membership of the House is that this is a national and not a local problem. I wonder how many realize the national consequences implied in the program of surrendering their home markets to South America and the Middle East. The problem is more serious than

we realize. A few days ago the distinguished Representative from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] referred to the effect of oil imports as a creeping paralysis attacking the domestic oil industry.

This is an economic problem. The hundreds of thousands of persons who earn their living by drilling and operating oil wells, who operate pipe lines and refineries, have a direct and vital interest in the production of crude oil. Farmers who share in the proceeds of the sale of oil, the merchants in the hundreds of oil-producing communities, are affected by this situation.

Decrease in purchasing power amounting to more than \$1,500,000 per day in the oil industry is reflected in the purchase of manufactured products in other sections of the country. After all, it is a national problem.

It seems strange that the economic benefits of the domestic oil industry of the State and Nation should be transferred to foreign lands and foreign dictators, and to a small group of powerful companies which, though domiciled in the United States, give the appearance of willingness to sacrifice domestic welfare and increase their foreign position. It cannot be right that our own independent producers should be required to cut their allocations or go out of business while our Government sanctions increases of oil from foreign countries.

There is further consideration. In the event of war, our petroleum security can be assured in no other part of the world than within the limits of the United States. The history of two wars should teach us something. I am reminded of the very slender margin of safety which we had when we entered the war in 1917. It happened that the oil production in the district I represent meant the difference between bare sufficiency and a deficiency grave enough* to have spelled defeat. Shortly before we went into the European conflict, the El Dorado field in Butler County, Kans., was discovered. Kansas was able, because of the sudden addition to its production of crude oil, to supply about one-eighth of all the oil produced in the United States in the year 1918. That same field made its contribution of more than 2,000,000,000 barrels a year during the Second World War, when every barrel that could be produced was needed.

Is there anyone in the Congress who wants to take the risk of basing the national security on oil supplies hundreds and thousands of miles away from the United States? That is exactly what is implied in this program of flooding the markets of the United States with foreign oil. In order to have a dependable, available, and adequate supply ready for any emergency, as well as for the peacetime uses, there must be continuous and big-scale drilling. New fields must and can be found and developed. In 1948, when economic conditions were encouraging to the producer, more than twice as much new oil was found as was used. The discovered reserves of petroleum were being built up to the position where we could have no fears as to the ability of the United States to meet any sudden increases in demand for oil.

That condition is being reversed. Producers are beginning to curtail their drilling. They pay for drilling by selling crude oil.

Certain visionaries have suggested we shut down our oil producing properties at home, use foreign oil, and then have an emergency reserve. The idea is fallacious. Development would stop. Properties would fall into disrepair. They would not be ready when needed. The theory is too preposterous to warrant the attention of any reasonable-minded person.

Real conservation does not mean withholding from use. The domestic oil industry and the governments of oil-producing States learned years ago the value of conservation in the production of petroleum. By full use of our reserves, not by hoarding them, the industry is encouraged to explore for new reserves. Last year we found twice the amount of oil consumed. Today our discovered reserves are the highest in history.

Mr. Speaker, the trade agreement concessions heretofore granted on crude petroleum and petroleum products should be withdrawn. There should be established a quantitative restriction on the importation of crude petroleum and petroleum products limiting the imports of such commodities to not more than the amount needed to supplement domestic production.

Unless we are able to get the agencies of Government, including the State Department, the Tariff Commission, and other agencies who have authority to do so, to deal with this problem and protect one of the greatest industries of the country, it will in my opinion, be necessary to call upon this Congress to enact legislation to protect an industry that is presently sustaining a loss of business amounting to more than \$1,000,000 every day.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill that will restrict the importation of crude petroleum and petroleum products, limiting such imports to not more than the amount required to supplement domestic production of these products. Unless affirmative action is taken administratively, I shall press for action on this proposed legislation.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 255. An act to amend section 205 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint boards;

S. 937. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States;

S. 1279. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to provide that minimum rates of wages need be specified only in contracts in excess of \$2,000;

S. 1280. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to limit to 10 percent any increase of the amount stated as a maximum obligation under a grant agreement; and

S. 1639. An act to amend section 1452, revised statutes, relating to Presidential action on the proceedings and decisions of Navy retiring boards.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 21, 1949, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

778. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the Second Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency covering the housing activities of the Federal Government for the calendar year 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

779. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To give effect to the International Wheat Agreement signed by the United States and other countries relating to the stabilization of supplies and prices in the international wheat market"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

780. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "To authorize the construction and equipment of a research laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

781. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules, or parts of lists or schedules, covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

782. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report including the name of each claimant, a statement of the amount claimed and the amount awarded, and a brief description of the claims against the Central Intelligence Agency under the provisions of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, during the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 302. Joint resolution to amend the act of June 30, 1949, which increased the compensation of certain employees of the District of Columbia, so as to clarify the provisions relating to retired policemen and firemen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1081). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 803. An act to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the State of Maryland for use as a site for a National Guard armory and for training the National Guard or for other military purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1082). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 1161. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 1083). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1283. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire, construct, operate, and main-

tain public airports in, or in close proximity to, national parks, monuments, and recreation areas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1084). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 3829. A bill to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred enrollments where such agencies received similar assistance during any prior fiscal year; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1085). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 111. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Shizuko Okada Pape; without amendment (Rept. No. 1076). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 317. An act for the relief of Margita Kofler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1077). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 905. An act for the relief of John Sewen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2921. A bill for the relief of Nicholas C. Kalcoutsakis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4040. A bill for the relief of Agnes Tarjani; with amendment (Rept. No. 1080). 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. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 5689. A bill to provide for the return to the State of California of certain original documents and maps, known as the Spanish-Mexican land-grant papers, deposited in the National Archives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5690. A bill to prevent manufacturers and wholesalers of products from offering for sale and selling the same at retail in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5691. A bill to prevent manufacturers and wholesalers of products from offering for sale and selling the same at retail in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 5692. A bill to provide for the return to the State of California of certain original documents and maps, known as the Spanish-Mexican land-grant papers, deposited in the National Archives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5693. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on photographic apparatus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 5694. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize care of graves of deceased patients buried at the expense of the Public Health Service, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5695. A bill to provide for the return to the State of California of certain original documents and maps, known as the Spanish-Mexican land-grant papers, deposited in the National Archives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 5696. A bill to provide specific measures in furtherance of the national policy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, as established in the Employment Act of 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 5697. A bill to amend the Stock Pile Act of 1946, Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 590, second session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5698. A bill to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien sheep herders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 5699. A bill to provide for the transfer to Pierce County, Wash., of certain surplus land in the Fort Lewis military reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5700. A bill to provide for appeals to the Civil Service Commission in cases of employees improperly removed from the classified civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 5701. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code relative to the deductibility of losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 5702. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the presence of a quorum in meetings of committees of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5703. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERTER (by request):

H. J. Res. 313. Joint resolution to create a Commission to study and report on the feasibility of constructing the Mexican Canal; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution to seek development of the United Nations into a world federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 5704. A bill for the relief of Janis Shimada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 5705. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H. R. 5706. A bill for the relief of Sidney F. Croft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5707. A bill for the relief of Stefano Pecoraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5708. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Konstantino Papanicolaou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 5709. A bill for the relief of Patrick Cronin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5710. A bill for the relief of the estate of Victor Jacobowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 5711. A bill to extend the patent of Frank Sipos, of Detroit, Mich., being patent No. 2,047,295 for a period of 17 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 5712. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bucaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5713. A bill for the relief of Fanny Tshrintge Papan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 5714. A bill for the relief of Charles Cutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 5715. A bill for the relief of King Mayberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Res. 288. Resolution for the relief of Isabel Muth Meade; to the Committee on House Administration.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1330. By Mr. HART: Petition of citizens of the United States, residents of New Jersey, protesting against the imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac and Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1331. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Arthur H. Weber and other residents of Williamsport, Pa., in opposition to H. R. 4643, the Barden bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1332. Also, petition of Rev. Leo J. Post and parishioners of St. Boniface Church, Williamsport, Pa., in opposition to H. R. 4643, the Barden bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1333. Also, petition of parishioners of Church of the Annunciation, Williamsport, Pa., in opposition to H. R. 4643, the Barden bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1334. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Swen Swenson and others, Bristol, S. Dak., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1335. Also, petition of Charles H. Nutting and others, Fifth Congressional Townsend Club, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1336. Also, petition of Mr. Frank G. Newhart and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1337. Also, petition of Mr. O. F. Horton and others, Oviedo, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and H. R. 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JULY 8, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph O. Parker.....	Attorney.....	\$5,164.98
Altavene Clark.....	Executive officer.....	4,304.15
John J. Heimburger.....	Commodity and research specialist.....	4,927.08
Mabel C. Downey.....	Clerk.....	4,304.15
Ruth B. Phillips.....	Staff assistant.....	2,325.40
Lorraine Adamson.....	do.....	1,757.55
Lydia Vucin.....	do.....	1,539.56
Betty Prezioso.....	do.....	1,069.42
Hugh H. Soper.....	Research specialist.....	1,225.40
George L. Reid, Jr.....	Staff assistant.....	1,495.47
Katherine D. Wheeler.....	Assistant clerk.....	953.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$50,000
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949..... \$50,000

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JULY 8, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey.....	The clerk.....	\$5,164.98
Kenneth Sprankle.....	The assistant clerk.....	5,164.98
William A. Duvall.....	Second assistant clerk.....	4,992.90
Corhal D. Orescan.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,992.90
Robert E. Lambert.....	do.....	4,961.79
Arthur Orr.....	do.....	4,663.68
Robert P. Williams.....	do.....	4,334.52
Paul M. Wilson.....	do.....	4,334.52
Claude E. Hobbs, Jr.....	do.....	4,005.36
Jay B. Howe.....	do.....	4,005.36
Frank Sanders.....	do.....	3,206.46
Lawrence C. Miller.....	Junior assistant clerk.....	2,516.22
G. Homer Skarin.....	do.....	2,309.34
Earl C. Silsby.....	do.....	2,102.40
Melvin E. Lefever.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	1,895.52
Robert W. Thompson.....	do.....	1,695.43
Watson L. Cormier.....	do.....	493.90
Ralph A. O'Malley.....	do.....	1,337.38
Sam H. Neel.....	Assistant clerk.....	1,439.49
Robert M. Lewis.....	Messenger.....	1,605.84
Frank B. Avery, Jr.....	Page.....	1,481.70
Bruce R. Grindrod.....	do.....	1,234.75
E. L. Eckloff.....	Clerk to the majority.....	3,337.80
Robert E. Lee.....	Clerk to the minority.....	4,677.17
Lawrence A. DiCenzo.....	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member.....	1,611.19
Dorothy Davis.....	Clerk-stenographer to chairman.....	157.96

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Molly J. Turner.....	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman.	\$31.59
Mary Jane Fisher.....	do.	31.59
Vivian I. Raber.....	do.	31.59
Helen Knechtel.....	do.	31.59
Charlotte M. Plumley.....	do.	31.59
Graham W. Howe.....	do.	31.59
Marjorie V. R. De ment.....	do.	31.59
Bette Donlin.....	do.	1,400.57
Josephine E. Frick.....	do.	1,716.49
Judy Jones.....	do.	1,400.57
Elizabeth Layne.....	do.	1,579.60
Eula D. Rigby.....	do.	1,579.60
Joseph P. Hansen.....	do.	947.76
Dorothy A. Caddigan.....	do.	1,579.60
Helen S. Boyle.....	do.	1,337.38
Annette L. Kelley.....	do.	1,263.68
Norajan R. Ray.....	do.	1,315.92
Joseph V. Gartlan, Jr.....	do.	168.48
Ruth F. Ringstrom.....	do.	315.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$185,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 84,190.87

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1949..... 91,570.24

Total amount expended from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949..... 175,761.11

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949..... 9,238.89

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

JULY 8, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Edward E. Hargett.....	Chief investigator.....	\$3,596.21
Robert E. Lee.....	do.	471.55
Orrin H. Bartlett.....	Investigator.....	3,640.11
Paul G. Travers.....	do.	1,741.55
Harris H. Huston.....	do.	511.72
James J. Kerr.....	do.	919.05
Harry S. Barger.....	do.	612.70
Eugene F. Rinta.....	do.	204.22
Enid Morrison.....	Legal clerk.....	128.29
Virginia A. Keep.....	Clerk stenographer.....	89.97
Lois Moore.....	do.	246.95
Rena F. Sylvestre.....	do.	1,352.24
Lorene Hudgens.....	do.	1,307.09
Dorothy Davis.....	do.	157.96
Federal Security Agency: Reimbursement for services of David W. Bishop.....	Investigator.....	1,716.47
Tennessee Valley Authority: Reimbursement for services of Van Court Hare.....	do.	888.02
Navy Department: Reimbursement for services of L. B. Wilson.....	do.	1,424.40
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Reimbursement for services of Paul G. Travers.....	do.	1,000.49

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Reimbursement for services of James J. Maloney.....	Investigator.....	\$771.80
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		31,040.80
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1949.....		31,138.12
Total amount expended from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949.....		62,178.92
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949.....		87,821.08

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

JULY 5, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert H. Harper.....	Chief clerk.....	\$5,164.88
James Deakins.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,014.79
John R. Blandford.....	Professional staff member.....	5,121.44
Clinton B. D. Brown.....	do.	5,095.11
Bryce N. Harlow.....	do.	5,121.44
Robert W. Smart.....	do.	5,121.44
Agnes H. Johnston.....	Secretary.....	2,532.79
Rosemary Curry.....	Stenographer.....	2,338.27
Gladys E. Flanagan.....	do.	2,314.73
Berniece Kalinowski.....	do.	2,338.27

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$25,000

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949..... 25,000

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JULY 11, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink.....	Professional staff.....	\$4,532.04
John E. Barriere.....	do.	3,057.16
William J. Hallahan.....	Clerk.....	4,268.64
Elsie L. Gould.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,544.50
Margaret P. Battle.....	Stenographer.....	2,309.34
Helen E. Long.....	Assistant clerk.....	202.19

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, none.

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JULY 15, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Mable Haller.....	Staff director.....	\$4,159.55
Ruth Pingley.....	Assistant clerk.....	384.89
Jack Cable.....	Staff member.....	2,889.68
W. N. McLeod.....	Clerk.....	4,894.67
Ruth Butterworth.....	Assistant clerk.....	1,854.67
Charles Farmer.....	Minority clerk.....	1,650.00
Charles Howe.....	Messenger.....	424.32
Total.....		16,257.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$2,000

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949..... \$2,000

JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JULY 8, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
W. Manly Sheppard.....	Chief clerk, Jan. 1 to 26.....	\$746.05
F. Albert Reiman.....	Assistant clerk (professional staff), Jan. 1 to 26.....	746.05
Irving G. McCann.....	Chief counsel (professional staff), Jan. 1 to 26.....	746.05
Frank S. McArthur.....	Investigator (professional staff), Jan. 1 to 26.....	746.05
Bingham W. Mathias.....	Minority clerk (professional staff), Jan. 1 to 26.....	746.05
Joseph Koski.....	Chief clerk and executive assistant, from Jan. 27.....	4,418.93
John S. Forsythe.....	General counsel (professional staff), from Feb. 4.....	4,218.02
Joseph S. Jarosz.....	Research specialist (professional staff), from Jan. 27.....	4,418.93
Frank E. Boyer.....	Investigator (professional staff), from Jan. 27.....	4,418.93
John O. Graham.....	Minority clerk (professional staff), from Jan. 27.....	4,418.93
Frances A. Los.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,598.96
Eleanor Bare.....	Assistant clerk from Jan. 27.....	2,223.55
Mary Pauline Smith.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,598.96
Mary E. Gilbert Sanders.....	do.	2,598.96

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Myrtle S. Locher.....	Assistant clerk (minority)	\$2,598.96
Jennie Ward Carter....	Clerk-stenographer, Jan. 1 to 26.	375.41

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures... \$15,000.00
 Amount expended from January 2 to June 30..... 863.20
 Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1949..... 14,136.80

JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JUNE 30, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses of full committee and subcommittees, itemized on attached:

Full committee.....	\$2,075.96
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman Chet Holifield, chairman.....	3,659.23
Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman Porter Hardy, Jr., chairman.....	11,883.03
Federal Relations with International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman Henderson Lanham, chairman.....	938.71
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman Herbert O. Bonner, chairman.....	1,322.30
Total spent.....	19,879.23

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Helen M. Boyer.....	Clerk, Jan. 1 to 19.	\$499.29
Helen Balog.....	Assistant clerk, Jan. 1 to 19.	279.21
Carl Hoffman.....	Counsel, Jan. 1 to 19.	433.45
Hazel Huffman.....	Investigator, Jan. 1 to 19.	446.63
Christine Ray Davis.....	Chief clerk.....	4,177.89
Martha C. Roland.....	Assistant chief clerk.....	3,587.79
Thomas A. Kennedy.....	General counsel.....	3,843.73
William A. Young.....	Staff director.....	5,016.20
Julian Fahy.....	Research analyst.....	2,889.68
J. Robert Brown.....	do.....	1,531.75
Delores Fel'Dotto.....	Clerk stenographer.....	2,612.89
Dorothy Morrison.....	do.....	1,582.19
Olive Willeroy.....	do.....	698.02
Teresa Barrett.....	Clerk typist.....	419.81
Francis T. O'Donnell.....	Minority counsel.....	3,818.50
Annabell Zue.....	Minority clerk.....	3,022.02
Hazel Huffman.....	Completing report started in 60th Cong.	1,141.35
Truman Ward.....	Mimeographing.....	39.00
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.	do.....	76.69
Martha Quill.....	Stenographic service.....	150.15
Cohen's.....	Framing pictures.....	10.70
J. Robert Brown.....	Expenses.....	411.62
William A. Young.....	do.....	4.80
Hon. Ralph Harvey.....	do.....	80.21
Mildred Philbaum.....	Reporting.....	30.00
Supplies, stationery room.....	do.....	131.44
Total expenses, full committee.....		2,075.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures... \$100,000.00
 Amount expended from Feb. 14 to June 30... 19,879.23
 Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949... 80,120.77

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JUNE 30, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from April 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Dorothy Morrison.....	Clerk.....	\$791.09
W. Brooke Graves.....	Staff director.....	2,582.49
Stationery supplies.....	do.....	180.65
Jaunita Ball.....	Expenses.....	35.00
Blaine Robinette.....	do.....	35.00
Eleanor Nelson.....	do.....	7.00
Grayce Golding.....	do.....	7.00
Ada M. Elrod.....	do.....	21.00
Total expenses.....		3,659.23

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

GOVERNMENT OPERATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JUNE 30, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from February 14, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carl H. Monsees.....	Staff director.....	\$3,463.63
Charles Futterer.....	Administrative analyst.....	1,524.11
James T. Gobbel.....	do.....	1,636.52
John C. Vick.....	do.....	809.62
Gordon P. Peyton.....	Counsel.....	1,083.62
Olive Willeroy.....	Secretary.....	799.84
Eloise G. Menefee.....	Stenographer.....	853.17
J. Robert Brown.....	Investigator.....	1,381.07
Gordon P. Peyton.....	Expenses.....	43.07
Francis T. O'Donnell.....	do.....	91.83
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.	do.....	1.25
Stationery supplies.....	do.....	195.30
Total spent.....		11,883.03

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

FEDERAL RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JUNE 30, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, pro-

fession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from May 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Franklin D. Rogers, Jr.....	Clerk.....	\$907.72
Stationery supplies.....	do.....	30.99
Total expenses.....		938.71

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JUNE 30, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from April 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles Warren.....	Clerk, Apr. 1 to June 8.	\$924.53
Lindsay C. Warren, Jr.....	Clerk, June 9 to 30..	397.77
Total expenses.....		1,322.30

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JUNE 30, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford.....	Clerk and administrative officer.....	\$5,164.98
Charles Burton Marshall.....	Staff consultant.....	5,164.98
Ira E. Bennett.....	do.....	3,443.32
June Nigh.....	Staff assistant.....	2,723.16
Winifred Osborne.....	do.....	2,723.16
Doris Leone.....	do.....	2,723.16
Mabel Henderson.....	do.....	2,056.42
Mary G. Chase.....	do.....	2,838.11

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures... \$50,000
 Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949... \$50,000

JOHN KEE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JUNE 24, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jeanne McDonagh.....	Clerk, Committee on House Administration.	\$3,308.58
Marjorie Savage.....	Assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Accounts.	3,544.50
Jack Watson.....	Assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Enrolled Bills, Library, Disposition of Executive Papers and Memorials.	3,412.86
Lura Cannon.....	Assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Printing.	2,078.41
Maureen B. Sandiford.....	Assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Elections.	2,288.65
Merle Harris.....	Assistant clerk and stenographer.	1,447.60
Irene Gilchrist.....	Assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Elections (1 month).	350.40
Frank Specht.....	Assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Accounts (2 weeks).	341.29
Gladys Riggs.....	Assistant clerk and clerk to Subcommittee on Printing (2 weeks).	210.24

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures None

MARY T. NORTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JUNE 30, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff		
Elton J. Layton.....	Clerk.....	\$5,164.98
Glenn R. Ward.....	Assistant clerk (employed effective Feb. 1, 1949).	2,096.85

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff—Con.		
Marjorie A. Biddle.....	Assistant clerk (resigned Jan. 31, 1949).	\$384.89
Royce Reno.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,309.34
Georgia G. Glasmann.....	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	2,185.14
Helen A. Grickis.....	Assistant clerk-stenographer (employed effective May 16, 1949).	525.60
Julia Watterson.....	Assistant clerk-stenographer (resigned May 15, 1949).	1,638.85
Frances W. Galvin.....	Assistant clerk-stenographer (authorized: H. Res. 157) employed effective June 20, 1949).	122.67
Roy P. Wilkinson.....	Assistant clerk.....	1,619.64
Professional staff		
Arlin E. Stockburger.....	Aviation and engineering consultant.	5,164.98
Andrew Stevenson.....	Expert.....	5,164.98
Kurt Borchardt.....	Professional assistant.	5,164.98
Sam G. Spal.....	Research specialist employed effective July 1, 1949).
John H. Frederick.....	Consultant (resigned Jan. 31, 1949).	634.64

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (funds authorized under H. Res. 157) \$60,000.00
Total amount expended from January 1, to June 30, 1949..... 323.64

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949..... 59,676.36

ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JULY 15, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
C. Murray Bernhardt.....	Committee counsel, Jan. 19 to June 30, 1949, chief clerk, Jan. 1 to Jan. 19, 1949.	\$5,114.85
Walter M. Besterman.....	Legislative assistant.	4,961.18
Bess Effrat Dick ¹	Chief clerk.....	4,648.48
William R. Foley ²	Committee counsel.....	3,443.32
Walter R. Lee.....	Legislative assistant.	5,016.10
Velma Smedley.....	Assistant chief clerk.....	5,081.93
Anne J. Berger.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,205.88
Frances Christy.....	2,205.88
Mabel L. Collier ³	1,747.95
Berta Kaslow ⁴	3,009.47
Harriet B. Lamb ⁵	277.45
Lucile P. Lamon ⁶	840.34

¹ Appointed Jan. 19, 1949.

² Appointed Mar. 1, 1949.

³ Appointed Jan. 24, 1949.

⁴ From Jan. 1 to Jan. 24, 1949.

⁵ Appointed Apr. 14, 1949.

1. Funds authorized or appropriated for preparation of U. S. Code and revision of the laws since Jan. 1, 1949:

A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year): Unexpended balance Jan. 1, 1949..... \$15,311.63

B. Revision of the laws, 1949:

Unexpended balance, Jan. 1, 1949..... 4,785.46

Second deficiency appropriation, June 23, 1949..... 330.00

5,115.46

Total..... \$20,427.09

2. Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1949:

A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year)..... \$2,274.74

B. Revision of the laws, 1949..... 5,106.38

Total..... 7,381.12

3. Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949:

A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year)..... \$13,036.89

B. Revision of the laws, 1949..... 9.08

Total..... 13,045.97

4. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure by H. Res. 156 (pursuant to H. Res. 137)..... 30,000.00

Amount expended..... 413.57

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949..... 29,586.43

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JULY 1, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hugh A. Meade.....	General counsel.....	\$4,648.48
John M. Drewry.....	Assistant counsel.....	3,901.07
Reginald S. Losee.....	Investigator.....	3,841.77
Gus S. Caras.....	Investigator to the minority.	4,235.72
Elizabeth B. Bedell.....	Chief clerk.....	3,608.49
Frances Still.....	Secretary.....	2,699.13
Frances B. Hoover.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,574.99
Marie Wilson.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,574.99
Leonard P. Pliska.....	Clerk to the minority.	2,792.13
Total.....		30,876.77

S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

JULY 1, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits

the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from February 28, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Madonna Haworth...	stenographer.....	\$1,316.15

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$15,000.00
Amount expended from Feb. 28 to June 30, 1949..... 2,731.27

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949..... 12,268.73

S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant
Marine and Fisheries.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE JULY 7, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Moore.....	Chief counsel.....	\$5,164.82
Frederick C. Belen.....	Counsel.....	5,081.43
Lucy K. Daley.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,573.70
Elayne Morelle.....	Secretary.....	2,251.86
Lillian L. Hopkins.....	do.....	2,228.87
Ann E. Hayden.....	Stenographer.....	1,906.99
Elizabeth Feltman.....	Clerk-stenographer, Mar. 9, 1949, to June 30, 1949.....	1,222.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$25,000

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... None
Amount expended from May 12 to June 30, 1949..... 5

Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1949..... 5

Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1949..... 24,995

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

JUNE 30, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George H. Soule.....	Technical consultant.....	\$5,164.98
Saul C. Corwin.....	Counsel.....	4,304.15
Preston E. Peden.....	Attorney.....	1,359.69

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ernest A. Grant ¹	Clerk.....	\$516.50
Edith C. Curtiss ²	do.....	286.11
Gemma M. O'Brien ³	do.....	47.68
Mary L. Steele.....	do.....	4,648.48
Claude E. Ragan.....	do.....	4,501.16
Nancy J. Arnold.....	do.....	3,448.99
Virginia McMichael.....	do.....	2,574.99
Geraldine Eaker.....	do.....	2,078.41
Betty Lee Angus.....	do.....	1,549.72

¹ Terminated Jan. 18, 1949.

² Terminated Jan. 18, 1949.

³ Terminated Jan. 5, 1949.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 72)..... \$30,000

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... None
Amount expended from Apr. 1, to June 30, 1949..... 1,407.61

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949..... 28,592.39

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JULY 11, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.....	Professional staff member.....	\$689.50
Do.....	Clerk.....	3,447.50
Robert F. McConnell.....	do.....	522.83
Do.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,614.15
Joseph H. McGann, Jr.....	Minority clerk.....	384.89
Do.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,211.80
Mrs. Vera Watts.....	Stenographer-clerk.....	442.36
Mrs. Elaine Jackson.....	do.....	442.36
Mrs. Violet Schumaker.....	do.....	442.36
Mrs. Frances W. Latta.....	do.....	1,135.38
Mrs. Alice B. Norton.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,211.80
Mrs. Doris B. Hazur.....	do.....	2,211.80
Thomas E. Massie.....	Counsel.....	1,379.00
Mrs. Margaret R. Beiter.....	Stenographer-clerk.....	663.53

Subcommittee investigating questionable trade practices

John T. M. Reddan.....	Counsel.....	86.08
E. R. Ferguson, Jr.....	Assistant counsel.....	65.66
Charles F. Meany.....	Investigator-accountant.....	44.24
Arthur Perlman.....	Investigator.....	48.60
Walton Woods.....	do.....	52.51
Jay S. Hartzell.....	do.....	44.70
Doris M. Mahood.....	Stenographer-clerk.....	33.20
Catherine C. Hubbard.....	do.....	32.74
Dorothy B. Hayward.....	do.....	32.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$125,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 99,593.07
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to Jan. 3..... 636.59

Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30..... 100,229.66

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949..... 24,770.34

WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JULY 14, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Humphrey S. Shaw.....	Clerk (minority clerk from Jan. 1 to 18; clerk from Jan. 19).....	\$4,009.01
Merritt R. Kotin.....	Assistant clerk, from Jan. 19.....	3,182.76
Jane Snader.....	Minority clerk.....	2,874.84
Elliodor M. Libonati.....	Assistant clerk and stenographer from Jan. 19.....	2,587.35
James D. Loebl.....	Stenographer, from Feb. 17.....	1,103.04
Richard Haas.....	Stenographer, from Jan. 19 to Feb. 16.....	98.78
Lyle O. Snader.....	Clerk, from Jan. 1 to 18.....	516.50
Donald Montgomery.....	Assistant clerk, from Jan. 1 to 9.....	156.85
Mildred M. McGuire.....	Stenographer, from Jan. 1 to 18.....	153.69

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... None

A. J. SABATH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JULY 1, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from December 31, 1948, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
<i>Employees carried on permanent House pay roll</i>		
Frank S. Tavenner.....	Committee counsel (appointed May 2, 1949).....	\$1,885.66
Louis J. Russell.....	Chief investigator.....	4,839.27
John W. Carrington.....	Clerk.....	4,285.07
Benjamin Mandel.....	Director of research.....	4,663.68
Donald T. Appell.....	Investigator.....	4,137.00
Anne Turner.....	File chief.....	3,885.70
Caroline Roberts.....	Assistant file chief.....	2,585.22
Juliette Joray.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,309.34
Margaret Kerwan.....	do.....	2,654.16
Rosella A. Purdy.....	do.....	2,964.55
<i>Employees paid by voucher</i>		
William A. Wheeler.....	Investigator.....	3,788.28
Courtney Owens.....	do.....	3,744.38
C. E. McKillips.....	do.....	3,744.38
Wm. J. Jones.....	do.....	3,063.50
Alvin W. Stokes.....	do.....	3,614.94
Jo Benisch.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,270.85
Virginia McCraw.....	Clerk-typist (appointed June 1, 1949).....	338.91
Pearl Gay.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	1,592.35
Jane Gordon.....	Clerk-stenographer (appointed June 13, 1949).....	203.35

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
<i>Employees paid by voucher—Con.</i>		
Helen McCarthy	Clerk-stenographer	\$2,171.40
Lorraine Nichols	do.	2,270.85
Rose Sanko	do.	2,270.85
Thelma Seacore	do.	2,609.93
Ruth Tansill	do.	2,270.85
Catherine Crews	File clerk	2,270.85
Lucille Fitzgerald	do.	2,270.85
Alyce Gartrell	do.	1,676.78
Eileen Sonnett	do.	1,604.41
Alice Walker	do.	2,270.85
Lillian Howard	Research clerk	2,609.93
Helen Mattson	do.	2,745.17
Mary Ann Moffett	do.	2,270.85
Asselia Poore	do.	2,782.38
Peggy Shaw	File clerk, services terminated February 15, 1949.	538.84
Ann Kelliher	Clerk-typist, services terminated February 15, 1949.	538.84
Mary McFerran	Clerk-stenographer, services terminated February 15, 1949.	538.84
Robert B. Gaston	Investigator, services terminated February 15, 1949.	888.49
Helen Boyle	Clerk-stenographer, services terminated February 15, 1949.	538.84
Virginia Allen	File clerk, services terminated February 15, 1949.	538.85
Jean Carey	Clerk-stenographer, services terminated February 15, 1949.	538.85
Jane Hahn	Clerk-stenographer (Mar. 7 through June 10, 1949).	1,133.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 78).....\$200,000.00
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1949.....65,910.85

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1949.....134,089.15

JOHN S. WOOD,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JUNE 30, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ida Rowan	Chief clerk	\$5,164.98
Casey M. Jones	Professional aide	5,164.98
Edwin B. Patterson	do.	5,164.98
Karl Standish	do.	5,164.98

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	\$3,250.89
Bessie N. Kenyon	do.	667.56
Frances Montanye	Clerk stenographer	2,309.34
Mary Schmidt	Stenographer	2,309.34
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk	2,378.28
Edward C. Wreble	do.	3,612.10
Total		35,187.43

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....None

J. E. RANKIN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JUNE 30, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 5, 1949, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles W. Davis	Clerk (C)	\$5,050.20
Leo H. Irwin	Professional assistant (P)	2,965.82
Stella O. Miller	Assistant clerk (C)	2,864.92
Gladys L. Kullberg	Staff assistant (C)	2,460.30
Ralph G. Simmerson	do.	1,954.54
Harriet B. Lamb	Clerk-stenographer	1,660.04
Gordon Grand, Jr.	Minority adviser (P)	4,881.94
Susan Alice Taylor	Minority stenographer (C)	2,214.14
Fede F. Fauri	Social-security adviser (P)	3,443.32
Lynn L. Stratton	Tax adviser (P)	860.83
Harry Parker	Messenger	1,316.16
Sam Hardy	do.	1,275.96
Hughlon Greene	do.	1,275.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....None

R. L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND MORAL REARMAMENT CONFERENCE AT CAUX, SWITZERLAND, AS OBSERVERS

(Authorized under H. Res. 232)

JULY 6, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

June 2, 1949, to July 6, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
None		

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$5,000.00

Total amount expended from June 2 to July 6, 1949 (this amount was for expenses of Members making trip).....\$64.51

Balance unexpended as of July 6, 1949.....4,035.49

PRINCE H. PRESTON,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JULY 7, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 3, 1949, to June 19, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Otis H. Ellis	Executive director, from Feb. 22.	\$3,701.56
Joseph W. Kaufman	Chief counsel, from Feb. 2.	4,246.75
Victor P. Dalmass	Chief, special services, from Feb. 11.	3,739.94
Suzanne D. Manfull	Administrative assistant, from Feb. 7.	1,750.90
Kathryn E. Smith	Chief clerk, from Feb. 12.	1,783.31
Bertha A. Padgett	Secretary, from Mar. 10.	1,365.46
Mildred Deen	Stenographer, from Feb. 21.	1,299.21
Dorothy H. Lott	Stenographer, from Feb. 4 to Apr. 30.	869.47
LaVerne Maynard	Stenographer, from Feb. 16.	1,349.18
Wesley Naron	Stenographer, from Feb. 2.	1,489.07
Richard R. Haas	Research assistant, from Feb. 17.	1,195.45
Albert J. Wolken	Special investigator, from Mar. 21 to Apr. 23.	755.34
E. H. Cole	Special investigator, from Apr. 13 to June 18.	799.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....\$100,000.00

Total amount expended from Feb. 2 to June 30, 1949.....26,915.67

Balance unexpended.....73,084.33

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.