United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 21, 1949

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 2, 1949)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. R. Orman Roberts, D. D., Temple Methodist Church, San Francisco, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in the hush of these moments each day we heed the injunction of Holy Scripture, "Be still, and know that I am God." Drawing thus upon the holy reservoirs of Thy wisdom, love and power, we are better able to be our brother's keeper.

Often, at such times, our thoughts go far beyond these hallowed walls to feel the heartthrobs and sense the hopes and aspirations of peoples in teeming cities, quiet countrysides, and in lands beyond the sea. Amid varied emotions, their longing to live at peace with their fellow men haunts them night and day.

Grant then, O infinite God, special guidance to the distinguished servants of the people in this body that, when decisions affecting the peace and security of our world are made, they shall be in accordance with Thy will for all peoples of the earth, in satisfaction of their hearts' desire.

We pray in the name of Him who is the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 20, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 19, 1949, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 114) to provide an increase in the authorization for the Federal National Mortgage Association.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1184) to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. SMITH of Ohio were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5632) to reorganize fiscal management in the National Military Establishment to promote economy and efficiency, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. SHORT, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. COLE of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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

H. R. 627. An act for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio;

H. R. 660. An act for the relief of Julia Busch;

H. R. 752. An act 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.;

H. R. 1033. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Barrington MacDonald;

H. R. 1474. An act 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;

H. R. 1631. An act for the relief of John J. O'Mara;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Maurice J. Symms;

H. R. 1799. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacob Ornstein;

H. R. 2594. An act for the relief of Grace L. Elser;

H. R. 2628. An act for the relief of Auldon Albert Aiken;

H. R. 2928. An act for the relief of Dr. Leon L. Konchegul;

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of Public Utility District No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 3300. An act for the relief of Mary Thomas Schiek;

H. R. 3413. An act for the relief of Alfred Baumgarts;

H. R. 3494. An act 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;

H. R. 3726. An act for the relief of Knickerbocker Insurance Co. of New York and Atlas Assurance Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 3803. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary L. W. Dawson;

H. R. 3837. An act for the relief of Annie Balaz;

H. R. 4653. An act for the relief of the New York Quinine & Chemical Works, Inc.; Merck & Co., Inc.; and Mallinckrodt Chemical Works;

H. R. 5155. An act for the relief of Francesca Lucareni, a minor;

H. R. 5160. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giustina Schiano Lomoriello; and

H. R. 5356. An act to provide for the conveyance of land to the Norfolk County Trust Co. in Stoughton, Mass.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive L (81st Cong., 1st sess.), signed at Washington on April 4, 1949.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] does not want a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair assumes that the unanimous-consent agreement with reference to the division of time that was to have taken effect between 12 o'clock noon and 2 o'clock p. m. will apply to the time from now until 2 o'clock. Is that the correct interpretation?

The Chair is just now advised, however, that the Senator from Nebraska was given permission by the Senate last evening to speak until 12 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his observation; also, I appreciate the fact that it requires some time to get started. I desire to use every minute because I have a speech which I am sure I cannot complete in 30 minutes. For that reason, I waive the quorum call, and I am going to ask now, in view of the fact that about 5 minutes have passed since the Senate was called into session, that if I do not conclude by 12 o'clock I shall be given the right to conclude my speech, and that the additional time I may require be charged equally to the proponents and the opponents of the treaty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair merely wanted to ascertain whether the agreement as to division of time between

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

12 and 2 applied also to the time before 12 o'clock.

Mr. LUCAS. I object to the last suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the remarks I make this morning come from the junior Senator from Nebraska, and in no sense do they represent or reflect the opinions of one who might be speaking by reason of the office he holds in his party or in the United States Senate. What I am about to say represents my own observations and my own convictions.

Mr. President, it is my purpose now to explain the declaration to the ratifying resolution, which I shall offer at the proper time.

The amendment is brief and reads as follows:

> The United States of America ratifies this treaty with the understanding that article 3 commits none of the parties thereto, morally or legally, to furnish or supply arms, armaments, military, naval or air equipment or military, naval, or air supplies to any other party or parties to this treaty.

Procedures in the North Atlantic Treaty are divided into two parts. There is the part which provides for preparedness against aggression, and there is the part to govern action after there has been armed attack against one or more of the parties.

The preparedness part is specified in articles 3 and 9.

Article 9 is the planning part of the treaty. It provides for a council representing all of the parties to consider—notice that it says "consider"—matters concerning the implementation of the treaty. The council makes plans and recommendations to implement article 3.

Article 9 also charges the council with the planning for the implementation of article 5, which is the part of the treaty that does not become operative until after there has been an armed attack.

The declaration which I shall offer on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and myself, does not modify or expand in any way the functions of the council as provided in article 9. The council can make recommendations for arms any time it desires—either before or after an armed attack. Obviously, it would be unwise to have a treaty for cooperation against armed attack unless some advance preparations are made prior to such an attack.

As I have already stated, article 3 is the heart of all preparedness action, since it commits all the parties to the treaty to "mutual aid" without defining what the nature of that mutual aid shall be. Article 3 reads as follows:

> In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

The planning and recommendations assigned to the council to be established under article 9 are directed to the "self-help and mutual aid" agreed upon in article 3.

The amendment which I intend to offer to the resolution of ratification applies only to article 3. In no way does it modify or change the procedures set forth in article 5, which provisions are carried out only in the event there is an attack upon any or all of the parties. Article 5 says what shall be done after an attack. It is true that the council established under article 9 is directed to consider and recommend for the implementation of article 5, as well as for article 3, in the preparedness part of the treaty.

But I emphasize that the amendment I shall offer would not affect article 9. All the provisions of article 9 for consideration of plans and to make recommendations to implement articles 3 and 5 would be in full force and effect. The amendment is directed to only one purpose: To declare that the understanding of the United States in ratifying the treaty is that article 3 commits none of the parties thereto to furnish or supply arms, armaments, military, naval, or air equipment, or military, naval, or air supplies to any other party or parties to this treaty. It should be specifically understood that arms or weapons include the atomic bomb, atomic weapons of all kinds, all materials which enter into the production of atomic bombs or atomic weapons, and the secrets of how the bombs and other weapons are produced.

This amendment does not forbid or prohibit any of the parties to the treaty from furnishing military equipment or supplies to each other.

It does not prevent or affect in any way practices of our Department of Defense or surplus-property-disposal agencies in selling surplus defense equipment to other nations.

It does not foreclose any authorizations or appropriations which Congress may desire to make to furnish military weapons and supplies to other parties to the treaty.

It does not in any way restrict the creation of a council representing all the parties or interfere with its planning or recommending the furnishing of arms.

Affirmatively the amendment clearly declares the understanding of the United States to be that there is no moral or legal obligation under article 3 for the United States to approve in whole or in part any recommendation of the council for arms or armament.

Senators know that there is no moral or legal obligation upon Congress to approve any arms program which may be recommended by the executive branch of our own Government. Congress has complete freedom of action; and that right of freedom of action should apply in considering requests for arms by foreign countries.

My amendment gives advance notice to all parties to the treaty that the United States understands that it has the right under article 3 to determine what shall be the character of "mutual aid" called for in article 3.

Certainly it is not the intention of the Eighty-first Congress to commit future Congresses, extending over the 20 years of this treaty, to any moral or legal obligation to furnish arms to other countries. Congress should have complete freedom to consider all recommendations by the council provided for in this treaty.

Certainly none of us wants to see a situation develop in which the council decides upon an arms program, or strategical distribution of military, naval or air defenses, and then submits it to the Congress for authorizations and appropriations, with the claim that the Congress is obligated to approve it.

Honesty and frankness is the foundation of foreign relations; and it should be the basis of our foreign policy. Let us know exactly what we are committing the United States to do over 20 years in this treaty. Let us be frank with the other parties to this treaty as to what our intentions are and what our commitments to them are, so that there will be no misunderstanding.

We should not leave the matter of moral or legal obligations hanging in dispute. Senators are well aware of the conflict of opinion which has been expressed during the debate on the treaty. It is not enough to say that Secretary of State Acheson says the treaty means this or it means that. It is not enough to rely, upon the report of the Foreign Relations Committee. It is not enough to say, that Senators on either side of this issue are right or wrong. It will only be enough when the Senate, by a vote on this clarifying declaration, says whether there is a legal or moral obligation to furnish arms under article 3 of the treaty.

If the Senate had before it only the question of whether there is a moral or legal obligation to furnish arms to foreign countries the Senate would have no difficulty in answering that question. But, the Senate has before it a treaty, which it is alleged by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is the vehicle for arms legislation; and we ourselves must know what the treaty means as well as how other parties to the treaty interpret it.

There is abundant evidence that some of the leaders of the other parties to the treaty believe that once the treaty is ratified the flow of arms to western Europe must begin, not as a free-will gift in self-interest, though it may be, but as a moral right, a legal right, which the western European countries can expect and demand be fulfilled.

Certainly, if we are to share our arms and our armaments with the signatory powers, they will want, and they should have, the best of weapons—not obsolete, worn-out equipment, but effective weapons to meet the offensive in modern war. A second-hand air force is no good, and is not effective. A second-hand Navy is as good as none. If the mutual aid is to be effective, on whatever basis it is to be shared, it must be shared with modern weapons and armaments which

will provide for the mutual defense of all the signatory powers.

This brings up the question, Is there a moral or legal commitment to furnish atomic bombs, or the secrets, or the know-how? Churchill said that the thing which stopped the expansion of communism in Europe was the atomic bomb. Certainly we can all agree that it is a most effective weapon.

I ask the question, Are we to share the atomic bomb, its secrets, and the know-how? Will the signatory nations have a right to them? Is there a moral or legal commitment to do that very thing? A treaty supersedes a law. Under our present statutes they would not have a right; but a treaty supersedes a law. In this treaty are we in any way committing ourselves morally or legally to share the atomic bomb?

The argument is made—indeed, it was made by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]—that the time to decide these questions is when the arms-implementing legislation comes forward. But now is the time to decide it, because the treaty will govern the actions which must be taken on legislation to implement the pact.

By adopting the declaration which I shall submit for the consideration of the Senate, the door is tightly and firmly closed against any moral or legal obligation upon the United States to furnish the atomic bomb or any of the materials or know-how in the making of it.

And, if it is not adopted, it can be interpreted that any moral or legal commitment made under the treaty runs to the atomic bomb as well as to any other weapon or arms that may be furnished thereunder.

None of us wants our country to be placed in the position of welshing on its obligations. The United States keeps its word. If we are morally and legally obligated to furnish arms before there is an attack upon any or all the parties, the United States will keep that obligation.

Time and again we have been assured by Members of the Senate on this floor, Senators who are piloting this treaty, that there is no moral or legal obligation to furnish arms before there is an attack upon any of the parties to the treaty. Over and over the Members of the Senate have been told that they will be absolutely free to vote as they choose on any arms program that comes along, without having any moral or legal obligation to vote for it. We also have had interpretations, in the twilight zone, that we have an obligation to provide arms, in view of this or that. Why not put in writing in the resolution of ratification what we actually mean?

The argument is made that the amendment I shall propose is unnecessary and untimely. But let me remind Senators there is nothing sacred about a treaty until it has been ratified.

It is nothing short of effrontery to say the Senate must ratify this treaty as is, without changing a comma, crossing a "t," dotting an "i," or even stating an understanding of the terms of any part of it. Of course, no Member of this body takes that position.

But my declaration does not amend the treaty. It is a type of reservation to the resolution of ratification that does not require renegotiation of the treaty. It does not require a new meeting of the parties. It can be rejected by the other parties if they do not have the same understanding of article 3 that we have.

This procedure is followed out time after time in treaties, including multilateral agreements.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a list of the treaties which have been adopted since 1939, with respect to which other countries have declared their understandings or interpretations of the treaties or made reservations to them. The list includes such action by the Senate.

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

TREATIES WHICH HAVE ENTERED INTO FORCE SINCE JANUARY 1, 1939, TO WHICH THE UNITED STATES IS A PARTY AND WITH RESPECT TO WHICH OTHER STATES HAVE MADE RESERVATIONS OR UNDERSTANDINGS

Protocol embodying a declaration concerning the juridical personality of foreign companies. Opened for signature at Washington June 25, 1936 (T. S. 973, 55 Stat. 1201).

Convention on nature protection and wildlife preservation in the Western Hemisphere. Opened for signature at Washington October 12, 1940 (T. S. 981, 56 Stat. 1354).

Protocol on uniformity of powers of attorney which are to be used abroad. Opened for signature at Washington February 17, 1940 (T. S. 982, 56 Stat. 1376).

International agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar. Signed at London May 6, 1937 (T. S. 990, 59 Stat. 922).

Convention on the regulation of inter-American automotive traffic. Opened for signature at Washington December 15, 1943 (T. I. A. S. 1567).

International sanitary convention modifying the International Sanitary Convention signed at Paris June 21, 1926. Opened for signature at Washington December 15, 1944 (T. S. 991, 59 Stat. 955).

International sanitary convention for aerial navigation modifying the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation of April 12, 1933. Opened for signature at Washington December 15, 1944 (T. S. 992, 59 Stat. 991).

Protocol to prolong the International Sanitary Convention, 1944. Opened for signature at Washington April 23, 1946 (T. I. A. S. 1551).

Protocol to prolong the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation. Opened for signature at Washington April 23, 1946 (T. I. A. S. 1552).

Recognition of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Inter-American treaty of reciprocal assistance. Opened for signature at Rio de Janeiro September 2, 1947 (T. I. A. S. 1838).

International telecommunications convention and final protocol of signature. Signed at Atlantic City October 2, 1947.

TREATIES WHICH HAVE ENTERED INTO FORCE SINCE JANUARY 1, 1939, WITH RESPECT TO WHICH THE UNITED STATES HAS MADE RESERVATIONS OR UNDERSTANDINGS

Convention concerning the minimum requirement of professional capacity for masters and officers on board merchant ships. Adopted at Geneva October 24, 1936 (T. S. 950, 54 Stat. 1683).

Convention concerning the liability of the shipowner in case of sickness, injury, or death of seamen. Adopted at Geneva October 24, 1936 (T. S. 951, 54 Stat. 1693).

Convention fixing the minimum age for the admission of children to employment at sea. Adopted at Geneva October 24, 1936 (T. S. 952, 54 Stat. 1705).

Convention on the interchange of publications. Signed at Buenos Aires December 23, 1936 (T. S. 954, 54 Stat. 1715).

Protocol embodying a declaration concerning the juridical personality of foreign companies. Opened for signature at Washington June 25, 1936 (T. S. 973, 55 Stat. 1201).

Supplementary arrangement with Canada regarding additional temporary diversion for power purposes of waters of the Niagara River above the Falls. Signed at Washington October 27 and November 27, 1941 (E. A. S. 223, 55 Stat. 1380).

International agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar. Signed at London May 6, 1937 (T. S. 990, 59 Stat. 922).

Treaty with the United Mexican States relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande and protocol. Signed at Washington February 3, 1944 (T. S. 994, 59 Stat. 1219).

Convention on the regulation of inter-American automotive traffic. Opened for signature at Washington December 15, 1943 (T. I. A. S. 1567).

Convention with Denmark for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income. Signed at Washington May 6, 1948 (T. I. A. S. 1854).

Convention with the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes. Signed at Washington April 29, 1948 (T. I. A. S. 1855).

Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation with China. Signed at Nanking November 4, 1946 (T. I. A. S. 1871).

Declaration on behalf of the United States of America recognizing compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Dated August 14, 1946 (T. I. A. S. 1598).

International telecommunication convention and final protocol of signature. Signed at Atlantic City October 2, 1947.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the record shows the list of the treaties which have been ratified with or without reservations to the resolution of ratification. It discloses that time after time the signatories have accepted the amendments to the resolution of ratification without any renegotiations whatsover.

If the Senate wants to attach a declaration or an understanding such as I am proposing, the Senate certainly ought to be free to do so, without being subjected to blasts by outsiders that if such is done, it means the end of the world is at hand.

We must have that freedom of action, or else the Senate becomes a rubber stamp, accepting what is put before it without ever raising a question.

What would be the practical effect if this declaration should be adopted? It would enable the Senate to consider all requests for arms in the light of all the circumstances at the time the requests are made. They could be—and should be—considered in the light of the need of our over-all defenses within our own

national-defense establishment, and also whatever amounts may be found necessary in other parts of the world throughout the 20 years' duration of the treaty. Certainly we should have that right.

Arms proposals for our own country and for countries abroad could and should be considered in the light of our own fiscal situation when such proposals are made. No one now can foretell the future. Certainly no one can tell what will happen in the Pacific or in Europe, on the other side of the world.

Conceivably conditions could develop—and, in fact, they may now exist—indicating that the primary security interest of the United States lies in the Pacific. The peace of the world may depend upon the fate of China. Many patriotic citizens, including Members of the Senate, believe that arms should be furnished in the Pacific to resist the tide of Communist armies sweeping southward.

Last year, on May 27, 1948, I made a request of the Senate Appropriations Committee that the chairman of the committee be instructed by the committee to request, through proper military channels, the appearance of Gen. Douglas MacArthur at committee hearings then being held on all appropriations affecting the Far East. The committee adopted the motion and presented it through the proper channels. At that time it was stated by the high military authorities that although General MacArthur could return to the United States of America, they did not feel that he should be ordered back to the United States at that time.

I felt then, as I do now, that General MacArthur has vast knowledge of political, military, and economic matters in the Pacific about which every Member of the Senate should know. Certainly we should know his reaction to what our Pacific policy has been, is now, and ought to be.

He has not appeared before a congressional committee, to my knowledge, since before the war. General Clay and others high-ranking generals have come back from Germany numerous times to give first-hand reports on the situation in Europe. The administration is long overdue in bringing General MacArthur back home so that he may appear before Congress and give Congress and the American people his advice and judgment on policies affecting the Pacific. Certainly the American people should have a first-hand report on his accomplishments in Japan.

Will we have, or should we have, a Pacific pact similar to the North Atlantic Treaty? While we are ratifying the North Atlantic Treaty, what about our policy in the Pacific? Are we going to close the front door to communism in Europe, but leave the back door to communism wide open in the Pacific? Our policy in the Pacific is drifting like a ship without a rudder.

Once again, I demand from the floor of the United States Senate that the administration bring General MacArthur back home for a report to the Congress and to the American people.

Mr. President, I ask again, can we chart the future? Is any Senator prepared to say that he can now chart his entire future course in every contingency which may arise? Of course, he cannot do so. He can only dedicate himself to abide by what his conscience dictates is best for his beloved country.

As I mentioned a moment ago, can we be sure of what the economic condition of our own country will be during the next year and the 19 years which are to follow? Will we be able to finance all these proposals if we assume moral and legal obligations under article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty, let alone obligations we might have to assume in other parts of the world?

All these questions are raised to emphasize the importance of making certain that this Congress and future Congresses shall have freedom of action on any question of providing arms prior to an attack upon any of the parties to this treaty.

I desire now to make clear my position with respect to article 5 of the treaty. I think it is the heart of the treaty. In effect, it is a multilateral assumption by the parties to the treaty to the principles of the Monroe Doctrine.

I am in favor of extending the principles of the Monroe Doctrine to all of the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty. I take this position with a full understanding of the heavy responsibilities involved. The Monroe Doctrine has been proven no idle gesture. It has served its purpose in protecting nations of the Western Hemisphere against intrusions by foreign countries. The Monroe Doctrine serves notice to nations across the oceans that any act of aggression in this hemisphere by them will be considered a violation of the interest and the security of the United States.

We have been prepared to back up that notice with force if necessary. We are now, and we must be, prepared to back it up with force in the future, if necessary.

This declaration of policy should be extended to all the parties to the pending treaty, and it should be done with full recognition of what these responsibilities entail.

The Monroe Doctrine does not spell out in detail how the United States will enforce its provisions should any aggressor nation seek to challenge it. The simple notice to the world, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan says, to "keep off the grass" has been sufficient to accomplish its purposes, because back of that notice is the might and power of the United States.

I am willing to extend the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, because America has been in two world wars which America did not start. Certainly these experiences have proved that, when the conflagration of war starts in Europe, America inevitably is drawn in. If we are going to be in all the crash landings, we ought to be in a position to help prevent the take-offs.

Since experience has proved that, when other major nations become embroiled in war, our country eventually becomes a full-fledged partner in the conflict and in the terrible aftermath of righting the economies of our devastated allies, it behooves us to take a serious interest in what goes on abroad and to pull an oar toward adjusting disputes amicably.

That is why I voted for the United Nations Charter. The United States is no longer an isolated nation. We are part and parcel of the world. Events halfway around the world have their impacts upon us. Cooperation among the nations of the earth, through the facilities provided by the United Nations, is imperative if we, and all freedom-loving peoples everywhere, are to make progress toward that hoped-for day when war will be no more.

And so I wish for the United Nations Godspeed, correcting and adjusting its procedures as experience indicates wise. Broadly considered, I believe the North Atlantic Treaty conforms to the United Nations Charter.

As was pointed out by the senior Senator from Michigan, I voted for Senate Resolution 239, and I am definitely committed to its provisions. But I did not think then, and I do not think now, that it commits the United States of America morally or legally to furnish arms or military aid to any other country.

The ranking minority Member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, asked this question of the Senate: What did the Senate commit itself to, when it passed Senate Resolution 239?

I answer that question by asking this one: Did the Senate, in Senate Resolution 239, commit itself to article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the provisions of which were drafted long after Senate Resolution 239 was adopted by the Senate?

Certainly, in committing myself to Senate Resolution 239, I did not then consider, and I do not now, that it was a commitment that would bind the junior Senator from Nebraska or other Members of the Senate to a legal or moral commitment to provide arms under section 3 of the proposed North Atlantic Treaty.

For that reason it becomes crystal clear that it is absolutely necessary and timely to clarify the Senate's position, and that can be done only by the adoption of the declaration I have proposed.

These are Senators who feel that it is unnecessary to amend the resolution of ratification by this declaration because the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee have made statements which in effect imply at least that the treaty and the arms implementation are separate; that Senators can vote for the treaty and against the arms implementation; that one is not dependent upon the other.

On the other hand there are Senators who take a completely different viewpoint. In fact, I doubt if there has been a debate on the Senate floor in which greater differences existed in the interpretation of a treaty than exist with respect to this one.

Let me review very briefly the history of this treaty in the Senate.

The junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] stated, in effect, that the North Atlantic Treaty and the arms implementation legislation are inseparable. He said the North Atlantic Treaty is the vehicle upon which the arms-implementation legislation depends. He concluded his speech by stating that he would vote for the treaty, and yet, he said it was the most bitter pill he ever had to swallow. In his mind he feels that the treaty and arms implementation are inseparable, and that the treaty, in reality, forms a military alliance, which he states is a backward step in the quest for lasting peace.

In fact, it is common knowledge that a revamped bill for arms implementation will be before the Congress, I think, almost immediately after the treaty is ratified and I feel the administration will leave no stone unturned to have it passed at this session.

The junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who stated he would support the treaty, also said, however, there is no moral or legal obligation to provide arms. He said he was supporting the treaty with the full conviction in his heart that there was no such moral or legal obligation.

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in unmistakable language told the Senate that, in his opinion, the North Atlantic Treaty and the arms implementation were tied together unless separated by some proposed amendment.

The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who supports the pact, emphatically stated in his formal address there was a moral obligation that the people of the United States of America should recognize, and that moral obligation was to provide arms-implementing legislation. He said further that, unless that obligation was there and the Senate accepted it, the North Atlantic Treaty became merely a scrap of paper.

Then the Senate had the observations of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES]. He was asked, "Is there a moral and legal obligation to provide arms?" He said, "No." Yet when the junior Senator from Oregon was asked the identical question, he said, "Yes." The present Secretary of State or a future Secretary of State, I submit, can find an abundance of evidence to support a position on either side, as he chooses.

Is this the way the Senate wants to leave to the signatory powers this controversial point? Is this the way the membership of the Senate wants to leave this question in the minds of the American people?

We have been told, and we will be told again, that the adoption of the declaration is unnecessary because this question is already handled in the report of the Foreign Relations Committee. Ordinarily, what a Senate committee report says carries great weight, especially if the report is unanimous and no exception is taken to it.

But let me remind the Senate in this instance that now, long after the report has been made, the debate upon the Senate floor has ensued, and the report, instead of being substantiated, is challenged, and it loses its effect because of the contradictory interpretations which have been placed upon the North Atlantic Treaty by the different Members of the Senate. That is my position.

This is not only true of Members of the Senate who have taken part in the debate, it is also equally true of statements which have been made by leaders in the foreign countries that are to be parties to the treaty, who in unmistakable terms, have implied that they expect arms and armament of all kinds to flow to them in unlimited quantities after the North Atlantic Treaty has been signed. Most of all, they want the atomic bomb.

Certainly we cannot rely upon the Foreign Relations Committee report to clarify the one big issue, and that is, is there under article 3 a legal obligation to provide arms to the signatory powers before they are attacked?

I say again, with all the emphasis I can muster, that the adoption of the declaration does not foreclose or in any way prevent orderly consideration and action upon requests for military aid at any time in the future after the treaty is ratified.

There are also those who say the declaration is untimely. Yet there is no other time a declaration could be attached to a resolution of ratification than the present. This is the only time under our legal processes when the Senate is asked to advise and consent to the ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty, which has been negotiated by the President of the United States.

Certainly it is our solemn duty and responsibility to be timely, and now is the only time to have a mutual understanding among all the signatory nations as to what the Senate understands article 3 to mean. Now is the time.

A misunderstanding later will cause a greater impact on the implementation than a clarifying declaration will cause now on our relations with the signatory powers.

Since it is argued that the Foreign Relations Committee has unanimously held there is no moral or legal obligation to furnish arms under article 3, certainly there should be no opposition from the committee or its membership to placing in the resolution of ratification a declaration to that effect. By doing so the Senate would simply be writing into the resolution of ratification what it has been given to understand are the commitments which the Senate makes under article 3.

Mr. President, within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty there is opportunity to strengthen the freedom-loving countries for the maintenance of peace.

Wisely managed, with frank, aboveboard cooperation among all the parties, the treaty can become a great instrument for peace. Through acceptance by all the parties of the declaration against moral and legal obligation to furnish arms before an attack, each country retains its freedom of action to approach all proposals for arms in the light of circumstances affecting each signatory throughout the life of the treaty.

Such freedom of action must be preserved, Mr. President. We have no right to bind the membership of future Congresses to a limited freedom of action. Under no circumstances should we do that. At all times we should have a right, without any moral obligation, to consider the proposals for arms under article 9 which might be submitted by the Defense Council. We should have the right, without a limitation of any kind, to consider what those proposals are, and, in the light of our fiscal policy and the need of our own defense, we should then consider such proposals.

Mr. President, I have stated my support of the principle of multilateral application of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine. I only wish we could, this morning, extend those principles multilaterally to the signatory powers. That is the potential which the Senior Senator from Michigan says he desires. I am perfectly willing to accept that particular responsibility; but I say that with article 3 in the North Atlantic Treaty, to my mind, there is a moral obligation. So I shall offer, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and myself a declaration to the resolution of ratification. I am not asking anything more than has been said time and again on the floor. It will not require renegotiation of the treaty. It is an entirely different procedure. We have adopted such a course time after time since 1939.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to finish my speech before I yield. I am working on a time basis.

With the adoption of the declaration I shall offer on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and myself, I shall vote for ratification of the treaty, confident of its success. But I say now that I cannot vote for ratification of the treaty if this vital declaration is rejected. I shall not vote to impose an onerous obligation upon my country.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. In line with the Senator's question as to whether there is any likelihood of our being obligated to furnish the atomic bomb, there are two thoughts in my mind. One is that the furnishing of the atomic bomb is one thing; the furnishing of information and knowledge with respect to it is another thing. I am wondering whether the declaration intended to be proposed by the Senator from Nebraska for himself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], is sufficiently broad to cover the atomic bomb, on the one hand, and knowledge or information concerning it, on the other hand. I should like to suggest that in the interim between now and 2 o'clock the Senator consider the inclusion of this language following the word "supplies," in line 5:

including atomic bombs or knowledge or information of any nature whatsoever.

So it will provide that the United States of America ratifies this treaty with the understanding that the United States

commits none of the parties thereto to supply arms, armament material, and so forth.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I think I made it very plain in my formal address on that point that I felt that atomic bombs, the know-how, and the information concerning them were inseparable and should be included in arms and planes. I shall be glad to consider it. I want to make it unmistakably clear as to what the Senate commits itself to when it ratifies the North Atlantic Treaty.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In my opinion, the words "military, naval, or air supplies" clearly cover the atomic bomb. I do not think there can be any question about that. The matter of information is another question.

I should like to ask the Senator whether he has considered the possibility of the treaty suspending and superseding the Atomic Energy Act which now forbids the furnishing of supplies and information to foreign nations, and whether the Senator knows the treaty will supersede the law once it has been ratified.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for suggesting the question. There was no quorum call this morning, and I wanted to complete my remarks before noon. I fully agree with the Senator from Ohio that the treaty does supersede the Atomic Energy Act. If the treaty is signed, it will supersede the present law. That is the reason I asked the question last night as to what our commitments might be. My feeling is that if there is any doubt about our commitments, the nations which are signatory powers should have, not obsolete and worn-out military machinery, but they will want to share percentagewise in that to which they are entitled, effective offensive weapons.

Former Prime Minister Churchill has said that the thing that stops communism in Europe is the atomic bomb. Does anyone think that the signatory powers will be satisfied with being given old, worn-out surplus equipment? No. They want to have the best defense they can have under the theory of mutual aid. I am in favor of giving them whatever the United States wants to give them when the matter is brought before the Senate and considered on its merits; but I do not want any moral obligation which supersedes the present law.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not a fact that General Bradley, our Chief of Staff, in testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee, certainly implied, if he did not expressly state, that we do not intend to give the signatory powers junk?

Mr. WHERRY. I have read his testimony; but that is not exactly what I had in mind. Of course we appreciate what General Bradley said. It is certain that the signatory nations will want modern weapons of war. All I am asking for by the approval of this declaration, I may say to the Senator from Indiana, is that we shall not wrap up in this treaty a moral commitment which will embarrass us, because the treaty supersedes the present law which protects us in regard to the atomic bomb.

Mr. JENNER. Did not the signatory powers, when they signed the North Atlantic Treaty in Washington, D. C., on April 4, take into consideration the fact that the very reservation which the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska has discussed this morning was likely and probable and within the constitutional process of this country?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly; and that is not all. They not only knew the treaty had to be ratified, but they will accept the treaty with this declaration, as has been demonstrated by the record of what we have done since 1939, unless they have made commitments to the contrary. Some sort of a definition should be provided of what mutual aid really means.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. In view of the fact that "mutual aid" is the term used in article 3 and that it might refer to the giving of information as well as physical things, I think it is extremely important to know whether military assistance would include knowledge or information.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has one more minute before 12 o'clock.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a dispatch from Paris, dated July 20, in which it is reported that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the French Legislature has proposed that the French ratification act should include a provision that an invitation to any additional states to joint the pact must be sanctioned by an act of parliament. The committee held that such an invitation would amount to making a new treaty. There has been concern in France lest the pact be construed to include Spain or Germany.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the first I have heard about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired. The hour of 12 o'clock having arrived, the time from now until 2 o'clock will be divided between the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I assume that the proponents of the treaty will be entitled to open and close the debate.

Mr. DONNELL. I think so.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan 25 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the reservations upon which the Senate soon will vote clearly crystallize the only remaining point of major controversy over the North Atlantic Pact. This point has ceased to be the pact's philosophy of action, namely, the probability that no armed aggressor will attack a competently united North Atlantic community which he knows he cannot divide and conquer. Indeed, some critics have gone far beyond this multilateral concept and have offered, unilaterally, as did the able Senator from Nebraska a moment ago, to extend the Monroe Doctrine to Europe and "commit the United States to war if Russia attacks western Europe."

There has been general acceptance of the theme that the surest chance of stopping an aggressor is to convincingly warn him in advance that he is bound to lose his war; also that our own national security is unavoidably involved—pact or no pact—if an armed aggressor starts to march into western Europe.

The pact sensibly proposes that those who share this jeopardy shall share effective vigilance against it. It thus reduces—indeed, it may extinguish—the jeopardy by anticipating it. The exclusive aim is peace.

There are a few Senators who reject this total concept, but among the majority the remaining point of controversy seems to involve only the nature of our responsibility to help our allies "maintain their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack."

Since the point has already been debated to exhaustion, it may be wishful thinking to hope to clarify the clarifiers, myself included; but it is vitally important to keep the record straight. It is still more important that superficially persuasive reservations—and I say this most respectfully—shall not be allowed to undermine the whole fundamental philosophy of protective action upon which this pact is built and upon which there is such general concert.

Therefore, Mr. President, I briefly discuss reservations with reference to arms and article 3.

Just what are our obligations? A logical answer requires us first to search out the roots of article 3. Where did it come from? Why? What was its initial intent?

The answers are officially available. It came from the Senate itself. It is the Senate's own idea.

On June 11, 1948, by a vote of 64 to 4, the Senate advised the President to seek "association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid," for purposes of "individual and collective self-defense" against aggression.

The President took our advice. Article 3 says that the parties to the treaty "by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack"; and article 11 says this "shall be done by constitutional process."

The two propositions are amazingly identical in literal text. The President could not have more faithfully followed Senate advice. Senators attached no "reservations" to their advice—except that they would be free to decide for

themselves whether the advice was satisfactorily followed. They will now exercise that freedom. But we must start with the probative premise that article 3 is literally the Senate's own words.

Now the next question. Why did we, the Senate, use these words about "continuous self-help and mutual aid" to "resist armed attack?" The official answer may be found in the unanimous report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on Senate Resolution 239. Let us read it:

The committee considers the principle of self-help and mutual aid followed in the European recovery program equally applicable in the field of security. United States association with arrangements for collective defense must supplement, rather than replace, the efforts of the other participants on their own behalf.

Still quoting the committee.

Such arrangements must be based upon continuous effective self-help and mutual aid. This means, in practice—

Says the committee—

that the participants must be prepared resolutely to defend their liberties against attack from any source, and efficiently to develop their maximum defense potential by coordination of their military forces and resources.

And listen particularly to this, the Senate committee speaking:

The resolution has been designed to avoid open-ended or unlimited commitments and to require reciprocity of aid.

That, Mr. President, is why "continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid" to "resist armed attack" went into Senate Resolution 239; and that is how it got into article 3 of the pending treaty. It is the exact antithesis of open-ended or unlimited commitments. It is a contract for mutual cooperation in behalf of a common defense objective. It deliberately rejects any idea that the United States accepts any unilateral responsibility which is not shared by others. We, like every other signatory, most emphatically do accept responsibility for contributing to the security of the North Atlantic area in whatever fashion events may require as honestly estimated by each signatory for itself. This may include arms. Perhaps it should. Obviously the administration thinks so. That is for us, the Congress, honestly to decide from time to time—so far as this pact is concerned—after the Advisory Council makes its recommendations under article 9. The extent of self-help will be one of the controlling factors. This is not a one-way street. Wise strategy for peace will be another factor. The goal is peace. The goal is less armaments, not more—if aggressors will allow us to reach it.

Our obligation is to our general responsibility under the pact. Our obligation is to make honest decisions as events unfold and in response to this general responsibility which must be shared by all the others.

The preservation of this free and mutual responsibility is vital to the enterprise. It is vital to the United States not only as a signatory which gives but also as one which gets.

If each signatory now tries to spell out what it does or does not intend in the application of this concept to unpredictable events, we can make a shambles of this essential spirit of the enterprise which must be general in character if it shall competently cope with an unknown future. If we cannot trust ourselves, we cannot trust others and we cannot expect others to trust us.

There is no hazard in the generality because there is not a word in the treaty which limits final freedom of honorable decision in the execution of its underlying pledge. But there is real hazard in attempting needless specifications because they may invite doubts regarding the validity of our intentions if we seem to be afraid of our own words.

As the pact stands, we are partners in pursuit of a general objective. But after honestly acknowledging the objective, we are free agents in determining our contribution. As a matter of fact, by attempting to define specifications in one instance we may find that we have actually increased our liabilities by neglecting specifications in others. The committee report speaks of "obligations" in 12 different places. They should all remain at the same level of senatorial concern.

If we start to try to spell out what we do or do not conceive our duties to be, there is no reason why every other signatory should not follow suit. Regardless of technicalities if renegotiation should be involved, it requires little imagination, under such circumstances, to see the end of confidence and the beginning of suspicion. This is a classical case where "the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life."

What are our duties under article III in respect to arms?

It is to take our share of responsibility in maintaining and developing the capacity of the North Atlantic community to resist aggression in whatever way, including arms if need be, our own independent judgment from time to time determines to be necessary.

Of course, the situation is not the same under the pact as it is without the pact—or there would be no sense in writing it. But the difference is not in our freedom of honest decision. It is in our acceptance of the general responsibilities to which these decisions shall be honestly applied.

We really, Mr. President, it seems to me, are back to the basic concept which the Senate had in mind when it inspired the pact. Those who do not think it wise for 300,000,000 free people to notify an armed aggressor that he cannot win because of the competent unity he will confront will undoubtedly be anxious to whittle away this general responsibility. That can be the vice of reservations. I can understand how article 3 might bother a Senator who is opposed to this total concept; and I have the deepest respect for the good conscience of others who are anxious to be sure of their ground. But it seems to me that those who support the concept need not fear the exercise of their own free judgments in honest subsequent decisions implementing this support.

Some of the confusion arises because the administration will follow the pact with an immediate request for a military assistance program for a number of countries outside—and some inside—the pact. Further confusion flows from the unfortunate but understandable coincidence that this military assistance program came to a head when the foreign ministers of all the treaty countries came to Washington to sign the pact.

But there is no further legitimate room for confusion since I put the State Department's categorical statement into the RECORD a few days ago.

The answer is that the military-assistance program which will presently be submitted to Congress is not a program for implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty. It could not be because article 3 requires recommendations under article 9 to initiate any such program.

The State Department says:

The program—

Referring to the pending military-assistance program—

would be necessary even if there were no treaty just as the treaty would be necessary if the military-assistance program had not yet been formulated. This latter program has its own validity and necessity, rooted in basic elements of our foreign policy. The principal element involved in both is that of the national interest of the United States in insuring the security of certain free nations. The military-assistance program is separate from the treaty, except that the treaty and the MAP both serve the national interest and security of the United States and in this way supplement each other. * * * Any further military-assistance programs involving Atlantic Pact countries will be prepared and submitted on the basis of recommendations which will be made by the organization to be established under article 9 of the treaty.

That ends the State Department quotation. It also ends any doubt about the status of the treaty in respect to the military-assistance program which is waiting around the corner.

This leaves us, therefore, exclusively with treaty obligations as involved in pending reservations. I use the reservation proposed by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] as an example. I understand it now will be offered in conjunction with other Senators, but that it is substantially the same as originally presented, with the deletion of one clause. It reads as follows:

Nothing contained in article III creates any legal or moral obligation on the part of the United States to furnish or supply arms, armaments, military, naval, or air equipment, or supplies to any other party or parties to said treaty.

That is true as far as it goes. But it does not go far enough. It is not all of the truth. Half-truths are dangerous. That is the difficulty in attempting specifications. That is why I am opposed to the attempt. If you start this business, the truth requires you to find

appropriate words to express, among other things, some such added thought as this, and even this is not comprehensive: Unless and until the Congress, in its own judgment, finds the furnishing of such supplies essential to peace and security in the North Atlantic community on the self-help basis defined in the treaty.

Then you are off to an argument, at home and abroad, as to precisely what it is you have said or are trying to say which is different from the treaty—and it is different from the treaty.

The Secretary of State puts it this way:

> The pact does not dictate the conclusion of honest judgment * * * it does preclude repudiation of the obligation of making that honest judgment.

In other words, we are not entitled to assert a total disclaimer of mutual responsibility to the pact—as distinguished from its individual signatories—under article 3. Nor is that what any of us really means. Indeed, it may well be that, under warranting justification, we may freely come to the precise conclusion which this reservation would denounce in advance.

This pact establishes no automatic right anywhere to demand arms of us. It does establish a right to present a request, under article 9, and to have it considered by us in the light of this mutual responsibility and our own honest estimate of the need and of our capacity to respond. Period.

No reservation is necessary to protect this point because it is plain in every word that has been uttered in this debate in the presentation of the pact. Surely the opponents of the pact will not be valid witnesses to the contrary because if the pact is ratified, their views will not have prevailed. If it be argued that Senators who vote against the reservation have thereby accepted the unlimited obligations which the reservation would denounce, my answer—of course, with no reflection on the good faith of the authors—is that Senators who vote against such reservations have merely rejected a half-truthful statement of those obligations which remain the same as if the rejected reservation had never been offered. It is infinitely better to stand upon the general text of the pact than to attempt specifications which easily may create more problems than they solve.

It is urged that we must not mislead our associates. I cordially agree. These debates will have disabused their minds of any notion that we are assuming responsibility for arming western Europe to the teeth or of turning ourselves into an automatic arsenal. But it would be even more tragic to invite misgivings that, though we ratify the pact, we shall have no sense of mutual concern in the defense problems of those brave countries which sit in the immediate shadow of the jeopardy which, wherever it might break, is aimed finally at us. The consequences could be appalling.

I happen to be one of those who believe that the overriding authority of this pact is in its potentials under article 5 rather than in forces-in-being under article 3. But I say again that I recognize the importance of putting this defense in gear and rounding out its normal sufficiency, particularly to sustain law and order against subversion. I shall fit my future judgments to the facts. But I certainly do not intend by my vote to invite the imputation that I am blind to these facts or to my country's interest in them. I consider that my treaty obligation is to give them honest and faithful consideration. I conceive that my right of action is totally my own.

I am certain that this or any other reservation is in no way necessary to protect our constitutional process, our independent judgments, our congressional conscience, and our nonaggressive purpose to use this pact for peace.

Needless reservations, though born of honorable caution, serve only to confuse—perhaps confound—our friends, while potential aggressors take renewed hope that we do not really mean what we say when we dedicate ouselves to effective unity against their North Atlantic conquests.

We may thus defeat our own purposes and cripple the protective values upon which so much depends.

I continue to believe, Mr. President, that this pact—if eloquently approved by the Senate—is our best peaceful and strategic chance to stop another war before it starts. If it starts—pact or no pact—it is headed straight in our direction.

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

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot consume the time of the Senate in answering parliamentary inquiries, because the time is already disposed of by a unanimous-consent agreement, and is in control of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. The Chair apologizes to the Senator from Missouri, but a parliamentary inquiry and the answer might consume several minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator from Texas expects us to go forward at this point. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the Senator from Ohio begins, let the Chair respectfully admonish Senators not to engage in conversation. The art of whispering seems to be a lost art in the Senate. Senators who feel it incumbent upon themselves to say anything say it loud enough to be heard. The Chair hopes that Senators will not indulge in conversation during this debate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have already stated at length and in detail the reasons why I intend to vote against the North Atlantic Pact. In substance, those reasons consist of the fact that, in my opinion, the North Atlantic Pact is part of a larger project including the arms program. The State Department in some places says it is incidental to the arms program. I think we close our eyes to realities unless we realize that this is one thing, and that in going into this pact we are committing ourselves to an arms program. Therefore I shall vote against the North Atlantic Pact, unless it is made clear that these two things are separate.

The declaration proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] says:

> The United States of America ratifies this treaty with the understanding that article 3 commits none of the parties thereto, morally or legally, to furnish or supply arms, armaments, military, naval or air equipment or military, naval, or air supplies to any other party or parties to this treaty.

Either the treaty commits us to that obligation or it does not. We have had throughout this entire debate a marked difference of opinion on that question, which has not been resolved by the very excellent speech of the Senator from Michigan. To my mind it is just as uncertain today whether he thinks there is a moral or legal obligation to go ahead with an arms program, as it was before he began to speak. I have heard that there is no particular arms program to which we are committed; but whether we are committed to an arms program or not, I cannot conclude from the Senator's speech. Even if we adopt this reservation it does not prevent us from proceeding with an arms program. It simply says that when the question of an arms program arises we are entirely free to adopt it if we wish, or to decline it if we wish; that we are not obligated to all 11 nations; that we can pick out a particular nation; that if a nation is threatened with actual attack, as was Turkey, or if a nation is threatened with internal attack, as was Greece, or if there is some country, like China today, which is threatened with Communist attack, and we can see the threat, and see that military aid may be effective, then we can proceed without regard to the obligations in the pact itself.

This does not foreclose us from a military program, but it says that there is no legal or moral obligation in the pact. It says that we can turn down completely, if we wish, the military program presented to us.

This treaty is ambiguous. Who can say that article 3 is not ambiguous? Who can say that there is any certainty as to what it means? Taking the views of various Senators as expressed during this debate, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES] said:

> I said in substance I see in the treaty no legal or moral obligation to vote any arms program which is not defensible on its own merits.

He takes an extreme view, that there is no obligation whatever. He says in other places that in his opinion the leaders of foreign governments do not think there is any obligation. If so, there can certainly be no objection on their part to our clearly making that statement; nor can I see how there can be a reasonable objection on his part or on the part of anyone who thinks there is no moral or legal obligation, to our frankly stating that fact in a reservation.

The distinguished Senator from New York also disagrees directly with the

State Department. The State Department says the North Atlantic Pact is an agreement on a policy of common defense, and that its very vital corollary is a program of military aid. The distinguished Senator from New York says he disagrees; he says that a program of military aid is not its vital corollary. There we have a direct difference of opinion on a vitally important question.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], it seems to me has taken two inconsistent positions in one sentence. He issued a statement which he said that a vote for the treaty does not carry with it any obligation to vote for arms implementation. But then he said that we must act promptly on arms implementation and assure the co-signers of the pact that we mean business, that we are sincere and earnest. If that is not a statement that there is certainly a moral obligation to provide arms, I do not know what it is. So the distinguished Senator from Texas says clearly that in his opinion there is a moral obligation to provide arms.

The position of the distinguished Senator from Michigan and the position of the distinguished Secretary of State constitute a kind of moderate intermediate position. They say that if we ratify the pact, it cannot be said there is no obligation to help. They say there will be an obligation to help. When they say that, they are talking about military help, not about other help. Article 3 may well bind us to a general ECA program, even if we adopt the reservation; but without the reservation, and in view of the history of what has gone on, it seems to me clearly that Article 3 is an obligation to provide arms.

We are told that there is an obligation to help, but that the extent, manner, and timing are up to the honest judgment of the parties. So, Mr. President, we see that they say there is an obligation.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan seems this afternoon to be saying in effect that of course there is going to be an arms program, but that we can decide just how big it should be and of what it should consist. But he says there is "an obligation." Fundamentally, those who object to the adoption of this reservation think there is an obligation, they know there is an obligation, and they think we must go on to an arms program as soon as we adopt the pact. I cannot escape the conclusion that there is a complete difference of opinion between different Senators on this question. Therefore, such a difference of opinion should be resolved, and should be resolved by the Senate of the United States, before we ratify a treaty which may well develop into one of the greatest foreign-aid assistance programs we have ever seen. It can easily go well beyond the total burden of ECA.

The newspapers differ as to what the treaty means. Mr. Arthur Krock, the distinguished representative of the New York Times, says very clearly that any Member of Congress who reads informed newspaper dispatches must have known from the time the Scandinavian ministers were encouraged to visit our State Department that the purpose of their visit was to get arms, and that the purpose of getting arms under the North Atlantic Pact was what impelled Norway to reject the Scandinavian pact with Sweden and Denmark.

I cannot find that the Foreign Relations Committee really repudiates the obligation provided under the treaty to supply arms. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is an excellent lawyer, has taken the position on this floor that there is clearly an obligation under the treaty to provide arms and that we should recognize it now. The Washington Post takes a similar position, namely, that that is what the treaty is and that arms are a necessary adjunct to the North Atlantic Treaty.

So, Mr. President, I cannot understand the position of those who say there is no obligation, and yet are unwilling to vote for this reservation, unless they think really there is an obligation—an indefinite one, perhaps, but still an obligation. That obligation changes, to my mind, the entire spirit of the North Atlantic Treaty.

I do not see how the other signatory countries are going to be discouraged by our adoption of this reservation. They know it is being debated here. They know very well that the arms program is going to be considered. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES], who knows many of the representatives of the foreign countries and has talked to them, says they do not really feel that any obligation is connected with the treaty.

So how can we in any way hurt their feelings by adopting this reservation? If we do not adopt it, are not we deceiving them? If we ratify the treaty, at the same time reserving in our minds the right to vote down any arms program at all, are not we fooling them by refusing to adopt the reservation now? Is not truth the best foreign policy, as it is the best domestic policy? Should not we make perfectly clear what we are doing and how far we are willing to go, and not lead the signatory countries to think that we are coming to their aid with arms sufficient to enable them to defend themselves? How many arms do Senators think are necessary for Denmark or for Norway to have to defend itself against Russia. The Italians must be looking for us to come to their aid. It has come to be assumed as a fact that the United States is coming to the assistance of the signatory nations, to defend them against a possible attack. But that is not so. We are not going to do it, in the last analysis. We may give them arms to some extent, but I myself do not think we should commit ourselves, and I do not think we will commit ourselves actually to send American troops to those countries.

Is it not better to be fair to these countries by defining exactly what we are prepared to do, which, to my mind, means one thing only, namely, to say to Russia that if she goes to war with any of these countries, although she may win for a time, yet in the end the United States has the power, which it will use in such a war, to attain victory, and the nation that challenges it will go down to defeat. That is what we say, but we should not guarantee arms to these countries. If we do so, I think we make it more probable that there will be a war.

The State Department comes forward with the rather naive view that, after all, the steps provided for under article 9 will not be taken at this time. Whether that means there will be another military program, or what the theory is, I do not know; but I think the idea that the supplying of arms and the pact are separate is merely a theory of the State Department, whereas everyone knows they are together and are one project. That is merely a bright idea conceived by someone in the State Department. They want to go ahead with the military program now; so they suggest that the nations do not meet under article 9, but that the military program be proceeded with as a separate matter.

If that is done, I admit we are not obligated to go ahead with such a military program. But under article 9, later it would be very difficult for us to escape another program.

So, Mr. President, I am opposing the treaty. If the reservation is adopted, I shall vote for the treaty. But with the reservation, this whole program in my opinion is not a peace program; it is a war program. Mr. President, I do not wish to make so didactic a statement as that, so I shall say that with the arms factor the whole tendency of this program is toward a third world war, instead of away from a third world war; because we are in the first place committing ourselves to a vast program of foreign aid.

In the second place, we are committing ourselves to a policy of war, not a policy of peace. We are building up armaments. We are undertaking to arm half the world against the other half. We are inevitably starting an armament race. The more the pact signatories arm, the more the Russians are going to arm. It is said they are armed too much already. Perhaps that is true. But that makes no difference. The more we arm, the more they will arm, the more they will devote their whole attention to the building up of arms. The general history of armament races in the world is that they have led to war, not to peace.

In the third place, we are going back to the old balance-of-power theory. Every American has denounced that theory. Every man who has thoroughly thought out the question of international organization has said the only ultimate hope of peace depends upon the establishment of law and justice among nations, with international action by joint force against an aggressor. We abandon that theory under the treaty and arms program; and we go back to the old balance-of-power theory, which

England followed for years. We are following exactly the theory she practiced—"Keep Europe divided more or less equally and so that neither can afford to attack safely and, ultimately, England has the balance of power." That is the effect of this program to turn back to the balance of power, which never prevented war, except for brief periods of time. It always led to a series of wars in Europe, and it will lead to a series of wars in the world, if that is all we develop.

So, Mr. President, I believe that if we simply want to take a purely defensive action, if we want to warn Russia, we ought to adopt this reservation and then ratify the treaty. But I feel as strongly as I can that if we go ahead with the arms program, in which I think the treaty now involves us, we are adopting a policy far more likely to lead to a third war, and the real tragedy of a third world war, than to peace.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, does the Senator from Texas desire to go forward at this time? If not, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio used 16 minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes, in absentia.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not see the Senator. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the North Atlantic Pact, as now written, will serve to protect the integrity of the colonial system of Asia and Africa—and will cause the Asiatic and African people to favor and to look upon as a savior any nation that will promise them relief from the European nations' colonial yoke—and the nation to promise such relief is Russia. It also, for the first time, removes our prerogative to be the sole judge when our peace and safety is threatened—also to declare war only in the event such peace and safety are threatened.

It is extremely doubtful if the empire nations of England, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium can hold their colonial possessions much longer even with our help—and the wisdom of lining up with this effort and alienating the Asiatic and African people is, to say the least, questionable.

This is not an isolated Atlantic Pact or treaty with the 12 European nations. On June 11, 1947, I debated the Vandenberg resolutions with the senior Senator from Michigan contending at that time that if the Senate demanded that the President make such a treaty or pact without the specific terms of such treaty being indicated, then this body would be morally bound to approve any such arrangements that the President might later send to the Senate floor. I further contended that it was the first breach of the 173-year-old policy of independent checking on any pact or treaty prepared by the executive branch of the Government.

One year later we find the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, saying that the Vandenberg resolutions were the basis of the pact, and find that all member nations were called to Washington to sign the pact—before it reached the Senate floor—thus, in every way possible embarrassing any Senator who might make so bold as to try to determine its real meaning.

The North Atlantic Pact will develop the basis for supplying arms to Europe, and I say to the distinguished Senators before me today, the arms will be the basis of the boys and girls going to Europe to use the arms.

For a precedent I refer my colleagues to the statement by Winston Churchill during World War II, in the early stages. At that time he said what was needed was funds and credit. We gave them credit. He then said, "Give us the tools and we will finish the job." We gave them the tools. Then we ended up by sending from 70 percent to 75 percent of all the boys and girls who were in the war in Europe. That is exactly where we are headed now. It is the old story over again.

When I mentioned the Monroe Doctrine a year ago last March in the Marshall plan debate as a substitute for our then international policy, then again in the ECA debate on March 30 of this year, then on July 12 in the North Atlantic Pact address and debate, I meant the Monroe Doctrine which we relied upon for 125 years, adopted in 1823, and which is still in existence, regardless of the 1947 Latin-American Defense Pact. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a very short statement, found at page 142 of a work, We of the Americas, by Carlos DeVilles, a statement that the Monroe Doctrine is still in effect and its purpose and effect, also a further statement on the same subject matter.

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

The last public statement of American foreign policy, issued in the form of a State Department pamphlet on October 20, 1947, observes: "There was a realization that the freedom of Latin America from European control was in the interest of our own security. This view was stated in the form of a policy or doctrine by President Monroe in 1823." The document states further that the two Americas were "brought closer together" through the multilateral agreements against aggressors, which culminated in the Rio de Janeiro continental defense pact of September 1947. It does not state, or remotely imply, that any of these joint agreements is a substitute for a Monroe Doctrine which now has been abandoned.

The Monroe Doctrine as a unilateral instrument or policy is not dead, nor has the self-nominated United States stewardship of this hemisphere been abandoned. Even if it had never been placed in words as a publicly stated policy, it seems to me that the Monroe Doctrine still would be a living reality; for it embodies the instinct of self-preservation of the most powerful nation in the Western Hemisphere. It was a definite part of the United States' position long before Monroe wrote his now famous message to Congress.

In a congressional resolution, as early as 1811, the United States evidenced increasing concern over the possibility of European invasions throughout the Spanish South. In early American history we frequently find official expression of this anxiety.

The principle of "no European entanglements" was basic to the Monroe Doctrine. Washington had said in his Farewell Address that European interests sprang from causes "essentially foreign to our concerns." Washington's main worry was that American peace and prosperity might be destroyed "in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice."

The Monroe Doctrine simply formulated the method by which these "toils" were to be kept as remote from the United States as possible. Washington's Farewell Address and the Monroe Doctrine are not only complementary; they are one and the same policy—a fact often disregarded by jurists and diplomats.

The Monroe Doctrine was a two-way precept: No European intervention in this hemisphere; no American intervention in Europe. It read: "In the wars of European powers relating to themselves, we have never taken any part; nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparations for our defense."

The Monroe move was one of the smartest in the history of world diplomacy. Generally pictured as a show of strength, it should rather be appraised as a bold attempt on the part of a comparatively weak nation to keep all powerful, potential aggressors at a safe distance.

So arrogant did the Monroe Doctrine appear to the Holy Alliance powers that Metternich called it "an indecent declaration," and Bismarck, "a diplomatic impertinence."

Not over 12,000,000 people inhabited the United States at that time; its great economic potentialities were just beginning to be developed; it did not have an army or navy of any importance. Unsure of its ability to meet European nations in a cold test of arms, the United States used to the utmost the diplomatic weapon of the Monroe Doctrine. Its purpose was not to invite a test of strength but to avoid one.

When the Truman Doctrine was formulated in March 1947 it was said that it meant an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to the world at large.

For a moment it appeared so but it was soon transformed as the Marshall plan was, into a negotiated affair with the European nations and finally has evolutionized into what we see today, a peacetime Atlantic alliance to depend, incredible as it may be, on American lend-lease military supplies and on the protection of the armed forces of the United States.

All potential aggressors knew exactly what would confornt them if they violated the Monroe Doctrine, and so would take no chances. For the potential aggressors of our times, it was always a matter of speculation whether the United States would fight in Europe or not; so they assumed it would not, and when opportunity for profitable aggression beckoned, they took the chance.

Even de-isolated Uncle Sam might still have prevented two world wars if he had preserved at least his century-old Monroe grand strategy.

It seems to me that besides the no-meddling-in-Europe clear implication of the Monroe Doctrine there is another basic difference between that doctrine and the one that the United States is now evolving for Europe.

President Monroe deliberately refused to enter into any negotiations or even into a joint declaration with Britain or with any other European nation.

The plan for a joint British-American declaration was Prime Minister George Canning's idea as we all know. So it was carefully weighed by the American Government and rejected. Jefferson and Madison were for it. But Secretary Adams was adamant; he refused to have the United States involved in any European commitment in safeguarding the security of this Nation and of this continent. Monroe followed Adams' advice and so the Monroe Doctrine became a unilateral declaration with no entanglement or commitment to any nation; to be used, as Secretary of State Calhoun said, "As the political interests of the country advised."

Any treaty or commitment would have forced this Nation to accept a foreign interpretation of the doctrine. Being unilateral only the Government of the United States had the right to say when and how the Monroe Doctrine should be brought into action.

Quite different from the Atlantic alliance where there are 11 governments which in due time may claim that any threat real or not or any provoked aggression is a case to bring the alliance into effect and put the United States on the spot.

President Monroe did not consult or negotiate with any of the Latin-American nations which the doctrine was going to protect against alien encroachments.

He did not summon the Foreign Affairs Committee of Congress.

He did not request any legislative authorization or indorsement.

He did not talk of military or economic help to any nation.

There was no Monroe plan nor a Monroe alliance.

His declaration was nothing but a declaration, no pact, no law, no Congress approval, no treaty; it created no obligation on the part of this Nation toward anybody but unto herself.

The doctrine as Wilson said was unilateral proclaimed by the United States on its own authority it has been and shall always be maintained its sole responsibility.

Monroe said that he would consider "dangerous to our peace and safety any attempt on the part of the European powers to extend their systems to any portion of this hemisphere"; he stamped as a manifestation of unfriendly disposition toward the United States any interposition for the purpose of oppressing the Latin-American nations or controlling any other manner their destiny by any European power.

That extremely simple insertion in a current Presidential message to Congress worked for over a century and it worked 100 percent.

It completely achieved its purpose of protecting the United States' flank against powerful potential European enemies.

It gave the Latin-American Republics their chance to freely carve out their own destiny.

It sharply deflected from this hemisphere all new colonizing drives.

Now, what the United States is trying to do for the western European nations today is exactly what she endeavored to do and did during 126 years, for the other nations of this continent.

In both cases, furthermore, the United States were concerned with their own security.

Why then could not a simple stern, American-like declaration work today as it worked 126 years ago?

At the time of Monroe this Nation had 12,000,000 inhabitants and no military power of any kind to face even one of the European nations which received the warning.

Today, it has all the power necessary to back a declaration effectively.

If Monroe had negotiated his doctrine within this Nation and with other nations he would surely have become involved in the same troubles that the Atlantic alliance is having, and will bring and would have meant all kinds of economic and military commitments as this Nation is now assuming.

Mr. MALONE. The Monroe Doctrine simply and briefly left with the United States of America the decision, which we always have made, throughout our 173 years of existence, that we go to war only when our peace and safety are threatened, and that we are the sole judges, under the Monroe Doctrine, when such peace and safety are threatened.

While under the North Atlantic Pact, we would divide that responsibility with 12 European nations. There will be 12 separate nations that, not only will be the judge of whether their peace and safety are threatened, but automatically our peace and safety is assumed to be threatened, and we must then come to their assistance.

In other words, we can, according to the pact, judge how best to help them but it can only lead to one thing, and that is a contest at arms.

I consider the North Atlantic Pact to be one of the most useless treaties we have ever considered, and to be a most dangerous and most radical departure from what constitutes the main duty of this body, which is to protect and promote the legitimate interests and the security of this Nation. Yet I would consider its ratification worth while, if that would solve the great problem which is facing humanity at this moment, the problem of giving back to the American people the management of their foreign policy.

This country was made by the people. They succeeded in everything except in the matter of foreign policy. Why? Because the people were bypassed in that field. Their rights were usurped. If the people had been informed and given a chance, then this Nation would not have been dragged from one emergency to another in the morass of this pact.

Do we realize that actually fewer men are shaping and formulating the carrying on of foreign policies of the United States than are in the Kremlin at Moscow? At least there are 13 or 14 men in the Politburo. Whereas when four men in Washington even commit this Nation to an irrevocable policy with respect to Europe for the next 20 years, and, when these four men agree, the policy becomes bipartisan, if you please, according to an ill-timed concept of the work of the United States Senate, then the whole weight of the machinery of the Government of the two parties goes into action, backed up by the press and by powerful public declarations. To dissent then is heresy, and the people, uninformed and confused, have to bow to the inexorable.

I feel a deep responsibility for what is happening today in the Senate. I feel responsible because I am unable to convince my colleagues of the perils involved in the surrender of the freedom of action of the Government of the United States; of the perils that their pact involves; of the surrender it means. I am so certain that I am right in opposing this strange European document baptized as a North Atlantic defense pact, that I must admit that it is only because of the failure of the opposition to make its point clear that this vote is going the way it is going: against the United States of America and against the New World.

I said a few days ago that this was the culmination of a plan. I am afraid that unless the American people wake up, it will not be the culmination. Fortunately the American conscience is awakening. We must beware from now on. There is an angry wave of public opinion rising against these un-American policies. They want to know why this Nation cannot have a foreign policy of its own. Why we were led from UNRRA to Bretton Woods; from Bretton Woods to the $3,000,000,000 loan to England; from the loan to England to the Truman doctrine; from the Truman doctrine to the Marshall plan; from the Marshall plan to the Atlantic alliance while always told again and again that those were the last commitments and the last dollars. From Atlantic alliance we are being led now to a new armaments lend lease to Europe which the Secretary of State announced yesterday will be soon sent to Congress.

The angry wave is rising, gentlemen. This day of joy on this floor is of sorrows in millions of humble homes all over this country. Here are the applauses; there the bells are tolling. Here the flag is up; in millions of American houses and hearts the flag is at half mast. This twentieth of July may go down in history as the day of American dependence just as the fourth was the day of independence 173 years ago. This angry wave of public opinion is not against internationalism; far from that their aim is an effective internationalism to take the place of mere Europeanism which is all that our foreign policy means at this moment.

It is a wave based also on the conviction that the best and only way to serve the world is to keep this Nation safe and strong and secured. We are doing absolutely the opposite today gentlemen.

ONE PART OF A PROGRAM OF FIVE PARTS

The North Atlantic Pact is only one part of a five part administration hybrid national and international program that will average the wage-living standard of living of this Nation with the low-wage living standards and slave labor of the Asiatic and European countries. The complete program includes: The North Atlantic Pact, the Marshall-ERP-ECA plan, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the International Trade Organization, the "Bold new program"—point 4 of the President's announcement.

This entire Administration program together with a suggested alternate American program is fully outlined in my address and debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 12, 1949.

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

Mr. DONNELL. I yield myself 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] referred at the outset of his remarks to what he termed "superficially persuasive reservations." He then proceeded to discuss the happenings with respect to Senate Resolution 239, which was adopted on July 11, 1948. I understood him to say, in substance, that at that time the only reservation made by the Senate, when it adopted Senate Resolution 239, was as to whether the provision regarding advice which was contained in it was satisfactorily followed by the President in the negotiations which ensued. I disagree most emphatically with the statement made by the Senator from Michigan, and I quote from his own language as it appeared on that date. Said he:

> Repeatedly I have insisted that we must be perfectly sure that when we exercise the advice function in respect to the advice to the President on this subject, we are not yielding any of our subsequent consent prerogative. So far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, he completely disagrees with any assertion that the exercise of the advice functions is a surrender of the consent function.

It is true he said the following, which I think in fairness to him should be included:

> I hope there will be no misunderstanding about the nature of the resultant obligation. I do not think the situation remains entirely as it was before we acted. I think we have emphasized our very deep interest in exploring any regional arrangements which may be made, from the standpoint of our own national security. I think that carries with it the implication that if we find it to be to the advantage of our national security, we shall be very definitely sympathetic with the objectives. At that point we shall assess the situation from the standpoint of our own national security, and make our decision accordingly.

Mr. President, this differs very materially from the announcement made today by the Senator from Michigan that the only reservation made by the Senate was whether the advice contained in Senate Resolution 239 was satisfactorily followed.

I desire to address myself briefly to the importance of attaching reservations to the treaty. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has very very clearly pointed out, as I see it, the tremendous importance of the reservation which has been offered by himself and two other Senators and which is now before us, with respect to article 3. In that connection, I should like to refer to the letter written by Charles Evans Hughes, back in 1919 when, referring to the League of Nations, he said:

> The proposed covenant should be viewed as a mere beginning, and while it is important that we should have a beginning, it is equally important that we should not make a false start.

So, Mr. President, I submit that it is important here that we make no false start.

It has been suggested that there are various objections to reservations. The experience of our country, to my mind, with respect to reservations, does not make valid that point in opposition to them. In the first place, it is perfectly clear that it is important to have a definite understanding at the time we enter into the pact as to what our obligations under it may be. Obviously, it is also perfectly clear that abroad it is understood in one way, and upon the floor of the Senate it is understood by some Senators in one way and by other Senators in another way.

In the Washington Post this morning I find that Foreign Minister Robert Schuman told the French Cabinet today that he was confident the United States would supply arms aid to western Europe to put teeth into the Atlantic Pact. I read:

> Schuman said American aid would be a "natural sequel" to the pact. He added he attached "the highest importance" to President Truman's proposal to Congress for a $1,450,000,000 appropriation to put teeth into the pact.
>
> The Foreign Affairs Committee of the Council of the Republic, corresponding to a senate, voted 16 to 1 tonight for ratification.
>
> Debate will start in the Chamber of Deputies Friday morning and a vote is expected late Saturday night.

Mr. President, it is of the highest importance to have a clear and definite statement in our own minds and in the minds of the other signatories as to what article 3 of the treaty means. It may be thought by some persons that the reservations—and I may say I am not a party to the reservations, but I shall vote for this reservation, and I shall vote against the treaty, even though the reservation be adopted—it may be thought by some persons that the reservations, including this one, are but a means to kill the treaty. If the treaty means anything other than what is in the first reservation, I, for one, do not want to enter the pact. Indeed, I do not want to enter it at all, and, as I have indicated, I shall so vote. But if it does not mean anything other than what is in the reservation, the other parties ought to agree promptly. Some may think that a reservation is but a device to kill a treaty. I have no doubt it has been used in that way in some instances, but the history of our country shows, for illustration, in a statement issued by Mr. Hoskins, of the Library of Congress, whose name has been featured in the debate several times—and if I had any later information I would give it—that 36 treaties with reservations were made by this country from August 4, 1821, to December 21, 1944, and of those treaties only 4 have failed to be subsequently entirely ratified and become effective. In other words, as to 32 out of 36 treaties, reservations certainly have not killed them. I do not know that the reservations in the 4 to which I have referred were or were not the cause of failure of complete ratification of the treaties, but, obviously, the fact is that 32 treaties out of 36 were not killed by reservations.

If we go back over the history of this country and see the great list of treaties which have been made, we find, for instance, the Jay treaty with Great Britain, made in 1794, involving commercial rights. It was a treaty by which Great Britain surrendered western military posts. It provided also for the settlement of revolutionary war debts, for seizure during the war, and other subjects. The Jay treaty had one or more reservations, I am not sure how many. There was certainly one reservation; and yet the treaty was ratified.

The treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo with Mexico, was entered into on February 2, 1848. It arose out of the Mexican War, and by it the United States received all the southwestern part of the United States. It had one or more reservations, and that treaty was ratified.

The treaty with regard to the Gadsden Purchase, which the Senate will recall as having been entered into with Mexico on December 30, 1853, and which pertained to the acquisition of a part of southern California, had a reservation. It was ratified and went into full effect. When we reach the debate on the subject of the tidelands, we shall find that the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo will feature very interestingly on that point.

The treaty with Great Britain, entered into on January 11, 1809, which settled the boundary between the United States and Canada, had a reservation, but it went into effect.

The treaty with Denmark with respect to the Danish West Indies, had a reservation and went into effect.

So, Mr. President, the thought which may enter the minds of some persons with respect to the possibility of reservations killing a treaty is not sound and is not justified by the history of the United States.

I am against this pact, as I have said, outright. I am against it no matter if every reservation before us shall be adopted. There are numerous reasons for my position. I have attempted to set them forth. I have appeared too extensively on the floor of the Senate, and I shall not now trespass on its time for more than a few moments.

One of the reasons for my opposition to the ratification of the pact is that it is a compact which runs for 20 years—20 long years—without the slightest opportunity on the part of our country to withdraw, no matter what the eventualities may be. We are in it for 20 years, no matter whether France or Italy shall become communistic in time. Notwithstanding the assurances given by the Senator from Michigan, I say those countries likewise stay within the confines of the treaty for 20 years. It is unwise for this country to enter into an obligation which binds it for 20 long years without the slightest possibility of becoming released from it. If this treaty shall be ratified, I, for one, cannot possibly escape the somber thought that our country has mortgaged itself for a vague, indeterminate sum, probably increasing year after year over the period

of 20 years. I cannot escape the thought that from then on, instead of having a clear balance sheet, without contingent liabilities of this kind, we shall have contingent liabilities of almost virtually unlimited and certainly indeterminate amounts.

We are going into a contract which should cause every man, woman, and child with the power of understanding to feel appalled—yes; I mean appalled—at the nature of the obligations it entails. The obligations enter not merely the field of economics, but they go to the extent of affecting the very question of human lives and happiness—yes; perhaps even the life of our Republic—if we should become involved in wars because of the ambitions of some rulers in Europe, by reason of the difficulties and controversies which have pervaded those countries for thousands of years. Our boys and girls may lose their lives as a result of it. They will be mute and dead because of the folly of our becoming a party to this agreement.

Mr. President, there has been argument with respect to article 3. I again point out the vagueness of it, and yet the clarity of it, from one standpoint, that it does impose this vast, indeterminate contract involving an unlimited amount which we cannot anticipate or prophesy.

Then we come to article 5. We were told by the Senator from Michigan this morning that half-truths are dangerous, and I agree with that statement. It calls to mind the article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat which was read a few days ago with reference to an address delivered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as to which the article said:

> Senator CONNALLY pulled out all the stops in a 9,000-word concert appealing for Senate ratification of the Atlantic Pact. He stated the obvious, irrefutable arguments, and then some.

I pause, Mr. President, to say that the St. Louis Globe-Democrat is in favor of ratifying the treaty; and yet it says:

> Our automatic involvement in big-scale foreign wars is the fundamental fact of the treaty; without that fact—stated or implied—European nations would not be interested in it. The pact should be sold to the American people on that basis.

I do not see the Senator from Michigan on the floor at the moment. But the Senator is right and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat is right when it says that half-truths are not enough. I read further:

> If they will not accept it in its true meaning, now is the time for them to say so.

So, Mr. President, I say that the half-truths point made by the Senator from Michigan is strikingly borne out by this important and strong editorial in this great metropolitan newspaper from my own State.

Mr. President, in addition to the obligations which I have pointed out, however, we are told that this treaty is the best possible deterrent to war. We have argued that up one side and down the other. I say now, as I have said more than once on this floor, that whether it is or is not a deterrent to war is entirely a matter of speculation, and one man's guess on this floor is pretty nearly as good as another man's guess, because every Senator has intelligence and patriotism and zeal and ardor for our country. But no human being can tell whether this pact will act as a deterrent to war, or whether it will result as Viscount Grey pointed out, as has been mentioned in the previous debates in the Senate, with respect to the agreements which had been entered into in Europe prior to the First World War. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], now presiding over the Senate, will, I trust, remember the words of Viscount Grey, that every country had been piling up armaments and making preparations for war. The object in each case, the viscount said, had been security, and he said the effect had been precisely the contrary of what was intended and desired.

Mr. President, I wish to submit in conclusion——

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

Mr. DONNELL. I yield myself one more minute.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to yield back to the Senator 5 minutes he has previously offered to yield to me.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. I shall take but a moment or two.

I wish to say, with the utmost power that I possess, that I think our joining in this pact is a departure from the uniform policy of our country, except in the case of the agreement made at Rio de Janeiro, and the Chapultepec agreement made prior thereto. I approach with fear and trembling this departure from a policy of 160 years, or thereabouts, of our national history, violating, as this treaty does, the fundamental principles laid down by the father of his country, George Washington, violating the principles laid down by Thomas Jefferson, which have been quoted in this debate, and violating the principles laid down by John Marshall, later to become, as he did, the Chief Justice of the United States. I approach it with the fear that our country is committing itself so that from now on, and for 20 long years—and some of us may not be here, may not be alive, 20 years from now—no matter what happens, every morning and every evening during that period when we pick up the newspaper and read what is occurring in the world, we must realize that every cloud across the sky, every cloud across the economic sky, every cloud in Europe, every danger, every threat, every difference of opinion between European nations, may develop into a conflict in which we may become involved under the terms of the contract which we are so solemnly entering into.

Mr. President, we have spoken here about the effect on lives. Going back for a moment to the material features, if I were the Secretary of State of this Government—I shall never be so honored, I know, but if I were—and I were called upon to make any international agreement contemplated by this treaty, I would not know, in a great majority of the cases, whether the international engagement before me for consideration could safely be entered into, on economic matters, or any type of matters, which some one of the 11 nations or all of them might bring up, after the negotiation of the international arrangement, and whether I shall say, "This violates the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty."

We might ourselves come to the conclusion, on further reflection, that we had overlooked something. In order that we may be sure that nobody could make such a contention, and make it properly, before we entered into international engagements, even on purely material subjects, the Secretary of State, in order to be absolutely safe, would have to exhibit to all the members of the North Atlantic Pact a proposed engagement.

Mr. President, it would appear to me that we are going into something that is the wildest type of vagary. Bearing in mind the traditions of our country, bearing in mind the freedom which we now have, bearing in mind the opportunities which America has, bearing in mind the young manhood and womanhood who will be involved, bearing in mind the material aspects, bearing in mind the spiritual values, it is beyond me how any Senate of the United States can vote to tie us up for 20 long years, without any opportunity of withdrawing.

I appreciate that doubtless this treaty will be ratified this afternoon, but I think that if we ratify it today, we will be making the mistake of our lives, and I most earnestly hope that every Senator who is wavering on the problem, if there be any such, will give consideration to the thoughts I have tried to express.

I pray that this flag of ours which is behind the Presiding Officer may not suffer dishonor, may not suffer loss, by reason of our going into this treaty. I hope that if we go into it, it will justify the expectations of its proponents, but I fear that if we go into it we will be encompassing our country with dangers, with a series of obligations which may prove destructive even of the high purposes of our Nation.

Mr. President, I inquire how much more time our side has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The Chair is advised that the Senator's side has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. DONNELL. Very well. To the Senator from Vermont I yield 5 minutes.

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

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am grateful for an opportunity to express very briefly and finally the reasons why I cannot vote for the Atlantic Pact.

The principal value of the pact is that it gives expression to a national interest in the freedom of western Europe which we must recognize and assert. In the treaty this national interest is so tied up with procedures, with rearming other

nations, with prospective huge expenditures, and with many other dubious commitments, that its simple, fundamental purpose is buried and sunk.

Senate Resolution 134 would have been infinitely preferable. Recognizing, however, that the Senate is expected to ratify the treaty, but that a real opportunity for orderly thought and action exists in connection with the rearmament program, it has seemed wise not to press Senate Resolution 134, but to ask for the earnest consideration of this body of Senate Resolution 133 when the subject matter thereof comes before us.

The dangers in this treaty are numerous. They have been pretty well discussed. I shall briefly recapitulate a few of them.

The treaty reemphasizes the mistaken notion as to the location of the real battlefield in this war. That battlefield is in the minds and hearts of men. Russia has no reason to resort to arms unless she is defeated on her present battlefield. It is proper for us to have our guns cleaned and oiled and our powder dry for military warfare, but the chances are that we will not face the enemy on the military battlefield.

Pursuing this false concept as to the deployment of the enemy force, we have in this measure a new outlet through which ultimate billions will flow to the further weakening of our weakening economy and to the further calm content of the watchful gentleman behind the iron curtain. Fiscal chaos and resulting unemployment constitute the troubled waters in which the enemy is most successful in fishing for its moral and mental support.

It is a fallacious and unsupportable argument that this treaty supports, or in spirit has any relation to, the United Nations. It is an alternative action resorted to as a result of failure in the fundamental purpose of the United Nations. This is no subsidiary crisis or situation. This is the thing itself for which the United Nations is formed.

When it comes to the rearmament program, we will have the opportunity either in Senate Resolution 133 or in some useful and well-thought-out modification thereof to bring such armed support as is advisable back into the procedure and structure which was devised for the United Nations. We can strengthen that organization instead of supplanting it. We can thereby strengthen the ideals and the intangibles instead of permeating them with the cancerous infection of unrestrained and sole reliance on arms programs which may not develop toward the trillions.

Mr. President, never in the three sessions of which I have been a Member of this Congress have I seen a measure more regretfully supported by its friends than is the Atlantic Pact. I shall vote unregretfully for rejection.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I yield the remaining portion of the time of the opponents to the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have stated for the RECORD many of the reasons why I think reservations to the treaty should be adopted. I do not expect to convert anyone here today to my views unless he is already converted to my way of thinking regarding the necessity for making it clear what we understand this treaty to mean. Otherwise my remarks will probably be only for the RECORD.

There has been much discussion of the treaty. We have heard much talk on the need for reservations, or concerning the damage they may do if we adopt them. It seems to me we should keep in mind what the treaty means in its underlying philosophy, and see whether or not the reservation we are proposing interferes with that at all.

The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan said that we must not undermine the fundamental philosophy of the pact. I am wondering in what way and in what respect the reservation to article 3 proposed by the distinguished Senators from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and by myself would in any way undermine it.

I have investigated the record somewhat with respect to how this treaty was prepared, and I think we should keep that matter in mind as a part of the history which will aid those who at some time will be required to interpret it. We here may understand it clearly. The senior Senator from Michigan and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and other Senators may understand what they think the pact means. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has written into its report what it thinks the treaty means, and has given us an interpretation; but I point out here and now that such interpretations are in no way binding upon the other parties to the pact, either upon Canada or upon the 10 nations in Europe. What they think about it is important, and what they understand it to mean is important, and the only way we can give our meaning, our interpretation, if there is any doubt with respect to it, is to write it in a reservation, or a declaration as the Senator from Nebraska wants to call it. We can do it in no other way. The other countries are not bound by anything we say in our reports or anything we say in the Senate. They are bound only by a reservation or something that is put in the resolution of ratification which will be of equal dignity with the treaty itself. That is why it is necessary to have a reservation put in the treaty so as to clarify its meaning.

How do other countries understand article 3, which we have been talking about? I have before me now a dispatch sent to the New York Times from Paris under date of July 20. It is headed:

Schuman sees United States military aid for France as natural consequence of pact approval.

PARIS, July 20.—Speaking to the French Cabinet today of the expected ratification of the North Atlantic pact by the United States Senate tomorrow, Foreign Minister Robert Schuman said that military aid by the United States to the European signatories seemed a natural consequence of that ratification.

The same contention was made today in a report of the Foreign Affairs Committee to the National Assembly. The report, quoting the United States State Department, said that although the pact and the military assistance plan had been separately conceived, they were based on the same principles and were complementary.

I think we have had that discussed more or less in the Senate before now.

"In recommending the ratification [of the pact], the Government takes account of the need of the material and financial aid of the United States for our national defense," said the report. "In voting ratification, the Assembly will say that this aid is one of the indispensable elements in the efficacy of the North Atlantic Treaty."

Let me repeat those words:

one of the indispensable elements in the efficacy of the North Atlantic Treaty—

I continue reading:

and of the common defense of the western European countries. It will say that this aid should enable France to bear the effort that will be imposed by putting in order her national defense without endangering her economic stability or her financial recovery.

That is what is being said over there now. That has been said by the Foreign Minister of France, Mr. Schuman, and we have concurrence in that view by the Foreign Relations Committee of the French National Assembly. That is what they understand the treaty to mean.

Someone may want to quibble over the word "natural," and may say "well it grows out of it." They are saying in effect that it is a consequence, it is complementary to it, it is a part thereof, and of the whole understanding. Without military aid, they are telling us in that diplomatic language, the pact will be worthless. There must be something there to implement it, and to put them in position to defend themselves.

Another circumstance which will aid us to interpret the pact, as to what it means and what the other countries think it means is this: We should keep in mind that when the pact was signed the foreign ministers of the nations who came here to sign it were on hand the next morning with specifications and with applications for military aid. They did not present them before the pact was signed. Oh, no, they did not present them before it was signed. But immediately upon its being signed, they presented the specifications and applications. Most of them were specifications covering what they need. The natural inference is that that presentation grew out of what they thought they had agreed to in the pact.

Then we have the dispatch which has been called to the attention of the Senate previously, which came from Denmark—I think the dispatch was placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] a few days ago—in which it was said that that Government considered the pact and the contract to be entered into as a sort of a bank account on which they could begin to write checks. That is the way they understood it over there. That is the feeling they have. Yet we say here it does not mean that at all; that there is no moral or legal commitment.

Before I close I desire to call attention to one other thing connected with the matter of reservations. It has been indicated here that we are going to do irreparable damage to the treaty if we adopt some reservations. If Senators will look

at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday they will find in the speech I delivered then that I pointed out the numerous times reservations have been written into treaties in the past few years; in fact, the majority of treaties have contained reservations. The other signatory countries are not going to hesitate to write reservations into this treaty if they deem it necessary to do so in order to clear up some of the points in the treaty.

The same dispatch from Paris, from which I have just read, contains this statement:

The committee—

Referring to the French Foreign Relations Committee—

proposed that the French ratification act should include a provision that an invitation to any additional state to join the pact must be sanctioned by an act of Parliament.

The committee held that such an invitation would amount to making a new treaty. There has been concern in France lest the pact be extended to include Spain or Germany.

They are going to protect that situation, and they propose a reservation. Do not be surprised if from the parliaments of Europe which have not already acted upon the treaty a number of reservations are submitted. Are we going to turn the treaty down if reservations are attached? I am certain that we will not. They will aid in clarifying the meaning.

It has been said to us, with reference to the matter of taking in additional nations, that none can be taken in without the consent of all members of the pact. But apparently France wants to be sure of that fact, and so that nation is apparently preparing such a reservation, and she might adopt it.

I call attention to this so that we may see clearly that there is no reason on principle why we should not interpret this pact by the necessary and proper reservations. I believe that the one which has been submitted to interpret article 3 is clear. In principle it has been agreed to by the proponents of the treaty. They have used the very same argument—that we are not bound morally or legally to furnish arms or armaments—as a reason why we ought to ratify the pact. That has been in all their arguments. Mr. Justice Hughes pointed out in his letter to Senator HALE that when that happens, and the proponents rely on such reasons, there can be no good reason for not writing those reasons into a reservation. If it be true that the other nations understand it as we do, why on earth should they object?

Senators will remember that when I asked the junior Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES] whether the principles contained in the reservation which I read to him represented his understanding of what the pact meant he said, "Yes." That was the reservation which I proposed to article 3. It has been reworded, but it is substantially the same as what I read to him at that time. He agreed that it represented the correct interpretation of the pact. At least, the pact did not include the things which I placed in the reservation, which should be excluded.

Mr. President, I intend to speak later during the day when reservations may be offered, but I do not intend to say anything more about the reservation which I have submitted to article 3. However, I invite the attention of Senators to what I said last night, after some intense preparation on the subject. I think it outlines a new approach. It points out to us why article 5 should be looked into with greater care than has been exercised by Senators who have been debating this question.

To me article 5 is the heart of the pact. I have said—and I want Senators to think about this—that if we adopt the pact without certain reservations, either as I have proposed them, or in substance, we are cutting the heart out of the Constitution. I think it goes to one of the great fundamental principles. I shall discuss that question later this afternoon.

Mr. President, I feel that in the interest of good will and understanding with our fellow members in the pact, we should clarify any indefinite, vague language, so that there will be no misunderstandings in the future. This will aid good will. It will aid in the direction of peace. If we adopt a reservation of this kind, it will not prevent us from doing any of the things we want to do, but it will say in unmistakable language that we are under no legal or moral obligation to do those things by reason of the treaty.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, how much time have we left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, as appears on page 9800 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I made the following statement:

I was very greatly interested, as was the Senator from New Hampshire, in the very beautiful and eloquent address delivered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. I notice his emphasis in the concluding portion, and at other places in his address, upon the idea of one God. I should like to ask him a question, and that is whether or not he knows if the word "God," or any synonym of Deity, was mentioned from the beginning to the end of the solemn ceremony of the signing of this treaty for 12 nations by 24 men, except the one concluding sentence or two in the remarks of the representative of the Netherlands, which reads:

"And so with the humble prayer for God's merciful blessing, I declare the Netherlands Government's readiness to sign this treaty for peace."

My attention has been very kindly called by the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] to the fact that, in addition to the sentence quoted by me from the remarks of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, there appears in the remarks of Carlo Sforza, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Italy, a sentence reading as follows:

We must pray to God that this pact will prove to be like the English Magna Carta: on one side intangible, on the other side a continuous creation.

I have also noted that, in addition to the sentence quoted by me from the remarks of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, the Minister also said:

We shall sign with a clear conscience in the face of God.

I call attention also to the fact that in the remarks of Joseph Bech, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Luxemburg, on that occasion appears this paragraph:

Nothing proves better this ineluctable solidarity of the destinies of our countries than the fact that the United States, breaking with a tradition two centuries old, is concluding a military alliance in peacetime. That is an event of extraordinary historical significance for the United States and of the utmost importance for Europe.

Mr. President, how much more time have I?

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

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has at his disposal the time from now until 2 o'clock.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we are approaching the final consideration of the treaty called the North Atlantic Pact. It is a treaty of sovereign nations, to preserve their security and independence, not by war, but by means which they believe will prevent war.

I am gratified that in this country treaties cannot be ratified except with Senate approval. In the olden days the treaty-making function was purely one of royalty, of monarchs, sovereigns who handed out in the form of treaties their commitments, without reference to the authority of the people themselves. It is specified in the treaty that this Government and other signers of the treaty shall follow democratic processes—not always in the same way, but that they will follow the constitutional requirements of their respective countries.

Mr. President, this treaty has been attacked on many grounds, one of which is that it is violative of our obligations under the United Nations Charter. I challenge any Senator to find in this treaty anything that is hostile to the provisions of the United Nations Charter. On the other hand, I insist that in a number of its provisions it sincerely and earnestly proclaims its allegiance to the United Nations Charter, and specifies that it is not in conflict therewith.

Let me say to the Senate that this treaty is primarily based upon what is contained in article 51 of the United Nations Charter, that nothing in the United Nations Charter shall impair the inherent right of nations to provide for individual or collective self-defense. In other words, the United Nations Charter recognizes that there is an area into which it cannot obtrude itself, and that is the inherent right—not a right secured from the United Nations, not a right granted by any other governmental power, but an inherent right—to individual or collective self-defense.

We all know that self-defense is one of the most vital and inherent principles in our private life as well as in our governmental relations and obligations. The right of a man to defend his home or his person against violence and attack is absolutely fundamental. It is the purpose of this treaty to permit free

nations to preserve their freedom against invasion and aggression by those who would seek to overthrow their freedoms and substitute slavery and chains.

All of us are aware of the fact that since World War I our American foreign relations have expanded until now they touch and relate to many nations in remote and distant parts of the world. This treaty is a significant contribution to that field. It proclaims our own adherence to the rights of free peoples to defend themselves, and it ought to, and I believe it will, carry to the other nations of the world assurance of our position on all these fundamental questions.

Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Missouri has just left the Chamber. I hope he will be called back. I shall discuss another matter for the present.

Most of the heat of the attack on the treaty is based upon complaints about article 3. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has quite amply discussed that particular article of the treaty, but I wish to advert to it briefly at this time.

What does article 3 provide? Let us read it. I hope the Senator from Ohio will return to the Chamber a little later, because I shall advert to some of his views.

Article 3 provides:

> In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

Mr. President, what is wrong with that article? If we are to preserve the integrity of these nations, do we not desire that they will develop their individual and collective power to resist attack? Do we wish to weaken them? Do we wish to discourage them? Or do we wish to do what we think is possible and desirable from the standpoint of giving them resistance and strength to maintain their democracy and to maintain their freedom?

But it is said that under article 3 we are obligated to furnish arms. Mr. President, we are not specifically obligated to furnish anything. There is nothing in the treaty that says we shall give them tanks or bombs or arms. There is an obligation upon the United States—and I do not seek to avoid it—to consider what, in the view of our honest judgment and our sincerity, it would be desirable for us to do to bring about fulfillment of the objectives stated in article 3. In other words, after the treaty has been ratified, if the other nations request arms and point out their reasons and their situation and their inability to provide themselves with arms, then it would be for the people of the United States, through the Congress, to determine whether it was desirable or suitable, under article 3, to give or to furnish them arms.

Senators feel sensitive about the matter of providing arms. Will not the Congress have to be the one to decide whether to provide them? Will not Senators who now are in the Senate Chamber be here then? Are Senators afraid to trust future Congresses? Do they wish to tie the hands of future Congresses and make a pronouncement that would embarrass a future Congress if it were to consider the matter of giving or withholding arms? I believe the Congress can be trusted. The Congress is being trusted now in connection with this treaty. Cannot we trust future Congresses in regard to the granting of arms? I shall refer to that matter a little later.

I note that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has returned to the Chamber. Mr. President, I remember, if I am not in error, that when Senate Resolution 239 was before the Senate, the eminent Senator from Missouri supported it. Did he mean what he said when he then said, in language almost identical, I think, to the language of the present treaty, that the Congress approved—

> (3) Association of the United States, by constitutional process,

Which is what we are doing in connection with this treaty—

> with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, and as affect its national security.

If that doctrine was good a year ago, why is not it good now?

That resolution also provided:

> (4) Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security.

Why should the Senator from Missouri have changed his views on this subject? Why has he reconsidered his judgment? Why is not the doctrine which was good a year ago, good now?

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], with a great deal of unction declared that under article 3 there is an obligation. Of course there is an obligation. I have never said there was not an obligation. There is no detailed obligation to furnish any particular thing, but there is an obligation for the United States to give honest, forthright, and sincere consideration to what may be needed on the part of other governments which cannot themselves supply what they need to contribute to the maintenance of their power of self-defense and the accomplishment of the purpose of this treaty.

Senators are afraid of giving arms to other nations. Did they not vote for arms for Greece? Although I have not consulted the record, yet I am sure I am correct when I say that both the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] voted for arms for Greece. I do not know what position the Senator from Utah took in that connection. Did not those Senators vote to give arms to Greece, to enable Greece to protect her independence and to drive out those who were coming there from other countries and interfering with her internal affairs? Mr. President, the Senate voted for arms for Greece, and Congress undertook to supply those arms to maintain her integrity and her independence.

What is the purpose of this treaty? Its purpose is to give arms wherever they may be necessary to preserve the independence and security of the countries involved. Where can we draw any hostile parallel between these situations?

The other day the Senator from Ohio said he voted to provide Greece and Turkey with arms, and that now he wishes to vote to provide more arms for China. We gave China approximately $2,000,000,000 for arms and ammunition. I have always been a friend of China. I regret the disasters which have befallen China and her nationalist government. The Senator from Ohio says that war is now going on in China; yet he is in favor of sending arms to China, thereby taking part in a domestic, civil war. I myself am not committed to that course; I am open to further considerations in regard to supplying arms, if the Chinese need them. But if it is all right to send arms to China in order to protect her independence and to preserve her security, why is it wrong to send arms, if need be, under a treaty with the 12 signatory powers? The whole point of the attack made by the Senator from Ohio relates to the subject of arms. The Congress will be the only authority that can grant arms. That question will be considered when the occasion arises. Senators will express themselves, Senators may vote against it. Senators may offer reservations. But that is a question the Congress is capable of deciding when and if it arises. We should not undertake now, without further information, to foreclose the action of the Congress on that subject when it becomes pertinent.

The Senator from Ohio says he favors an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to Europe. He wants to draw a line somewhere and declare that the Monroe Doctrine applies to Europe. The Monroe Doctrine has served magnificently in the cause of peace and in the preservation of the independence and security of the nations to the south of us, in Central and South America. Its principles and objectives I entirely approve. But let us see what the course recommended by the Senator from Ohio would be. The Senator is opposed to the North Atlantic Treaty. He would adopt a policy under which the United States would assume sole responsibility for the defense of Europe. We would have no treaty obligations with any European power to stand by our side. It would be a matter of our sole responsibility. We would have the help only of those nations or peoples that voluntarily might come to our rescue or aid. It would be a matter of our sole responsibility. Where would we get bases, if we acted alone, if we should march into Europe and say to these other nations, "You need not bother about this; it is our responsibility; the United States is going to defend Europe, on its own, unilaterally, without your cooperation, unless you see fit to stand by our side?" Where would we get bases in Europe? Where would we get bases in Iceland and in Greenland and in Denmark, if there is no obligation on the part of the nations concerned to aid us or to supply us?

Mr. President, the distinguished and able Senator from Ohio, for whom we all have a high regard, is opposed to sending

arms to the nations who are signatories to the treaty, to preserve their independence, their integrity, and their security. But he is in favor of sending American boys with arms in their hands to Europe to establish a European Monroe Doctrine. The Senator from Ohio says he is in favor of defending Norway and Denmark. He then says that their defense—and I quote him—"is probably impossible." Yet under his theory of the Monroe Doctrine we would be required to undertake the defense of Norway and Denmark. If we are to defend them, will it not be much more desirable that they stand by our side, furnish us bases, and render such assistance and cooperation as are within their power?

The Senator from Ohio says, "Take Italy for example." He says, "I see no way in which we can defend Italy." If there is no way to defend Italy, how are we going to defend it under the Monroe Doctrine? Would it not be of some help in the defense of Italy to have Italy's assistance? Would it not be well for Italy to cooperate with us as to strategic locations and bases? No, Mr. President, from my point of view, it is an illogical position the Senator from Ohio takes.

Furthermore, the assumption by the United States alone of the defense of Europe under the Monroe Doctrine would fall right into the line of Russian propaganda. Russia has been charging that under ECA and under the North Atlantic Pact the United States, which she claims is a great imperial power, will use the advantages we get from those organizations to take over responsibility for all these countries in Europe, subordinating them to our will, and forming a great alliance with the United States at its head. Would not our action in undertaking solely the defense of Europe fit the charges of imperialism made against us by the Russians—in this case taking over all 12 countries, they would say, without their help and without their request?

What about the satellite countries? We do not need to be told they will be armed by Russia, if they are not already armed by her, and that they will fight at the side of Russia whenever she makes war. At the present time, without a treaty, and without anything except the command of the dictator, they are already in an alliance to fight for and to protect and defend Russia. If it is all right for Russia to have such an arrangement, why is not the North Atlantic Pact justifiable when we proclaim within the treaty its peaceful purposes and its solely defensive purposes? We are not urging war.

But it is said, "Oh, it is a military alliance." Mr. President, it is an alliance in behalf of peace. When we speak of a military alliance we think of the classical examples of times that have passed, in which sovereigns or nations made treaties or agreements whereby they stood with each other, both offensively and defensively. The language of our first President, George Washington, in warning against entangling alliances, was inspired by the fact that in Europe at that very moment there were such alliances and treaty obligations among the European powers, looking to war and not to peace. It was a perfectly natural and wise admonition he gave his countrymen to abstain from alliances of that kind. But I contend this treaty has none of the qualities of the old-fashioned military alliances, most of which were for conquest. They were to build up the ambitions of the sovereigns of the respective countries. Members of the alliance were to stand together defensively and offensively.

It will be remembered that in World War I Italy had a treaty with the Central Powers, a treaty to go to war. The Central Powers complained bitterly because Italy did not respond when they asked her to join their side in the war. That is the kind of military alliance I think about. But I do not see that that in anywise approaches the principles or the obligations of the pending treaty.

What do we face in the pending issue? We all know that the Communist influences and the totalitarian powers have proclaimed their purpose, which is perfectly apparent, to conquer the world by their ideology. They do not say so, of course, but back of that is their armed might—bayonets, airplanes, and all the other instrumentalities of teriffic war. They propose to conquer the world. They wish to impose upon the world their ideas of government and their ideas of economics.

What does the destruction of democracy mean? How dreadful it is to contemplate the destruction of democracy in every country where it at present exists. The 12 countries that are associated together in this pact know that whenever and wherever the Russians or other totalitarian masters are able to do so they will crush democracy and place the citizens of those countries in chains and slavery. That means ultimately the United States. After they shall have picked off, one by one, the weaker nations, and have fortified their strength and increased the vast armies which they already possess, when they get more jet planes which fly so rapidly that they can scarcely be seen, when they build up their military strength sufficiently, they will say, with the Red army standing out in the wings, ready to rush to the scene when necessary, as they did in Czechoslovakia and in other countries, "Come over to this side."

If we permit the blocking off of nation after nation we may ultimately stand alone, seeking to preserve our democracy, our integrity as a nation, and our freedom. No, Mr. President, we cannot do that. The Russians look across those little countries and see the United States; they look past the shadows, and look at the United States and assail it with propaganda. What nation is more bitterly and constantly assailed over the air and in the press than is the United States? Every act of the United States for the nations of the world is construed to be imperialistic in nature. That is apparent to all who read or listen. We cannot afford to deny the nations of Europe which are signatories to this pact our cooperation and assistance and, if need be, our arms. Under article 5, if they are attacked by an armed force, we must go to their rescue and help to preserve their lives. The treaty gives substance, vitality, and encouragement to democracies. The doctrine of totalitarianism is hostile to and determined upon our destruction whenever that can be accomplished.

Mr. President, this is a contest between tyranny and freedom. It is a contest between slavery and democracy. Where do we want to stand on the question? Where shall we stand? We should stand on the side of freedom and democracy against the evil powers which seek to overthrow us.

The United States has had a career that will embellish the pages of history so long as men meditate upon the past. In a little nation of 3,000,000 souls, scattered along the Atlantic coast, our courageous forebears envisaged the accomplishment of liberty, freedom, and constitutional processes. They were successful in that great enterprise, and for 150 years we have grown in strength, resources, and in the admiration of the peoples of the world. We have attracted the adoration of men who love freedom, who look to the great symbol of our national strength with veneration, with love, and, sometimes, with tears.

The United States has been an outstanding champion of democracy and freedom everywhere on this revolving globe. We cannot surrender our position on that question, we cannot give it up; we must meet the responsibilities which face us. Those responsibilities are not confined by our borders. As a great Nation, as a great power, we have responsibilities beyond the surveyor's chain. We have responsibilities to other countries and peoples. We cannot wrap around ourselves the cloak of the publican and pass by on the other side of the street. We cannot do that. We must perform our obligations and our responsibilities.

When the United States was founded and finally established its freedom and independence, the impact within a few years reached across the Atlantic and profoundly affected the peoples of Europe, and the revolutionary movements which followed over the years were inspired by the example of the United States.

That same spirit leaped across the Atlantic Ocean again, and in Central and South America the people were moved to fight, and many of them shed their blood, in movements of freedom and independence. The same spirit swept across the western world. Bolivar, the great patriot of South America, followed the example of George Washington and other patriots who were associated with him, and independence was achieved.

In 1823 President Monroe proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine and asserted that no European or other power should invade the Western Hemisphere with a hostile purpose or with the purpose of establishing any part of their system. That was a world-moving declaration, which has been honored and venerated for 126 years. That doctrine has grown

in strength until it has become a part of the international law of the world. It was not set forth in a statute, but other nations respected it. Great Britain had to release her hold in Venezuela. The Holy Alliance had to give up its plans to reconquer Central and South America under the tyrannical masters it had known. The German Fleet vanished from Venezuela when the United States spoke with a voice of certainty and a voice of vigor.

Mr. President, shall we refuse to remain the champion of democracy and the rights of free peoples to survive without conquest and without being compelled to surrender their liberties? Shall we refuse to assist in preserving democracy and independence in Europe? Shall we decline to help weak and struggling nations to resist aggressors who have only swords in their hands and chains for their victims?

History records that when the Declaration of Independence was being considered in the Continental Congress, Benjamin Franklin said to Jefferson, John Hancock, and others:

> We must all hang together, or, most assuredly, we shall all hang separately.

In the world-wide fight of communism against democracy, the democracies must all hang together, or there is danger—I do not concede we shall be defeated—but there is danger to us all unless we hang together.

This treaty undertakes to tie the democratic free peoples of the world into an agreement whereby any invasion of their independence or their democracy or their integrity shall meet the determined resistance of the signatories to the treaty who have pledged their strengths, their resources, and their arms to the preservation of freedom, independence, and democracy.

Mr. President, this treaty has been considered for a long period of time, most laboriously and studiously, by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. That is a bipartisan committee. Both Democrats and Republicans are members of it. Never has there been any idea of partisanship suggested in the consideration by the committee, in the hearings, or in the deliberations on the treaty. In a treaty we cannot specify every detail that may occur in the future. To do so would tie the hands of the Congress. That would be seeking to establish here a dictatorship, as it were, over future Congresses. The obligations are plainly set forth in the treaty, and to the Congress itself must be remitted the matter of whatever we furnish under article 3 or under other articles of the treaty. I am willing to trust the Congress. Congress is where the Constitution puts the responsibility, and that is where we shall put it. I very much hope that the treaty will be ratified without hampering and crippling reservations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Committee of the Whole will rise and report the treaty to the Senate without amendment. The Secretary will report the treaty by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. Executive L, Eighty-first Congress, first session. The North Atlantic Treaty, signed in Washington on April 4, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The treaty is now before the Senate and is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the resolution of ratification will be reported to the Senate by the clerk, and it will be open to amendment.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein)*, That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive L, Eighty-first Congress, first session, the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Washington on April 4, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As announced the other day by the Chair, reservations to the resolution of ratification may be offered and debated, 10 minutes for and 10 minutes against, and then, when the hour of 5 o'clock arrives, voted on in the order of their presentation to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that only six reservations or amendments have been offered to the treaty?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk advises the Chair that that is true.

Mr. LUCAS. So, under the unanimous consent agreement entered into a few days ago, if no more than six reservations are offered, with 20 minutes' debate allowed on each reservation, 120 minutes or 2 hours, will be consumed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That seems to be correct. Of course, all the reservations which have been printed may not be offered. Moreover, further reservations may be offered which have not been printed.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that. What I am trying to do is to speculate a little on what may happen in the event we run out of reservations and amendments before 5 o'clock. Therefore I am going to offer a unanimous consent agreement to cover that sort of a contingency.

I ask unanimous consent that if the time allotted to debate upon reservations and amendments shall expire before 5 o'clock, whatever time remains shall be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the treaty itself, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a declaration in behalf of myself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. I ask that the clerk read it as it has been modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed reservation as modified will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert the following at the end of the resolution of ratification:

> The United States of America ratifies this treaty with the understanding that article 3 commits none of the parties thereto, morally or legally, to furnish or supply arms, armaments, military, naval or air equipment or military, naval, or air supplies, including atomic bombs and information relating to such bombs, to any other party or parties to this treaty.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the declaration as I had originally prepared it is now modified to include atomic bombs and information relating to such bombs, to be inserted in line 5, after the word "supplies", which meets the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Missouri relative to what might be included in arms, armaments, and weapons.

Mr. President, I now offer the amendment to the resolution of ratification, and I wish to emphasize that this declaration applies solely to article 3. Especially do I want to emphasize that after the observations made by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Once again, in order to make it crystal clear, the treaty is divided into two parts, a part for prepardedness against war, and a part which becomes operative after an attack .

Article 3 is in the preparedness category. Article 5 is in the part which becomes operative after an attack.

Article 9 creates a council representing all the parties to the treaty. The council is to consider plans for mutual aid in preparedness against attack, as outlined in article 3. The council is also to consider and recommend plans for carrying out article 5. But this declaration does not touch article 9 or article 5. It is a whole truth. It does exactly what I think the Members of the Senate should have an opportunity to do.

Is there any legal obligation under article 3 to provide arms prior to an attack? That is what the Senate should declare itself upon, that is the important issue here, that is where the confusion is, not only on the part of those who have made speeches on the Senate floor, in their comments on that particular issue, but certainly it is true of the leaders of the countries across the water which are signatories to the pact. As I have said, this declaration does not touch article 9 or article 5. It applies to the provisions of article 3, which provides for mutual aid prior to an attack.

Should a war start, the procedures defined in article 5 begin, but prior to an attack the council is directed to develop plans for defense in connection with article 5.

These distinctions are pointed out because there has been in the minds of Senators some confusion that the article applies both before and after an attack. The argument has been made that my declaration would have the Senate declare there is not a moral or legal obligation to provide arms at any time, so I want to clarify it, because the article does do exactly what I think the Members of the Senate should have an opportunity to do, namely, to decide now, before it is too late, what we mean in article 3, and the one thing we do not mean is that there is a moral or legal obligation connected with the provision of article 3. That is exactly what has been said. It was restated by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, it has been reemphasized by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations,

so why should we not include in a declaration attached to the resolution what we mean? It is in complete accord with the sentiments which have been expressed on the floor of the Senate.

Attempts have been made to make it appear that adoption of the declaration would nullify the treaty. That is not true. The sole intention of the declaration is to let the other parties to the treaty know that the United States understands that article 3 does not commit any of the parties to the furnishing of arms and armaments, military, naval, and air equipment, or supplies.

I wish to state that the confusion to which I have referred exists not only on the floor of the Senate, it is certainly in the minds of the leaders of the signatory powers. I have here the issue of the New York Times which has just come out:

PARIS, July 20.—Speaking to the French Cabinet today of the expected ratification of the North Atlantic Pact by the United States Senate tomorrow, Foreign Minister Robert Schuman said that military aid by the United States to the European signatories seemed a "natural consequence" of that ratification.

The same contention was made today in a report of the Foreign Affairs Committee to the National Assembly. The report, quoting the United States State Department, said that, although the pact and the military assistance plan had been separately conceived, they were based on the same principles and were complementary.

"In recommending ratification [of the pact], the Government takes account of the need of the material and financial aid of the United States for our national defense," said the report. "In voting ratification, the assembly will say that this aid is one of the indispensable elements in the efficacy of the North Atlantic Treaty and of the common defense of the western European countries. It will say that this aid should enable France to bear the effort that will be imposed by putting in order her national defense without endangering her economic stability or her financial recovery."

In the face of such a statement, in view of such an understanding, how can we as Members of the Senate ratify the treaty this afternoon without a declaration being contained in it which says unequivocally that there is no moral or legal obligation under article 3 to provide arms? I ask how can the Senate do so? Senators who expect to vote for it and Senators who are opposed to it ought to make crystal clear in a frank and truthful way what we mean by the treaty. We should mean what we say.

Attempts have been made to make it appear that adoption of the declaration will nullify the treaty. It is absolute effrontery to say such a thing. Earlier today I placed in the RECORD the number of treaties which have been ratified containing declarations in their resolutions of ratification. Scores of such treaties have been ratified since 1939. Some of the reservations have been proposed by France. By the way, only five of the countries, I believe, parties to the treaty have ratified the treaty. I am not certain of the number, but I believe I am correct in saying the number is five.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I call the Senator's attention to the dispatch from which the Senator has just read, from Paris, which says that even the Foreign Relations Committee of the French Assembly have proposed a reservation.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, that committee proposes a reservation which provides that the Parliament of France, by whatever vote is required, must vote to determine whether or not a new member may be taken in under the pact. I do not want to go further into that phase of the subject than to say that every Member of the United States Senate knows that if the declaration is written into the resolution of ratification it will not make one iota of difference to a ratifying country unless a commitment has been made prior to the time. And if a commitment has been made that country ought to be placed on notice now that there is no such moral or legal obligation. If no such commitment has been made, then in the declaration we do exactly what the distinguished ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman of the committee say they mean relative to article 3.

Mr. President, again I emphasize that my declaration applies only during the preparedness period. Should an armed attack occur against any or all the parties, the provisions of article 5 would become operative and the United States would be obligated to furnish aid, including military force, to resist the attack. I agree with that provision.

It is my opinion that article 5 imposes upon all the parties an obligation to act according to their constitutional or legal processes to help resist and defeat the aggressor. I agree with that provision.

With article 5 I am in complete accord. It is a multilateral adoption of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine. The United States pledges in article 5 to help any or all parties that may be attacked by an aggressor. At the same time the other signatories to the treaty pledge that they will help the United States if an aggressor attacks the United States.

As I said earlier today, the United States has been engaged in two world wars, and the United States has had no part in starting them. It is plain to nearly everyone that if another war between major nations breaks out, the United States will be eventually drawn into it. It is therefore wise for the United States to take a serious interest in what goes on abroad and pull an oar for security and peace. In doing so the United States will assume its responsibility for keeping the peace.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Perhaps the notice to the world that the United States will support any or all of the North Atlantic Treaty nations if they are attacked by an aggressor, will prevent another war. At any rate, I am in favor of trying it.

It has been suggested that the declaration I propose is not complete—that it does not go far enough and tells only two-thirds of the story. With that argument I disagree. All the parties to this Treaty know what my declaration means. They know that it applies only to the preparedness program and has nothing to do with article 5.

They also are familiar with the legislative procedures of the United States.

The declaration does not:

Prevent or affect in any way action by the United States or any of the parties in providing arms and armament to any other party to the treaty. This can all go on with the declaration adopted.

The declaration does not handicap or restrict in any way the process of the Council set up in article 9 to submit arms programs to the United States.

The declaration does make plain that there is no moral or legal obligation to approve the recommendations insofar as they apply during the preparedness period, which is covered by article 3.

It is absolutely necessary to adopt this declaration if the treaty is to get off to a wholesome start, with everybody knowing exactly where the United States stands.

It becomes especially important that the declaration be adopted in order to serve notice that there is no moral or legal obligation to furnish other parties to the treaty the atomic bomb, or any other atomic weapons that may be in existence or that may be developed—or any of the ingredients and know-how for the manufacture of atomic bombs.

You Senators know that a treaty takes precedence over a domestic law. When this treaty is ratified all laws to the contrary are nullified. This means that the phrase in article 3—mutual aid—might be construed as including the atomic bomb.

With the adoption of my declaration the door will be locked tightly against such a dreadful contingency. I am unwilling to give to the President of the United States—or any President during the next 20 years—the power to construe this treaty as permitting disclosure of atomic-bomb secrets, or even to furnish bombs to other parties to the treaty.

How long do you think the atomic secrets—our great anchor of safety in this chaotic world—would last, if the United States starts passing around the bombs and secrets among the governments parties to this treaty? The secrets would be out in no time.

If the Senate does not adopt my declaration it will be running the risk of having some administration interpret the rejection as a green light to pass the atom bombs around among our friends abroad.

Should a war break out it is just as possible that the United States would be the first nation attacked as it is that a European nation would be attacked. You know it doesn't take long to fly a plane over the ocean these days.

There is no substance to the argument that the Senate should wait for some arms-implementing program before the passing upon whether the bomb secrets shall be broadcast among parties to this treaty.

Whatever is done on arms after this treaty is adopted will have to be done according to the provisions of the treaty. The time to settle this question is now.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that 10 minutes is all the time that can be allotted to any Senator to speak on reservations. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the reservation reads as follows:

The United States of America ratifies this treaty with the understanding that article 3 commits none of the parties thereto, morally

or legally, to furnish or supply arms, armaments, military, naval or air equipment or military, naval, or air supplies, including bombs and information relating to such bombs, to any other party or parties to this treaty.

It would be difficult, Mr. President, to devise a reservation which would more completely negate the treaty. The third article in the treaty itself pledges this Nation to mutual aid and assistance for the specific purposes of resisting armed aggression or attack. It is quite true that hereafter, if the treaty is ratified, the Congress might, even in the face of the reservation, furnish or supply arms, armaments, military, naval, or air equipment or military, naval, or air supplies to any other party or parties to this treaty. That being true, why in the beginning affront the world or the other members to this pact by the declaration that we are under no moral or legal obligation to do it?

As I read the treaty, Mr. President, it seems to me to be very simple. Taking the treaty as a whole and giving effect to all its parts, especially article 3, article 5, article 9, and article 11, it seems to me that there does arise an obligation of mutual aid and assistance. What that aid is to be, when it is to be extended, how much aid is to be given, upon what terms or conditions the aid is to be extended, are all matters reserved to the Congress. That is necessarily so. In the express language of the treaty it is so. But to say that there is no legal or moral obligation arising under the treaty to contribute mutual aid and assistance to build up, first, the strength of the individual state making the contribution, and, second, the area defined in the treaty as the whole North Atlantic area, is to engage certainly in an idle thing. If we mean anything by the treaty we are obliged to concede or to declare—and I prefer to put it in the affirmative—that the treaty taken as a whole, giving effect to all its parts, clearly raises the obligation of mutual aid and assistance to provide defense to the Atlantic area as defined in the treaty, against armed attack, against armed aggression. Otherwise it means nothing. It is proposed to say that while we may do this, we wish it definitely understood that we are disclosing to all the other parties to the agreement our interpretation and our understanding of it in advance, namely, that we will furnish nothing of a military character—that is to say, we are not obligated to do so. Whether we may do so is a matter for our own will, for our own discretion.

Mr. President, a mutual-aid treaty specifically aimed to safeguard the members of the treaty against armed attack would itself be morally repudiated, it seems to me, if we were to say that there is no obligation resting upon us, either moral or legal. I do not know precisely what is meant by "moral obligation" under this pact. The moral obligation is to live up to our agreement. The moral obligation is to carry out faithfully our undertaking. There may be, in a broad general sense, a moral obligation resting upon all of us, individuals as well as States. But when we speak of treaties and when we deal with treaties, the moral obligation arises from our undertaking, our commitment. If this treaty is to be effective, if it is to mean anything, it must be conceded that it is a treaty for mutual assistance with respect to armed invasion or attack. If it is such a treaty, undertaking, or commitment, then the moral obligation is as clear as the noonday sun. We are playing on words when we say that we make it crystal-clear that we are not bound to do these things, but that we may hereafter do them when an emergency arises.

Could our act be accepted at full face value by the other signatories to the pact if they should hereafter ratify the treaty with this reservation looking straight into the faces of the other members of the North Atlantic Treaty? The conclusion is inescapable. They could not accept the pact, as read in all its parts, as I have said, as clearly a commitment of mutual aid and assistance.

I grant—and I am pleased to do so—that with respect to what we shall do, when we shall do it, in what quantities we shall make any aid available, or upon what terms or conditions we may extend aid, the matter rests within the bosom of the present Congress or future Congresses. It is true that the treaty does not raise an express obligation or commitment to furnish arms or military aid, but it does not exclude those things. That question is left to the Congress. But if we undertake by reservations to exclude, we may in the next reservation say that we will furnish no money. We may in the next reservation say that we have no legal or moral commitment to furnish food. We may in the next reservation say that we have no legal or moral obligation to furnish something else which these nations, if they are to rely upon our act in approving this treaty for mutual aid and assistance, would certainly have the right to call upon us to furnish.

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

The Chair understands, according to his previous announcement, that the various reservations as offered will remain in suspense until the hour of 5 o'clock, at which time they will be voted upon in the order in which they were presented.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a reservation proposed by me. As it is printed, it contains two paragraphs. I intend to present each of those paragraphs as a separate reservation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reservation will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, is the Senator from Utah going to present two separate reservations?

Mr. WATKINS. I intend to present two separate reservations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Only one at a time can be presented.

Mr. WATKINS. I intend to present them one at a time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first reservation offered by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the resolution of ratification it is proposed to insert the following:

The United States understands and construes article V of the treaty as follows:

That the United States assumes no obligation to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area or to assist any other party or parties in said area, by armed force, or to employ the military, air, or naval forces of the United States under article V or any article of the treaty, for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military, air, or naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so provide.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah has 10 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to present a unanimous-consent request. I intend to present the other reservation immediately following this one, and I should like to have the 10 minutes for that reservation added to the 10 minutes I now have.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent that the 10 minutes to which he would be entitled separately on each of these reservations be consolidated so that he may have 20 minutes on the reservation now presented, which would entitle the opponents to 10 minutes on each of the reservations. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does that consolidate the time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would consolidate the time of the Senator from Utah, but not the time of the opponents. The Senator from Utah asks that he be permitted to use the 20 minutes to which he would be entitled, 10 minutes on each reservation, at this time. That does not affect the right of the Senator from Texas to use 10 minutes on each of the reservations.

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have already stated at some length my views with respect to these reservations, the meaning of the treaty, and the underlying philosophy which runs through the treaty, as compared with the historical position of this country with respect to the power of Congress to declare war and the right of the country to have that interpretation maintained. Very few Senators heard my earlier remarks. I prepared them with some care. I wish now to state my argument, so that Senators will have an opportunity to know what is being presented, because in my humble opinion this is an issue of far greater importance than the question which has been raised with respect to article 3.

I presented the argument last night with the intention of placing it before Members of the Senate, for the RECORD, at least, because very few Senators heard my remarks. I think the question is fundamental, and I believe, in ratifying this treaty, we are making a grave departure from the policy of the United States which has made it great during the past 150 years. We have gone a long

distance down the international road. We have made commitment after commitment in our loans, including the Greek-Turkish loan, the ERP program, and the various other things we have done to help Europe. We joined the United Nations.

Now we come to this step, because all the others put together are not doing the job. So now we think it is necessary to enter into this kind of an alliance. Underlying it is a philosophy which, if fulfilled, in my opinion amends the Constitution and takes the very heart out of it.

The principles involved in this matter were more or less discussed in the League of Nations debate in the Senate. Yesterday I referred to a letter written by Chief Justice Hughes to Senator Hale, of Maine. Chief Justice Hughes was in favor of the adoption of reservations to the League of Nations Covenant. Senator Hale was also, and he wanted some advice. I thought the advice he received was good advice.

Fundamentally the issues raised in the League of Nations debate by the famous article 10 with its guaranty to "preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity" of all the members of the League are the same as those raised by article V of the Atlantic Pact, which in effect guarantees in different language, by a new approach, the territory and security of the pact nations in the North Atlantic area.

The times, the circumstances, the nations, and the area involved are different, but the underlying principles are the same.

The essential question, stripped of miscellaneous and extraneous matters, raised, so far as the United States is concerned, is:

Can this country under its Constitution give a firm, binding commitment without any escape clauses, that it will surely, certainly, and promptly come to the assistance, with its armed forces if necessary, of any one or more of the other parties to the treaty in the event they are subjected to an armed attack?

To raise the question squarely it should be understood that an "all-out armed attack" should be the "armed attack" under consideration.

Episodes, incidents, attacks short of an all-out war that have in the past, and can be in the future, readily settled by diplomatic methods are not pertinent to this issue and should not be considered in our debate.

Stated another way, the question is:

Can the President and the Senate by the treaty-making power granted these two divisions of Government by the Constitution, enter into an agreement with foreign powers which will firmly commit this country to go to war either by decision of the President acting under the treaty or by resolution of Congress, which, under the terms of the treaty, it is obligated to adopt?

The European members of the treaty want that firm commitment. They want, and need, according to their view, that kind of commitment.

From what has been said on the floor of the Senate, I am sure that kind of commitment is intended to be given to them, because if that does not happen, this treaty will not help solve the difficulties or cure the situation; it will not be an overwhelming power that will cause any other nation to hesitate to engage in an armed attack.

The European members of the treaty argue, and their American supporters agree with them, that anything less than a commitment for certain, prompt, immediate armed help will not meet the conditions of a sudden all-out attack of this modern age of supersonic speed planes loaded with atomic bombs and assisted with guided missiles.

The historic and generally accepted American view, is that only Congress sitting at the time the armed attack occurs, has the power, when the attack is made on other than United States territory, to declare war and authorize the employment of the armed forces of the United States to repel such an attack.

This historic view clashes head-on with the so-called needs of our European allies and the exigencies of modern warfare. The problem then confronting the treaty negotiators and drafters was how to write an agreement which would surely and certainly bring the United States and all the allies, for that matter, into the fight the moment it began, with an overwhelming force, and at the same time assure the American and other peoples that their constitutional processes of making and declaring war would be preserved.

In other words, the people in this country are led to believe that this country will engage in no war to assist our European allies in the event an all-out attack is made on them unless and until our Congress has declared war and authorized the employment of our armed forces to fight in that war.

It should be noticed that article 11 of the pact does not say that the provisions of the pact will be carried out by the parliaments, congresses, and legislative bodies of the respective parties in conjunction with their executive departments. On the contrary, it says "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

ARTICLE 11

This treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify all the other signatories of each deposit. The treaty shall enter into force between the states which have ratified it as soon as the ratifications of the majority of the signatories including the ratifications of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States have been deposited and shall come into effect with respect to other states on the date of the deposit of their ratifications.

This language permits, in the case of the United States, the use of a very ingenious device to make the firm commitment of certain, immediate aid in the event of the beginning of a major attack, and at the same time keep the American people assured that its Congress, free, unfettered, and uncommitted, will make the final decision before we are actually at war.

What is this ingenious device? It will be found in the first clause of the sentence of article 5:

The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.

To illustrate the meaning of that clause, an attack then against Denmark is an attack against the United States.

Here is the way, in the case of the United States, that the device is intended to work; here is the reasoning back of it:

First stage: An all-out attack, as distinguished from minor warlike incidents short of a major attack made on the United States, immediately creates a state of war.

Congress does not have to declare war; it happens by the act of the aggressor. Congress may recognize by declaration that a state of war exists, but the state of war was brought about by the act of the enemy power. Under these circumstances, the President immediately orders the armed forces to repel the attack. He does not wait for Congress. He probably would be derelict in his duty if he did wait. That is when an attack is made directly on the United States.

Now let us proceed to the second part of this argument. By the treaty, 10 European nations and Canada are put in the same class as the United States territory when an armed attack is made on them. For that purpose they become United States territory. For the purpose of repelling an armed attack, they become our responsibilities. They are made so by the treaty which, under our Constitution, becomes the law of the land.

The law of the land, which the President is sworn to uphold and enforce, makes it obligatory upon him to regard an armed attack on any one or more of our 11 allies as an attack upon the United States. An attack on the United States creates a state of war between us and the aggressor.

Let me state it another way: An attack on one ally creates a state of war between the nation attacked and the aggressor. That attack is an attack on all parties to the pact. By agreement in the pact itself, then, a state of war is created between the aggressor and all the members of the pact. There is no escape from this conclusion. The President must respond in good faith immediately to defend that additional territory. He must in good faith recognize that a state of war exists between the United States and the aggressor by reason of the treaty of agreement.

In modern war, to adequately defend our allies, he would be required to act immediately, even before he could get to Congress.

If he should order our armed forces into immediate action under the assumption that it was his duty to do so, then Congress would be confronted with a war already in being; and it certainly would not be free to say "No." Our forces would already be committed, and they would be committed under a treaty

which became the law of the land without the House of Representatives having had an opportunity to consider it and render its judgment. It would be completely bypassed. We would be at war by operation of the treaty—in other words, a declaration of war by treaty.

Is there anyone who would contend that the framers of the Constitution ever contemplated any such result or had any such intention when they drafted the Constitution?

All of this could be done under article 11, which provides that the provisions of the treaty "shall * * * be carried out in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

Carrying out the provisions of the treaty "in accordance with our respective constitutional processes" would include either action by the President in repelling an attack or by action of Congress.

I shall seek to clarify the situation by approaching the problem from another direction.

Article 5 creates an obligation to defend our allies' territory in the event of an armed attack upon them. This is an obligation we did not have before the treaty. I think that should be kept clearly in mind. Simply by making the treaty and adopting the device I have mentioned, which declares, "The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all," we enlarge the territory of the United States for defense purposes.

Article 5 does not increase either the authority of the President or the Congress under the Constitution. That should be carefully considered. It simply adds more territory in which or over which the Executive or the Congress or both can exercise that authority.

This is important, and should be kept clearly in mind. We extend to this new territory the same rights and privileges of defense as possessed by our own territory. By doing this we have taken on an obligation to defend it in case it is attacked. The way we shall discharge that obligation as a practical manner no doubt will be the same general way we discharge the obligation to defend the actual territory of the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. About 8 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, if an all-out attack is made up the new territory, it will call for an all-out defense on our part, the same as it would if an all-out attack were made on our own territory. There can be no difference in the approach, so that the language of article 5 which states that "each of them in the exercise of the right of individual or collective defense * * * will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith individually and in concert with the other parties such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area," is only saying in another way that each of the parties will take the same kind of action as they would take if their own territory were attacked; that is, they would wage war to defend the area and restore its security the same as they would wage war to defend and restore the security of their own territory.

The reservation I am proposing, which is labeled A, will clarify this situation. It in effect provides that only the Congress can authorize war and the employment of our armed forces to assist in the event one or more of our European allies are victims of armed attack.

It does not leave the field open for the President to act as article 5 would authorize him to do if its meaning were not clarified and restricted. It also states the time-honored and generally understood principle of constitutional law that only Congress can declare or make war and authorize the employment of our armed forces in the prosecution of a war.

It is true that it may make ineffective the device which sought to get around the Constitution. It may mean a few hours delay in the consideration of the emergency; but on the other hand it does no violence to the Constitution; in fact, it protects the right of a free people through their representatives to pass on such a vital matter as the declaring and making of war.

Mr. President, when I say that is an important matter, when I say it is the very heart of the Constitution, I want to remind this body that the people who came to this land, who settled the United States, came here to escape the tyrannies of the Old World. They came here to avoid being conscripted into the armies of Europe. They were conscripted and sent out at the will of one man, the king or the emperor, who could direct them in war, without their having a word to say about it.

The thing we are complaining about now, the thing we are fighting against, is the right or the power of one man, or of a small group of men associated with him, to set in motion the wheels of war upon this world again. We are fighting against that kind of domination. Yet by the treaty we are in effect agreeing that when one nation is attacked it is an attack upon all, that a state of war has been created which puts us into the war.

From then on the Congress, the President, or anyone else simply has the duty of following up and ratifying what has been done and proceeding to wage the war until we will have restored our security.

That is an important right. The people of this land felt keenly about it a few years ago. To show how fickle we are, to show how the tides of public sentiment ebb and flow, only a few years ago the newspapers were filled with the stories of Members of Congress who were proposing a referendum, to let the people of the United States decide by popular vote whether we should or should not have war. There was actually enacted in the Congress of the United States the neutrality law, which required us to remain neutral. And now we have another proposal in regard to this subject, which is just the opposite in its intent. We are now saying in this treaty we agree a state of war will be created between ourselves and any other nation the moment any one member of the pact is attacked. When that member is attacked, a state of war has been created, and we are in it. We cannot avoid it. If we understand the full meaning of that, we can see how the Constitution has been bypassed, how it has been made inoperative. I will take the proponents of the treaty at their word. If they are sincere and if they believe what they profess they should adopt this reservation. I think the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said Congress would have the right under the Constitution to declare war, with all that it implies. I reply, of what good is it, of what protection is it to the people of the United States, to say Congress will have that right, if we have created a situation from which there is no retreat, a situation in which, if we honor our obligation under the treaty, there is nothing left to do but to declare war automatically? We would be like a puppet which must move whenever the string is pulled. Our freedom of action would be gone, and that is the heart of our Constitution. That is why our people came here, so that no monarch, no one man could send them into a battle which they did not want to fight, and make them take up the wars of other peoples.

Let me remind my colleagues that every American boy, girl, and every other citizen owes allegiance to his own flag and to the principles of this country; but none of them owes any allegiance to the flags of other lands, or any obligation to defend the soil of other lands. By this device we are setting forth an entirely new principle which extends and makes as a part of our own territory the vast expanse of other nations, with all their quarrels and all their hatreds, built up through thousands of years. The Constitution protects the right of Congress, free, unfettered, and untrammeled, to declare war. All the Senators who have spoken for the treaty say Congress will still have that right, but such a contention flies squarely in the face of and is completely contradictory to the very terms of this agreement which we are asked to ratify.

I know it is said that the latter part of article 5 provides that we are only to use force as we deem it necessary. It is true, if we are in the war and are attacked directly, we shall use whatever force we deem necessary; and we will use the same amount of force if one of our allies is attacked, and a legal state of war is thereby created.

What I am saying, Mr. President, is that the American people should be protected against the right of any President to proceed to act under the treaty as though a war had been declared by Congress. If an attack were made directly, he could move; that is conceded, with the action of Congress. But we now bring into the picture all these other countries, because of which we may automatically be involved in war.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I should like, if I may be permitted to say that my second reservation goes to the protection of the

freedom of the Congress to act as it ought to act. I ask the indulgence of the Senate to offer the second reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WATKINS. The second reservation is on the same printed page, and is the second paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the reservation.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of resolution of ratification, it is proposed to insert the following:

The United States further understands and construes article 5 to the effect that in any particular case or event of armed attack on any other party or parties to the treaty, the Congress of the United States is not expressly, impliedly, or morally obligated or committed to declare war or authorize the employment of the military, air, or naval forces of the United States against the nation or nations making said attack, or to assist with its armed forces the nation or nations attacked, but shall have complete freedom in considering the circumstances of each case to act or refuse to act as the Congress in its discretion shall determine.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

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

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, as I understand the question with respect to the reservation, it is that we want to be doubly sure that Congress maintains its constitutional rights and privileges, no matter what happens, after we once ratify the pact. That is assumed in entering into the pact. To assume otherwise would be making an assumption contrary to every tenet of international law. Since the Supreme Court has declared that a treaty is the supreme law of the land, as is the Constitution, how in the wide world could we in any way imply that through the treaty process we could amend the Constitution of the United States? That would be an implication which would destroy the fundamental scheme of our Government; and surely at no time would any Government permit within itself an element which could bring about, by legislative action, the destruction of itself.

The argument which has been advanced in regard to amendments or reservations shows that they have been proposed for the primary reason that there is a feeling on the part of some that greater assurance will be afforded that our country will not get into war if such provisions are placed in the treaty. The treaty must be interpreted in the light of the treaty itself. The treaty guarantees constitutional processes. It provides what can be done and what cannot be done. It carries implications in regard to promises which will be fulfilled; but the enforcement of the promises is left, as is the enforcement of all promises in a treaty, to the good judgment and the moral attitude of those countries which believe in the sanctity of treaties.

No treaty has ever been entered into between nations which does not imply mutuality of some kind. If there is no mutuality there is no need for a treaty. The treaty itself implies that there will be joint action of some sort, a giving and a taking. If we lose sight of the fundamental purpose of a treaty, what it stands for, the reservations which we may add to it or the interpretations we may place on it do not in any way add to the fundamental powers or give to us greater fundamental powers than we already possess.

Therefore the reservation, as all other reservations to a pact of this kind, is merely something which shows that the Senate is probably doing something it wants to do but it has not full faith in what it is doing.

There is always a psychological aspect to every treaty. I myself believe that the psychological aspect of this treaty is so sure and so certain that it will actually prevent war. That is its purpose, and it is based upon a type of reasoning which has grown out of the incidents which have occurred during two great world wars and between those wars.

There has been attempts made throughout history to try to put a curb upon aggressors, to try to hold them in their place, to try to bring about a unity of right-thinking nations so strong and so complete that no independent aggressor nation would ever dare to attempt to bring about disunity. The treaty implies a high moral understanding. It implies that nations of high civilized character, treaty-keeping character, are willing to pledge themselves that they will do their best to put down aggression.

We have just heard an argument made as a result of fear of article 10 in the old League of Nations Covenant. Article 10 never had a chance to be tried. It was based upon a theory of mutuality; it was based upon a theory of unity; it was based upon a theory that if we could lay our finger on an aggressor and operate against him, the aggression would stop. It was based upon the notion that we could combine right-thinking and right-acting nations in such a way that the preponderance of their force could be hurled against an erring nation, a nation doing wrong. That was the first real attempt to curb an aggressor. It was not given a chance, because there was no way, as was said by the opponents of the idea, to define an aggressor. How could we say when one nation was on a warlike plane and another nation was not? How could we define an aggressor? Therefore, in a sense of frustration at not being able to meet the situation, the people became discouraged and discontented and did not stand for article 10.

I think we all know that no nation goes to war if it is sure it will be defeated. Persons in private life do not attempt to enter into an undertaking if they are sure it will be unsuccessful. Nations, in a way, must take the same sort of chances as those taken by private persons; and no nation will move if it knows it is foredoomed to defeat.

Mr. President, looking at it entirely from a military standpoint, what nation in the world, if it knew it had to fight the United States if it entered into a war, could defeat the United States in the next generation? Everyone knows the comparative strength of the United States of America and the other nations of the world. Nations are not backward in realizing that strength. We all know it so well that we are happy to take part in this treaty action. There is no doubt in my mind that the Kaiser would not have moved if he had thought he had to fight the United States; and I am sure Hitler would not have moved if he had thought he had to fight the United States. One need not trust to his own ideas concerning such matters. One can turn to history, to the testimony of persons representing those nations, and understand that that statement is true.

Another psychological feature of the treaty which is important is its political and moral aspect. The pact says, in so many words, that the United States admits itself morally bound to use its strength in cooperation with other nations to put down an aggressor and to come to the aid of a victim of aggression. We have said that before in our history, Mr. President. It is no new thing. We have proved that the declaration of President Monroe received the respect of the nations of the world. We do not have to go outside of our own history to prove that. All the fanciful ideas about the fears of tomorrow, about the changing of our Constitution because of the ratification of the treaty, about taking away from Congress its power to act, are all arguments which are not based upon facts, which are not based upon law or upon the experience of nations.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, some of my own constituents and those of other Senators from my section of the country have addressed an inquiry, and I should like to ask the Senator from Texas to permit me to make a statement with respect to it.

There are in certain parts of the world conditions which are constantly tending to better themselves. I refer to the effort of the people of Ireland to unify their country. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee if in this treaty or in any interpretation of it he foresees that there is anything to prevent continuing efforts to bring about unification of the northern counties with the southern part of Ireland?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, according to what is already in the RECORD, there is nothing in the treaty which touches the problem with regard to Ireland which the Senator mentions. In fact, as the Secretary of State said in a letter of May 4, which appears on page 1227 of the hearings:

The treaty has no relation whatever to the problem of partition.

This should dispose of this question once and for all.

I am confident the Senator may rest assured that the treaty in no wise relates to the subject he has mentioned. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. McGRATH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes of whatever time I have left to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have listened with great respect to the arguments which have been made by those who favor reservations to the treaty, and my respect is very sincere. But I must set down that in my judgment the viewpoint which animates the arguments and the logic which they follow completely lack reality. I think these Senators conduct themselves so as to give the impression that the last two world wars had never taken place. Some of the statements I have heard made, some of the phrases I have heard uttered, take one back to the days 25 years ago when we did not know the sad facts about the world as we know them now.

Let me give a few illustrations. I heard one Senator say that this North Atlantic Pact would promote the balance of power in Europe, that instead of seeking an international approach to the task of getting peace, we were following the old maxim of dividing the world and setting up two rival European camps with approximately equal strength.

It is hard to see how such a statement as that could be made, when we realize that a country like Soviet Russia has 200 infantry and armored divisions in existence at the present time, whereas the second largest land army in Europe, namely, in France, has only nine divisions. How is it possible, in the face of those facts, to talk about any balance of power? There is a great inequality of power, there is no balance of power. How is it possible, in the light of those facts, to speak about an armament race, when the ratio is 200 to 9 in that respect?

I heard another Senator say that we should not give arms before the nations were attacked. I suppose the inference is that we should give the arms after the attack. Anyone who has studied modern military science, even in the most superficial way, knows that unless the arms are available well ahead of the attack, there is no use sending them, because we would never be able to get them in, and the nations abroad would never be able to use them. Even if we were able to get the arms in 2 weeks before the attack, assuming the enemy were obliging enough to tell us when he was going to jump, that is not time enough to train people in their use, to get teamwork, to set up a staff, to set up the whole system that makes armed forces effective.

Arms are one part of an armed force, but they are not all there is to an armed force. When Senators talk about not giving them arms before the attack, they might just as well come out frankly and say they do not want to give them any arms at all, because that is what it amounts to.

I have heard Senators say here today that we should apply the principles of the Monroe Doctrine to western Europe. That is an extraordinary contention to make, when we consider that the Monroe Doctrine has been expanded to cover the Latin American countries, and that they are all equal partners with us in it now. It is still more extraordinary when we consider that the implication to be drawn from the statement that we ought to extend the principles of the Monroe Doctrine to Europe is that we should undertake the defense of Europe single-handed, without the cooperation of Europeans. I think that is a far more extreme proposal than any we confront in the North Atlantic Pact. It is more extreme because it assumes that we can carry the burden of European defense all by ourselves, it assumes we would be put into a war on the say-so of some foreign aggressor, instead of being able to choose our own way of doing it, and it assumes that as soon as we were in the war we would carry the whole load ourselves, and do all the fighting and killing. There is not much mutuality in that, and there is no recognition of the facts of modern life in that type of argument.

I heard another contention made today the inference of which was that it would be advantageous to us not to give our new weapons to Europeans, that we would be smart if we gave them just our junk, so to speak. That is an extremely short-sighted view. During the war we had a good many allies, thank heaven, and the experience was that the better the equipment we gave them, the better they fought, and the better results they achieved.

I remember one instance during the war in which one of the divisions of one of our allies had no gasoline, and the reason why it had no gasoline was that one American supply officer, who was not possessed of very brilliant intelligence, thought he would be very smart and use his superior knowledge of American paper work and American supply procedure and get all the gasoline for his outfit that ordinarily would have gone to the foreign outfit. How stupid. There was the foreign division bogged down, unable to move, but the Americans who had all the gas for their outfit they needed and much more, went up and had to carry the whole combat load themselves.

Mr. President, if that is promoting the welfare of the United States, then words have no meaning.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I wonder if the Senator is not misinformed as to what was said, and is not misquoting the record. As I remember, the Senator who referred to this matter of junk said that our military people said, "We will not be sending them junk." It was said that it was assumed that we would send them junk, but the argument, as I got the implication of it, was that we would send them the best weapons we had, and would not send them junk.

Mr. LODGE. The inference I got was that the Senator was very sorry we would not be sending them junk, the tone of his voice indicated that it was too bad we would be sending them good weapons. That was clear to me from the tone of his voice. I cannot quote the remarks, because I have not that good a memory.

Mr. WATKINS. I have not that good a memory either, but it seemed to me that the Senator was trying to point out that we would be sending them the best equipment we had, that others may have said to send them junk. The question was asked of General Bradley in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and also of Louis Johnson, and they said, "We will not be sending them junk." He was calling attention to the load we would be assuming by sending them good weapons.

Mr. LODGE. We should not send them junk, but weapons that are good. I point out that there are pieces of equipment we cannot use here but which those in foreign countries can use, and when we can make that kind of a trade, it is a good trade. They put in their young manhood, and we put in our young manhood, too. We are putting in our treasure and materials, and they are not putting in as much in the way of supplies. But they are putting up their young manhood, and that is a pretty substantial contribution for any country.

Mr. President, I heard some Senators compare the present situation with that which prevailed during the League of Nations debate. That was a startling thing to say, because it seems to me that implicit in this North Atlantic Pact are the lessons which we learned from the League of Nations debate. A guiding concept of the League of Nations, that we would guarantee the territorial integrity of countries, is completely left out of the North Atlantic Treaty. We are not guaranteeing the territorial integrity of any country. The spirit of article 10, which was the heart of the League of Nations Covenant, is frankly, patently, and obviously excluded from the North Atlantic Pact.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

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

Mr. LODGE. I have a little more to say, but my time has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, if I am permitted under the agreement, I will yield of my time two additional minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The whole time on the reservation has expired, including the 10 minutes allotted to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WATKINS. But I had 20 minutes, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator had 20 minutes; 10 minutes on each reservation. The Senator from Utah used 10 minutes on the first reservation.

Mr. WATKINS. There is plenty of time left for debate this afternoon. I doubt if there are going to be any more reservations presented. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts should be permitted to continue if there are no other reservations to be offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot anticipate that there are no further reservations to be offered.

Mr. WATKINS. I was going to ask if we can find out whether any more reservations are going to be offered, and if

not, whether the Senator from Massachusetts may be permitted to proceed. As I remember, the Chair said we would divide the time, under the agreement as announced, if it were not all used up on the reservations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announced at 2 o'clock that there were six reservations which had been printed and were lying on the table. Whether all of them would be offered the Chair could not say, and whether others would be offered, which are not printed, the Chair could not say.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that if there is any time left after we get through discussing the reservations, if the Senator from Massachusetts then wants some further time I shall try to arrange it so he can have further time.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was simply arguing. I have no set speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Other reservations have been ordered to be printed. They might be offered. We cannot tell at this time whether they will be offered or not.

The time having expired under the agreement on the first three reservations, the Chair might inquire if there are any other reservations Senators intend to offer.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has several reservations lying on the table. I do not know whether he intends to present them.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. Would it be proper, for the purpose of determining which of the reservations are to be offered, to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CONNALLY. That would take up a great deal of our time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would consume considerable time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will not make that suggestion.

Mr. CAIN. I merely made the inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. After the reservations offered have been debated under the agreement of 10 minutes for and 10 minutes against, if there are no further reservations, but there still remains some time, it is to be controlled by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Missouri. Looking at it from this viewpoint it seems likely that there are no other reservations to be offered at this time; but the Chair cannot say.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, Senators who have reservations should be here and should offer them. I have no objection to Senators offering all the reservations they want to offer. But they ought not to wait, and oblige us to send for them to offer their reservations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is still about an hour and three-quarters until 5 o'clock.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope we will not trespass too much on the time we are going to allocate, because considerable pressure has been put upon the Senator from Texas to allot part of the little time left after we get through with the reservations. The minority leader should have a solution. He usually does.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Texas. I suggest that we should have a quorum call now.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. And let it be charged equally to both sides. We have not had a quorum call today. By the time the call is concluded, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] will be present and have an opportunity to present his reservations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will not insist on a quorum call, because it cuts down our time considerably. The Senator from North Dakota can be sent for.

Mr. WHERRY. He has already been sent for.

Mr. CONNALLY. The sheriff can be sent after him.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from North Dakota will soon be here. He is ready to offer his reservation.

Mr. CONNALLY. He cannot offer it in the hall or in the street.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true. That is why I suggested the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the absence of a quorum is suggested, the Chair must order the Secretary to call the roll.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope that will not be done.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, if I may make an observation, under the arrangement made and announced, I take it any Senator would feel he would be within his rights to come in 5 minutes before 5 and offer a reservation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He would be entitled to offer it at 5 minutes to 5, or even after 5, but in that event he could not debate it.

Mr. WATKINS. That is the reason why I think it is not fair to say that a Senator ought to be here now to offer his reservation. He certainly would be within his rights to present it later.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am quite willing to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska that a roll call be had. I think it would require 10 or 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Nebraska making the point of no quorum?

Mr. WHERRY. I make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and several Senators answered to their names.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota is now in the Senate Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot interrupt the calling of the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with and that the order for the quorum call be vacated.

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

Does the Senator from North Dakota desire recognition?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am not going to present my reservation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota makes the announcement that he will not present his reservation.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. If there are to be no further reservations offered, do I correctly understand that under the unanimous-consent agreement the remaining time will be divided between the proponents and opponents of the treaty itself?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further reservations to be offered, the time from now until 5 o'clock is to be divided equally between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Missouri. The Chair assumes there are no further reservations to be offered. Therefore the Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very much pleased that we have finally received at last all the reservations, which I hope will be voted down by the Senate by a very overwhelming vote.

Any reservation is intended to water down and dilute the treaty or to destroy it, if that can be done. That is the purpose of the so-called reservations. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and other Senators who have offered reservations are opposed to the entire treaty. The Senator from Utah would wipe out the whole treaty if he could. He would provide reservations against the entire treaty if he could.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Was the Senator present last night when I announced that if the reservations I offered were accepted I would vote for the treaty?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes; but the Senator knew they would not be accepted. The Senator knew the Senate would not be so unwise.

Mr. WATKINS. If the Senator wants to test it out, let the Senator agree to the adoption of the reservation, and I will vote for the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say that the Senator's vote is not worth so much to us as to justify giving up the treaty in order to secure one vote for nothing. With his reservations in it the treaty would not be of any value.

Mr. President, the reservation he has discussed is not founded on fact. His reservation provides, "That the United States assumes no obligation to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area or to assist any party or parties in said area, by armed force, or to employ the military, air," and so on, "under article 5 for any purpose." I repeat, he would not want them to be used for any purpose. Not for war, but for "any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare

war or authorize the employment of the military, air, or naval forces of the United States."

That statement in the reservation is not accurate. The Congress has the sole right to declare war, but the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. Under the reservation, if an attack were made on New York City, the President could not resist it until he called Congress into session, and it acted. What happened at Pearl Harbor? There was no congressional declaration of war before we began to resist. We were attacked without notice. The President of the United States had a perfect right to put the Navy, the Army, and all other forces into operation to resist that attack.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. If the Senator will note this reservation, it says that:

> The United States assumes no obligation to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area or to assist any other party or parties in said area, by armed force, or to employ the military, air, or naval forces of the United States under article 5 or any article of the treaty, for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military, air, or naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so provide.

It has to do with an attack which is made upon other parties to the pact, other than ourselves. It does not affect us at all.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator believe that an attack on New York would not be an interpretation of the North Atlantic area? I think it would.

Mr. WATKINS. That is taken care of under our own Constitution, without any reservations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am talking about the treaty now. The Senator wants to tie the hands of the Congress and the President. He says:

> That the United States assumes no obligation to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area—

I insist that if an attack were made upon New York or any other part of the United States, we would owe an obligation under this treaty to restore that area, and to repel the attack.

Let me say a word or two as to the second reservation, which reads as follows:

> The United States further understands and construes article 5 to the effect that in any particular case or event of armed attack on any other party or parties to the treaty, the Congress of the United States is not expressly, impliedly, or morally obligated or committed to declare war or authorize the employment of the military, air, or naval forces of the United States against the nation or nations making said attack, or to assist with its armed forces the nation or nations attacked, but shall have complete freedom in considering the circumstances of each case to act or refuse to act as the Congress in its discretion shall determine.

That reservation is a complete repudiation of the treaty. Under that reservation we would have no obligations under the treaty with regard to armed force. Senators are saying, "We are for the treaty, except that we cannot furnish any arms." This is a defensive treaty. What are the signatory countries going to defend themselves with unless they have arms? It is said, "We can send them anything else." We can send them a lot of powder puffs, or all-day suckers, but we cannot send them any arms, although arms may be the very thing they need and desire.

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Chair advise us how much time is left to each side?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Starting at 3:16 p. m., there were 52 minutes to each side. The Senator from Texas has consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, this is not coming out of my time, is it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. That leaves the Senator from Texas 46 minutes and the Senator from Missouri 52 minutes. The Senator from West Virginia has 10 minutes of the 46.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, if Thomas Gray had known how interminably a few Senators would talk in favor of the emasculation of the pending treaty, or in opposition to its ratification because our 11 international relations who have joined us in the making of this important document are, unfortunately, all poor relations, the great poet never would have included in his Elegy in a Country Churchyard his admonition to grandeur not to "hear with a disdainful smile the short and simple annals of the poor." If Gray could only have envisaged the hundreds of pages and the hundreds of thousands of words of Senate debate in opposition to the treaty that have been written or uttered since the morning of the 5th day of July, he would have known that so far as the Senate is concerned only eternity is longer than the annals of the poor—particularly if the poor happen to be poor international relations and the circumstances such that certain distinguished Senators insist that we welsh on our obligations to help maintain world peace and spurn a golden opportunity to become the beneficiaries of the scriptural assurance: "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

Had all our relations who have become parties to the treaty been rich and powerful, ratification would, in my opinion, have been effected by unanimous consent immediately after the conclusion of the convincing, eloquent addresses of the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. But in this instance, as in countless others:

> Of all sad words of tongue or pen,
> The saddest are these: "It might have been!"

Mr. President, all over the world today, as in Xanadu in the age of Kublai Khan, are heard from near and far millions of melancholy "ancestral voices prophesying war." Indeed, the present far-flung war, whether it be considered cold or hot, has long since emerged from the realm of prophecy into all the earthly regions of reality. It has once more set the world on fire and the faces of millions of fearful men and women turn deadly pale in the ghastly light of the raging conflagration.

To the inhabitants of dreamland, the dwellers in fool's paradise and the advocates of Chamberlain-like appeasement who constantly cry out, "Where are the minions of aggression? Where are the Cossacks who are riding down the lovers of liberty and making war against the democracy and Christianity of the world?" We answer: "Ask the overwhelmed annexed people of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and parts of Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Finland, Poland, and Outer Mongolia. Ask the judge and jury that completed the trial of the Copion case in this city a few weeks ago. Ask the officers and members of the United Nations Organization who have seen a single nation, by the exercise of the veto power, 30 times paralyze the activity and stay the progress of this great humanitarian organization. Go to the dungeon in which Cardinal Mindszenty is rotting away and ask him." If these apostles of Pollyanna will listen to a comprehensive news broadcast any day in the week, they will hear startling answers to their inquiries, originating not only in their own country but from lands across the Atlantic on the east and from beyond the Pacific on the west.

If further answers are desired by those who are too blind to see the fifth columns of communism marching and countermarching over every great country in Christendom, inquiries should be made of the American aviators who recently completed the task of transporting to Berlin by air hundreds of thousands of tons of food and coal to save the inhabitants of that unfortunate city from starving or freezing to death as the result of Russia's perversity in preventing the delivery of these necessaries of life by truck and train.

The headlines of the metropolitan papers on Tuesday of last week would have provided sufficient, if not satisfying, information to anyone who should think of naively inquiring, "What nation is threatening world peace?" Some of those headlines are as follows:

First, "'Little blockade' manned by Reds." The article under that headline tells of the stranglehold of Russian soldiers on the only truck-supply route from western Germany to Berlin.

Second, "Pacific Pact Is Proposed Between Nationalist China and the Philippines To Oppose Communism."

Third, "United States Seeks To Oust Red Committeeman."

Fourth, "Czech Reds Seek To Curb Catholics." The article under this caption says, among other things, that the Czechoslovakia Communist Party served notice that it intends to fight the Roman Catholic Church.

To the regret of the United States and all other nations that long for peace, Russia daily adds new fuel to the flames of the warlike fires she has started all over the earth. It is unusual for a day

to pass without newspaper reports of some new unprovoked communistic offenses against humanity. And these daily provocations, in endless variety, have gone on and on until 12 of the important peace-loving countries of the world have at last been forced to lay the foundation for collective resistance to further Russian aggression. And that foundation consists of the North Atlantic Treaty that is now before the Senate.

All the nations that have signed the pending pact have done, are now doing, and purpose to continue to do everything that is consistent with national honor and self-respect in order to preserve everlasting peace with Russia and every other country in the world. But, unfortunately, Russia apparently construes the excessive generosity and tolerance of democratic governments in dealing with her as indications of weakness and fear. And her return for our extreme civility to her is never-ending noncooperation with us and an intensification of her efforts to distress the American people at home and discredit the United States abroad.

Let us hope that before the worse becomes the worst the small group that rules Russia with a rod of iron will consider the ratification of the pending treaty not as a threat but as a solemn warning that there are limits of forbearance beyond which the American people will not forbear, and that there are limits beyond which other nations will not be permitted to trespass upon our liberty or upon that of our neighbors who have joined us in the execution of the North Atlantic Pact.

Russia should, for her own sake, familiarize herself with the elementary history of the United States and from this source learn what our Continental Army, in the Revolutionary War, did to the greatest military power on earth as a punishment for that power's long-continued attempts to tyrannize over our people.

Russia should familiarize herself with the causes and consequences of the War of 1812, in which the United States forever established her right to the freedom of the seas. Russia should particularly note that the night before the Battle of New Orleans, the last battle of the 1812 War—Sir Edward Pakenham, the commander of the British troops, said in a note to Gen. Andrew Jackson, "If you do not surrender, I will storm your breastworks and eat breakfast in New Orleans tomorrow morning"; and that Jackson sent to Pakenham the laconic reply, "If you do, you will eat supper in hell tomorrow night." On the following day the American Army, under Jackson, won a glorious victory; Pakenham was killed and a large part of his army was destroyed. Where the British general ate his supper no man knows.

Russia should take notice of the fact that in 1898 a European country that was then powerful both on land and sea, by a long-continued course of provocation, at last compelled the United States to declare war against her, and in that war Spain's Army was conquered, her navy was destroyed and she forever lost all her possessions in both the Philippines and the West Indies. From the devastating effects of that war Spain has never completely recovered.

Russia should not be unmindful of the fact that in consequence of long-continued aggression against that country by Germany the United States entered the First World War against her and lavishly supplied the men and means necessary to dethrone the Kaiser, defeat his armies, destroy his navy, and win for the Allies a greater victory than the forces of democracy had ever before won over the hosts of autocracy and aggression.

Russia should particularly recall that in the Second World War the United States once more demonstrated that those who too long abuse her patience and too long trespass upon her rights are eventually subjected to the punishment which only military power can administer. Unhappily, such punishment sometimes constitutes the only language some dictators, tyrants, and aggressors can be made to understand.

It is my fervent hope that the foregoing will, at least to some slight degree, help to arouse Russia to a realization of the fact that she will be in deadly danger if she continues to follow the aggressive international course she has pursued during the last 3 years.

It is my further hope that Russia will profit by the examples of the past and avoid the disastrous consequences suffered by every nation that has ever forced a war upon the people of the United States.

Ever since Hiroshima was destroyed with the atom bomb, the common people of the world have hoped and prayed for peace as they never hoped and prayed for it before. In no other land are the hopes higher, or the prayers for peace more sincere than they are in the United States. The sole purpose of this Nation's joinder in the treaty before us is to preserve peace and prevent war, and to prevent it not by one nation's acting alone but by the 12 nations that are parties to the treaty acting inconcert for their common preservation and their common defense against any aggressor that may make war upon them. The wisdom of the agreement of which the treaty is the written memorial is illustrated by the famous Aesop fable, the substance of which is as follows:

An old man had many sons who frequently had trouble with one another. After the father had exhausted his authority in a vain attempt to reconcile them, he at last ordered all the sons to assemble before him. A bundle of sticks, compactly bound together, was then presented to the sons and each was requested to try to break it. But every son failed to accomplish this task. Then the father separated the sticks, gave one to each son and commanded him to break it, and this command was, without difficulty, obeyed. Thereupon the father said: "Behold, my sons, the power of unity."

If you, like the bundle of sticks, will only keep yourselves conjoined in the bonds of friendship and cooperation, it will not be in the power of any mortal to hurt you; but if your ties of brotherly affection are once dissolved, soon will your rights be violated by everyone that may wish to assault you.

The pending treaty will make the 12 signatory nations, after the manner of the bundle of sticks, so strong that no hostile outside nation on earth will be able to destroy them, or enslave them. The treaty, if ratified without weakening amendments, will be a shield and a buckler to all the nations that have signed it. But if the proposed reservations should be adopted, the treaty would, in the words of the immortal Lincoln, become as weak as soup made from the shadow of a pigeon that had starved to death.

In behalf of the general welfare of the 12 nations which are parties to the pact and in behalf of the peace of the world, let all the proposed reservations be decisively defeated and the treaty, in its present entirety, be ratified by an overwhelming majority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, reference has been made to what is meant by the reservations I have proposed, which recently have been the subject of debate. I wish to quote from two distinguished gentlemen who have set the pattern for me and have given me the foundation for my reservations. If my reservations are wrong, then I think the two distinguished gentlemen to whom I refer are wrong, and probably this treaty means something different from what they have said it means.

Let me call attention to the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in referring to the part that Congress would have in the future in respect to this treaty, declared:

> But if it does mean war, only Congress itself, under the specific terms of the pact, can declare it.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan also said:

> But suppose the event is obviously of major and deliberate magnitude and clearly discloses a criminal aggressor deliberately on the march—as Hitler entered Poland or as the Kaiser entered Belgium. Let us say that it is clearly the dread thinking which threatens the life and freedom of one of our associated nations, if not ourselves directly. If it is, it threatens the life and freedom of every other associated nation, including our own. If it is, it threatens total war or total surrender, pact or no pact. If it is, our commitment is clear as crystal. It is to take whatever action we deem necessary to maintain the security of the North Atlantic area, which vividly includes the security of the United States. If the only action adequate is war, then it means war. If it does mean war, I venture to assert that, pact or no pact, it would mean war for us anyway in this foreshortened world. If it does mean war, I venture to say that we would be infinitely

better off for having instant and competent allies.

I can agree with a great deal of that, and I do agree with the next statement the Senator made, because I think it is exactly what I tried to put in legal language in the reservation. The Senator from Michigan concluded that particular paragraph as follows:

But if it does mean war, only Congress itself, under the specific terms of the pact, can declare it.

In my argument yesterday, I cited all kinds of arguments as to whether the pact does or does not mean war. I cited an editorial from the New York Times which says that, without quibbling, it means war. I cited an editorial from a St. Louis newspaper which says the same thing.

But here we have statements from the two most important members of the Foreign Relations Committee. All I am pleading for in this reservation is for us to make them effective, in view of the fact that other people seem to have other ideas, in view of the fact that the treaty says that an attack upon one is an attack upon all, and that when that occurs, there will be a state of war with all of the signatories to the pact, and of course in that case we shall be at war. I have said, and I say again, that Congress would then be only an automaton, an agency acting under those circumstances to declare what already was a fact.

In these reservations I have tried to say definitely and distinctly that before war occurs, before that final thing is done, the Congress of the United States will have to declare it by resolution. I am not talking about an attack on New York, either; I am talking about an attack on one of the other signatories to the pact, whose territory we are guaranteeing to defend. That is what this reservation aims at. Of course, under our own Constitution we will take care of the United States. But in this reservation I am talking about the other signatories to the treaty. The reservation says:

That the United States assumes no obligation to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area or to assist any other party or parties in said area—

Which means any party other than ourselves—

by armed force, or to employ the military, air, or naval forces of the United States under article 5 or any article of the treaty, for any purpose—

And I am saying that for any purpose our military forces cannot be used in the event of such attack unless Congress says so.

I also provide—

unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military, air, or naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so provide.

We are told that Congress has to do it—with all that implies, as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee says. What does it imply? It implies that Congress shall then consider the matter, as of that hour and day, and shall do the wise thing for the protection of the United States. That is what I am trying to do. I have put in legal language the very things they have been saying.

Are they against them? Will the treaty be destroyed if we reaffirm our faith in our Constitution, if we say that this must be done to make it clear to the people overseas and to our own citizens, whom we have been assuring over the weeks and the months that, "Oh, the treaty does not automatically commit us to war, because we say Congress will declare war." Yet it is said here, today, that reservation 2 will take the very heart out of the treaty and will render inoperative all the benefits which should come from the treaty.

Suppose an emergency happens, and it is brought before the Congress, is the Congress at that time going to be a rubber stamp? Is it going to be told, "You agreed to this in the treaty; this nation over here has been attacked; we are at war, and now it is your duty to declare war, whether you think we ought to or not"? Remember, Mr. President, the pact is for 20 years. It is not a momentary plan; it is for 20 years. We say as of today, and I think the Senator from Michigan in his speech said, we would respond anyway, pact or no pact. Yes, we would, and I would vote as of today for a declaration of war on any nation attacking these nations in an all-out war. Five years from now, what? Ten years from now, what? Twenty years? The fact of the matter is we are trying to write into this treaty an agreement to preserve the status quo for 20 years. We are assuming it will be that way merely because we agree it will be that way. We have seen our allies, Russia and China and all the others, go somewhere else. Who knows what will happen to the Allies we are going to take on in the pact? I say to my colleagues this is one of the most important sections in the whole treaty. We are making a historic departure from the foreign policy of the past, which has made this the great Nation that it is, and I say the burden is upon those who propose to make that change, not upon us who want to ask certain questions, and who want to see that that Constitution is preserved. From the time of my infancy, I have been taught that the Constitution of the United States was divinely inspired, that it was written by men of God who were called and chosen to write and prepare that Constitution for this great Nation.

I have respect for it. I took my oath of office to defend it, and I am defending it. I am glad to know that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Senator from Michigan agree that that is what must be done when emergencies come. If it is war, then Congress will declare it. They are in agreement with me. That is, they say they are. Then why, in the name of all that is fair, should we not say it to the world so that there will be no doubt about it? It may be said the other nations would become discouraged; we would destroy that psychological warfare or advantage or whatever we are going to get, as my distinguished colleague from Utah said. We would destroy that. But it almost makes one suspicious, does it not, of the treaty when it is found that, notwithstanding the fact that it is said Congress has the right to declare war, they then do not want to put in anything that notifies the world, and particularly those people in Europe in those countries, that just the moment war strikes we will be in it. The treaty says so. All one has to do is to read it, and he will get that logical conclusion—that an attack on one is an attack on all. An attack on Denmark creates a state of war not only as between Denmark and the attacker but between the United States and every other state, on the one hand, and the attacker.

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

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

Mr. WATKINS. In just a moment. When that state of war occurs, what Congress, what President, would say "No?" What I am pleading for is on behalf of the generations to come, on behalf of the future Congresses, that it may have something to say about this for its freedom of action. They will do the right thing, we need not worry about that, I may say to my dear colleague from Texas and Michigan, and all the rest. They will have some intelligence. We are the egotistical crowd. We know what we would have done back in the days of World War I. Later, we know Hitler would never have struck, at least I say so, if we had had this type of organization. We say the Kaiser would never have struck, if we had had this type of organization. We know what they do today, and we know what they will do 20 years from now. I say we are taking in a little too much territory. I am calling attention to the fact that we have a Constitution, and its needs protection. The very fact that there are those who begin to point out that this would ruin the treaty, would take the heart out of it, indicates pretty clearly to me that it means something more than what is said. The Senator who said "War would be declared by the Congress, and all that it implies," was correct. What does it imply? Free, untrammeled action, and when the emergency arises, when the circumstances come, I have confidence that under the dictates of Almighty God and his inspiration the Congress at that time, whether it be us or some future Congress, will know what to do and will give the right answer, and if the conditions are the same then as now, yes, they will declare war; there will be no doubt about it. But who knows when an attack is made 15 years from now on some of the signatories of this pact that it will be right for us to come involved in that war at that moment. Those people, those Congressmen, the generation then, should say and determine it.

The other day I quoted from a letter by the late Charles Evans Hughes to Senator Hale. The logic contained in it is old-fashioned, but it is sound and it is true. Mr. Justice Hughes said:

If we are entering upon a new world of democracies, the inevitable consequence

should be recognized. Democracies cannot promise war after the manner of monarchs. It is ideal to attempt to commit free peoples to the making of wa. in an unknown contingency when such a war may be found to be clearly opposed to the dictates of justice * * *.

Article 10 is objectionable because it is an illusory engagement. Whether we shall go to war to preserve the territorial integrity of another state—

And that is about what we are trying to do, not only to guarantee it, but to restore it, to maintain it for 20 years—

the territorial integrity of another state in a situation not now disclosed or described so that the merits of the case may be judged will depend upon the action of the Congress, and that action will be taken according to the conviction of our duty in the light of the demands of justice as they appear when the exigency arises.

That was written by the former Chief Justice of the United States. Senators may laugh at my humble opinions. I am just an ordinary lawyer, a Member of this body. But this is a statement of a man who was during his brilliant career a governor, Secretary of State, and a Justice of the United States Supreme Court. He was a great man, and the principles embodied in his letter are sound and eternal. He continued:

The general guaranty of article 10 cannot be relied upon to produce action contrary to its judgment.

In other words, no matter what we agree, no Congress is going to act contrary to its judgment.

We should not enter into a guarantee which would expose us to the charge of bad faith or of having defaulted in our obligation, notwithstanding that Congress in refusing to make war had acted in accordance with its conception of duty in the circumstances disclosed * * *.

This is the reservation Mr. Justice Hughes suggested to Senator Hale:

* * * The United States of America assumes no obligation under said article to undertake any military expedition or to employ its armed forces on land or sea unless such action is authorized by the Congress of the United States of America which has exclusive authority to declare war or to determine for the United States of America whether there is any obligation on its part under said article and the means or action by which any such obligation shall be fulfilled.

That is substantially, in meaning, what I have already said, and as I have already indicated and stated, not by just an ordinary citizen, but by the Governor of the great State, who later became Secretary of State, and, still later, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I want to read my second reservation, because I am afraid most of the Senators never have read it. It is a declaration right in line with what Chief Justice Hughes said:

The United States further understands and construes article V to the effect that in any particular case or event of armed attack on any other party or parties to the treaty—

It does not say the Congress cannot act when an attack is made on any other of the parties to the treaty—

the Congress of the United States is not expressly, impliedly, or morally obligated or committed to declare war or authorize the employment of the military, air, or naval forces of the United States against the nation or nations making said attack * * *.

Does anyone here want to contend that we are obligated to declare war? Will anyone come out and say we are under obligation to declare war by that treaty, that we make that commitment, that we are obligated to do this, without Congress acting?

is not expressly, impliedly, or morally obligated to declare war or to authorize the employment of the military, air, or naval forces of the United States against the nation or nations making said attack or to assist with its armed forces the nation or nations attacked, but shall have complete freedom, considering the circumstances of each case, to act or to refuse to act as the Congress in its discretion shall determine.

The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said it did not imply the right to declare war. Does it imply what I have said in that reservation? I think it does. Under the treaty, we certainly must act. Then, what have we done to America? We have surrendered, through a treaty agreement, and we have the responsibility of sending our boys—our American citizens—into a war with respect to which the Representatives in the House will never have a chance to vote, if we take that position.

Mr. President, what I am pleading for is to do all we can under this treaty, to go as far as we can, to render all the assistance we can, but, in the name of Heaven, do not give up our rights for which we fought. We can do many of the things that are necessary to do without giving up those rights.

General Bradley was asked on cross-examination, before the Foreign Relations Committee, if this were the only way to defend America——

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

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. General Bradley said, "No, but I think it is the best way. Of course, it is not the only way."

I challenge that statement. No alliance has ever worked out that way. Alliances have always resulted in war. The greatest deterrent to war was given to the world in the Sermon on the Mount, in the philosophy of the Saviour. We have ignored it. It is not in this pact. It is not in the United Nations Charter. That is exactly why it cannot get anywhere—because we do not have peace-loving nations in the Charter. We have infidels, who are antichrist and antigod. Unless we can get great nations to agree on the principles taught by Christ, no matter how many vetoes we take out of a pact or a charter, it will not succeed.

I plead with my colleagues to give me a yea-and-nay vote on the reservation. Even if I am the only Senator to vote for it, I want it to go on record. I plead for a yea-and-nay vote on this reservation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has 30 minutes and the Senator from Texas has 36 minutes remaining.

The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, we live in a troubled world. Our position is precarious. Let us not make it more so. There have been great historic changes in the course of our Nation's previous policy. They provide reasons for deep concern. It should be said they also provide great reasons for inspiring hope. We are living in the new atomic age, and the need for hope is the paramount need of the world today, for man has, during the war just ended, so impetuously invaded those precincts which heretofore have been reserved to God himself, as to make even the strongest among us tremble. With the aid of radar man can look through the clouds and scan the moon. Through the release of atomic energy he has asserted tangible control over the very stuff of which the universe itself is made. Can there be any question that a new age is upon us and that the old equilibriums of history, the old balances of power upon which the North Atlantic Treaty bases the future peace of the world, are as terrifying in extent as were the Pharaohs. Do not call me an isolationist. Call me a realist. If there are any isolationists in this body they are those who are trying to foist upon the American people for the next 20 years the old equilibrium theory of history which has failed time after time, or the archaic and ancient theory of the balance of power.

Let us face a few fundamental facts which have been brought out in this debate. Military alliances—and this treaty is a military alliance—have inevitably resulted not in peace, but in war; and the same Senators who today are trying to sell the North Atlantic Treaty as an instrument of peace are the ones who stood on the floor of the Senate within the past 2 years and asserted that all the rest of our foreign policy, including lend-lease, was for peace and not for war.

There are some other fundamental facts which we may as well realize. Every crisis, every emergency, which the United States has faced in the past several years has been answered on one theory—taking money out of the pockets of the American taxpayers. Let us realize this basic fundamental principle. We can buy a government in Europe, or any other place in the world, but we cannot buy the hearts, the souls, and the minds of their people. How do we expect the great democratic, liberty-loving, friendly allies who are to be members of the pact to look upon us? We are thoroughly despised today throughout the world.

Let me read to the Senate this editorial:

The reason that Britain's welfare state is about ready to go bankrupt is because the United States has a welfare state.

This remark is not an editor's aberration. It's the sober view, offered in all seriousness, of Mr. Ernest Bevin, the British Foreign Secretary.

Listen to the doleful Mr. Bevin:

"The United States is as much a welfare state as we—the British—are—

Do Senators think they love us? They hate us. They hate us for our cockiness,

for our smugness. The editorial goes on to say—

only it is in a different form. One of our difficulties in the balance of payments today is the fact that the United States, in carrying out its welfare policy, has given basic prices to agriculture * * *."

I quote further from Mr. Bevin, as he is quoted in the editorial:

"I do not object—to the American welfare state. I think it is right, but on our part we have not yet worked out basic prices for commodities in the return way * * *."

I quote further:

"The Marshall plan must not be belittled. It must not be allowed to run down. It must be allowed to be carried on to the final fruition of European cooperation * * *."

I read further from the editorial:

Among the other United States policies causing trouble Mr. Bevin cited our high unemployment-insurance program and sick pay and the possibility that a great medical service will be established by the Government.

Now that explains everything. The British have a welfare state set up to guarantee full employment and cradle-to-the-grave security. This welfare state is slowly going bankrupt because it all costs more than the economy can pay for. Britain hasn't enough money—there's a dollar shortage, remember—to buy the things it needs from the United States to keep the welfare state going.

And the reason it can't buy is that we have a welfare state too. That is, our Government is also trying in its modest way to guarantee full employment and provide cradle-to-the-grave security. That means that the United States has inflated its wage-price structure, particularly farm prices. So the British welfare state can't afford to buy much from the American welfare state.

Now the only hope in this situation is that the American welfare state still has some reserves left, a little extra left from what is consumed by the state. And this little extra must be given to the British welfare state lest Attlee's atelier comes tumbling down.

Thus the fond best wish of Britain is that the United States doesn't go in for any more state welfaring, so that the British can be supported in their welfaring.

And, strangely, Mr. Bevin's right. He's spoken the only sense we've seen in the overseas cables.

We can luxuriate in but one welfare state at a time. Somebody—in this case the United States—has got to keep solvent so as to be able to foot the bills.

Mr. President, we cannot have a welfare state, we have to remain economically strong in order to support the English welfare state. But by the North Atlantic Pact the British may say, "You can have an armed encampment in America while we go ahead with our welfare state, but you cannot spend your money at home, because we must go on with our national socialization."

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

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Therefore, I say, Mr. President, the one best hope for peace on this earth is that we remain economically and militarily strong. Moscow will keep the peace only so long as we are strong enough to stay her covetousness.

All the jibberish and the double talk about this treaty was answered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia a few moments ago when that distinguished statesman said, "Of course there is a moral commitment." He did not refer to any specific article, but he said that moral commitment runs all the way through the treaty.

Of course, all Senators know that within the next 30 days there will be an arms implementation bill on this very floor for consideration, and again we will not get the truth, as we could not find out the truth about our commitment to Canada and the British about the atomic bomb, as we could not get the truth about what was told Norway would happen if she would come here and sign. We have been told that there will be a request for $1,450,000,000. I say that is a fraud on the American public. The $1,450,000,000 is for the cost of the transportation of war goods. It will cost the American taxpayer nearer $10,000,000,000 than a billion. So I come back to my basic conclusion, can America afford it? If we go into an economic tail spin, I say that there goes the last best hope for peace on earth.

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

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I yield 13 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I would not speak again if it had not been for the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I think, however, his address makes very clear the complete difference of opinion, among those who are supporting the treaty, as to what it means, whether there is an arms obligation or is not.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia said that there was a moral and legal obligation to give arms. He said if this reservation were adopted, it would kill the treaty. He said if this reservation were adopted, the treaty would mean nothing, and be ineffective. I disagree completely with his position, but it only points up the necessity of adopting the reservation, if one does not agree with the position of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, his position is fundamentally different from that, for instance, of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The Senator from Michigan emphasizes the fact that the heart of the treaty is the warning to Russia that we will be in the war if there is a war. The arms are incidental. He said in his original speech:

I know, Mr. President, there are many friends of this great peace adventure who are inclined to put their overriding emphasis upon the subsequent physical implementation of the pact. There are those who count it disingenuous to take any other view.

I do not agree. Frankly, I should have much less interest in this treaty if I thought its repressive influence for peace is measured by or dependent on any such implementation.

Yet the Senator from Georgia says that is the essential feature of the treaty. The Senator from Michigan said further:

It is not the military forces in being which measure the impact of this "knock-out" admonition, important though they are. It is the potential which counts, and any armed aggressor knows that he forthwith faces this potential from the moment he attacks. It is this total concept which, in my view, would give even a reincarnated Hitler pause.

Mr. President, the question here is, and that is what the vote on this reservation involves, do we think this is the real heart of this treaty, the warning to Russia, the Monroe Doctrine effect, or do we think it is the arms implementation, the preliminary aid to all these European nations?

I agree fully with the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and when the Senator from Georgia says that this treaty does not mean anything without the arms, I think he fails to realize the tremendous departure from our policy proposed, something that was denied for 150 years by the leaders of this country. It was against the whole foreign policy of our Government. It is a great departure, but one I think is necessary, to say that we will be in a European war if Russia starts such a war.

The pact itself is a tremendous departure, a tremendous concession. That is the heart of the treaty. I think that if we merely make it incidental to the arms obligation, as the State Department is inclined to do, if we do not make it perfectly clear we are going to deal with the arms question when it comes before us without obligation to any nation, then I think we are taking an additional and unnecessary step, a step which defeats the very deterrent effect on war which the treaty itself, without the arms, imposes upon all of Europe, as so graphically said by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I believe the treaty ought to be an obligation of the type of the Monroe Doctrine. I think the distinguished Senator from Texas does not quite realize what the Monroe Doctrine was. He seemed to think it was a much more extreme thing than this treaty is. Of course it was not. I quote from the message to the Congress at the time the Monroe Doctrine was enunciated:

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

I suppose what the doctrine refers to is aggression, and what it says is that

if there is aggression on an American state we will go to war. That is not said expressly. The United States is not bound in clear terms, as the treaty now before the Senate would bind us. The doctrine was stated in a mild way, but it was the most effective peace measure in the history of the world. It kept other nations from attacking South America. A similar doctrine respecting the North Atlantic area, without the arms, without even the bilateral obligations, I believe, would be exactly as effective as the Monroe Doctrine was with relation to South America.

The distinguished Senator from Texas says the Monroe Doctrine went further than the proposed treaty does. Of course it did not. It left us much more free than the Atlantic Pact would. Under the Monroe Doctrine we could determine whether the aggression was justified; perhaps whether it had been stimulated by the improper action of some South American state. A nation might go in to collect a debt, but if it was obviously going to get out immediately it had collected it, if there was no permanent aggression, we were not obligated to go to war. In case of aggression our war would probably be directly with the European state which threatened the aggression; it would, to a large extent, be a war at sea. But above all it included no arms for any South American nation. There was no arms program in connection with the Monroe Doctrine.

So it seems to me that if we adopt this treaty without reservation, in view particularly of the speech of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], we are going far beyond the Monroe Doctrine. We are getting into a military alliance. That is what it would be. The moment we put the arms provision in the treaty the alliance becomes a military alliance. The moment we arm the signatory nations it becomes at least a potentially offensive military alliance, because today nobody can separate offense from defense. The arms given for defense can be used for offense. The days of the Maginot line are gone. Defense is a dynamic, active process which consists largely in attacking the other nation at its weakest point. When we undertake to arm these nations to the teeth we turn a defensive alliance into an offensive alliance. Under the treaty we would obligate ourselves to go to the defense of the nations parties to the treaty, if they are attacked, no matter what the reason for the aggression is.

It seems to me that the pact, with the arms provision in it, would be no longer a deterrent. It would rather be an incitement to war, because Russia knows that we cannot complete the arming of these nations for 3 or 4 years. Russia may feel, if we were going to furnish arms to the signatory nations, that she would be justified—I do not think she would be justified, but she might think she was—in taking action against them before they were fully armed. She might contend that by our action she was going to be surrounded with arms from Norway to Turkey, and that sooner or later means war. In that event Russia might want war before we could arm the nations fully. We cannot arm them for 3 or 4 years.

For that position I have the general support, in fact my belief grew from the position of the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES], who in an article published in the New York Times on March 9, 1949, was quoted as saying the following:

> JOHN FOSTER DULLES bluntly warned the negotiators of the proposed Atlantic Pact today to avoid all commitments that might be construed by the Soviet Government as "bringing United States military might" directly to Russia's Scandinavian border * * *.
>
> * * * * *
>
> While the Soviet Government has no present intention of resorting to war as an instrument of national policy, nevertheless, said Mr. DULLES, it can be assumed that the Soviet state would use the Red army if its leaders felt that their homeland was imminently and seriously threatened.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It would, indeed, involve a high tribute to Soviet leaders to assume that, under these circumstances, they would exercise more self-control than would our people under comparable circumstances, as, for example, if the Soviet Union had military arrangements with a country at our border.

I think once the arms provision is added to the treaty it rather makes war more likely instead of making peace more likely.

As I said before, I believe the treaty is a violation of the whole theory of the United Nations. The United Nations permits nations to say, "We will come to the defense of each other if we are attacked and the United Nations does not act." It fills up a gap because of the veto in the United Nations. The United Nations Charter does not contemplate that under article 51 one of the most powerful nations of the world shall undertake to arm one-half the world against the other half. The United Nations looks to a gradual reduction of armaments. It does not contemplate the building up of an armament race.

It seems to me this treaty, taken altogether, with the arms, the whole program, which I think is inseparable unless we now make it perfectly clear that it is separable, unless we say in the reservation that we do not give the arms—I think this whole program means an armament race in Europe, and armament races in the future, as in the past, in my opinion, are more likely to lead to war than to peace.

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

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eight minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. I yield myself the remaining portion of my time.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], speaking to the reservation "That the United States of America ratifies this treaty with the understanding that article 3 commits none of the parties thereto, morally or legally, to furnish or supply arms, armaments, military, naval, or air equipment or military, naval, or air supplies, including bombs and information relating to such bombs, to any other party or parties to this treaty," says very clearly the following, and I have in my hand a transcript of his statement:

> It would be difficult, Mr. President, to devise a reservation which would more completely negate the treaty.

At a further point the Senator from Georgia said:

> Mr. President, a mutual-aid treaty specifically aimed to safeguard the members of the treaty against armed attack would itself be morally repudiated, it seems to me, if we were to say that there is no obligation resting upon us, either moral or legal.

So we find the distinguished Senator from Georgia coming here as a witness, direct and positive and unequivocal, to the effect, as I read his testimony, that there is an obligation under this treaty to furnish arms. For the Senator from Georgia, who is now upon the floor, said that the reservation which is proposed, which undertakes to say that the United States ratifies the treaty with the understanding that article 3 commits none of the parties to the furnishing of arms negates the treaty; therefore, obviously, he believes the treaty to be diametrically opposed to the provisions of the reservation.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia shows, if I may be pardoned by him and by the Senate, a most unusual conflict of opinion, as I read his statement. In the earlier part of it he said, with respect to the reservation:

> It is quite true that hereafter, if the treaty is ratified, the Congress might, even in the face of the reservation, furnish or supply arms, armaments, military, naval, or air equipment or military, naval, or air supplies to any other party or parties to this treaty.

I may interpolate, Mr. President, that I think he is entirely correct; that even if the reservation is adopted, Congress does have the right and power of its own volition, but not because of an obligation, to furnish the arms, armaments, and so forth. But on a subsequent page in his testimony, what do we find he said? He said:

> It is true that the treaty does not raise an express obligation or commitment to furnish arms or military aid, but it does not exclude those things. That question is left to the Congress. But if we undertake by reservation to exclude, we may in the next reservation say that we will furnish no money.

Mr. President, this reservation does not exclude arms or armament, or any of the other equipment. It merely provides that we ratify the treaty with the understanding that we are not committed by article 3, but that it is left open to our own judgment.

Awhile ago I mentioned on the floor of the Senate a very significant observation by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of little Luxemburg, one of the signers, which I judge, by the way, will have the same vote on matters in the council as we do. What did the distinguished Foreign Minister say? This is what he said on the afternoon the treaty was signed.

This is his official speech made at that time:

Nothing proves better this ineluctable solidarity of the destinies of our countries than the fact that the United States, breaking with a tradition two centuries old, is concluding a military alliance in peacetime. That is an event of extraordinary historical significance for the United States and of the utmost importance for Europe.

To say that this is not a military alliance, to say that this treaty does not contemplate the binding of the signatories to furnish arms and equipment, to my mind is an absolutely mistaken construction of the treaty.

We were challenged this afternoon by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to show any danger whatsoever to the United Nations from this charter. I accept that challenge. I point out to him testimony which the Senator highly regards, and which I highly regard, the testimony of the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES], in which he points out a number of dangers, one of which is that of the bypassing of the United Nations. I do not have time to develop the point. I made it on the floor of the Senate the other day, and quoted the Senator from New York. In substance it is that there is a danger in the event that this body of 11 nations shall consistently and frequently begin to meet together and decide things together. There is danger of arousing antagonism, antipathy, and envy—possibly even conflict—and breaking down the United Nations by reason of the bloc formed within it. Plenty of dangers to the United Nations could be readily demonstrated.

In my mind, and in the minds of many Senators, this treaty is a step designed to carry this Nation forward into a federation of nations. A Senator from New Jersey on my side of the aisle and a Senator from Tennessee on the other side of the aisle rose and eloquently and powerfully portrayed the advantages of a federation of nations. We were told by the distinguished former Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, before the committee that the plan in behalf of which he, Justice Roberts, and Mr. Clayton appeared before the committee envisaged the idea of a legislature of the federation of the world. I questioned him on this point. I read the following from page 615 of the committee record:

Senator DONNELL. There would be a legislative body which would pass laws which would apply to all of the component entities, one of which would be the United States of America; is that right?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir; within the limited fields.

Senator DONNELL. Which include the political, economic, and military fields?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, but, of course, limits within those fields, too.

Senator DONNELL. Could you tell us what those limits are?

Mr. PATTERSON. Those are the limits where local interests were believed to be predominant.

Senator DONNELL. And who would decide whether or not they were predominant.

Mr. PATTERSON. That would be in the charter that you would adopt.

Senator DONNELL. Would you plan that the union itself, the Atlantic union, would decide whether or not local interests were predominant, or would each particular component country in that union have the right to determine whether local interests were predominant?

Mr. PATTERSON. No nation would join it who thought its proper local interest would be infringed.

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

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Missouri if he will read into the RECORD the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act relative to international arrangements?

Mr. DONNELL. I am glad to do so. Section 8, under the heading "International arrangements," reads as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) Definition: As used in this act, the term "international arrangement" shall mean any treaty approved by the Senate or international agreement hereafter approved by the Congress, during the time such treaty or agreement is in full force and effect.

(b) Effect of international arrangements: Any provision of this act or any action of the Commission to the extent that it conflicts with the provisions of any international arrangement made after the date of enactment of this act shall be deemed to be of no further force or effect.

(c) Policies contained in international arrangements: In the performance of its functions under this act, the Commission shall give maximum effect to the policies contained in any such international arrangement.

Mr. President, this afternoon I wish to renew with all the power within me the feeling that we are making a great mistake in binding our country by a series of exceedingly strong obligations to a course of action for 20 long years, without the ability to repent at any time during that period. The treaty would be binding, not only on ourselves, but upon the generation yet unborn.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

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

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it is my intention to vote for the pending treaty and against all reservations. However, I have little to add to the profoundly able debates which have preceded my statement. I wish to associate myself with the statesmanlike addresses delivered by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

I wish, however, to present to the Senate the views upon this treaty of Upton Sinclair, one of America's noted authors. Recently I received a letter from Mrs. Sinclair enclosing a statement which her husband, Mr. Sinclair, had made in advocacy of the Atlantic Pact. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

MONROVIA, CALIF., *May 7, 1949.*

Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOWNEY: When you and I last met we were discussing the various personalities which had helped to make and to break Epic. Maybe you recall what I told you was the reason for the peculiar behavior of one of them. I'm taking him as a sample of the behavior pattern (to use a psychology term) which distinguishes the Commies all over the world. (I don't know what became of him; I presume that he still functions somewhere in the devious way in which he functioned in Epic.)

Now we are living on a planet infested with swarms of such people; they have multiplied and spread into every country, and won the suffering, ignorant masses to a belief that communism will give them freedom from their sufferings and revenge on all who possess even small amounts of material goods. But we, of this fairly comfortable United States of America, go about our daily pleasures and chores with a false sense of security, partly due to our ignorant belief that the atom bomb will save us from Russia's grim determination to rule the world, and partly due to our self-indulgent wish to enjoy each day, without sacrificing even a portion of it, to the protection of our inherited freedom. We take this freedom for granted because our forefathers fought for it and we inherited it—just as the sons and daughters of rich parents take their economic security for granted. And so, it is history repeating itself; it is the glory and luxury of ancient Rome and ancient Greece falling into the decay which preceded the conquests which ended the glory and luxury.

I'm presuming to make this little speech to you because I have spent my adult life as the wife of a man who was spending his as a crusader for human freedom, and so have had to become a close observer. During those years I knew many of the individuals who left the Socialist Party to become Communists. They were of the congenital adventurer type, who can be thus typed because they all displayed one identical behavior pattern. It is the old rule-or-ruin type. And they are devious.

We have been out of politics for years, because we knew that no writer should give up his most effective tool, the pen, for one which other men are better fitted to use, and because both of us came out of that terrific Epic campaign too ill physically to endure any more political activity. But recently we saw that the time had come when we could no longer retain this political isolation. Upton would have to declare his opinion in a public way, because the devious Communists were misusing his name and influence. This misuse of his name was not new, but what was new was the crisis in the cold war. The false peace offensive of Russia to prevent the accomplishment of the purposes of the Atlantic Pact included the propaganda activities of all the small but powerfully effective Communist-front groups. It was in these groups all over the world that his name was being misused.

It was the same pattern of deviousness reported to us in letters from the readers of his books all over the world. So cleverly had he been misrepresented that many of his readers wrote that they were not sure where he stood.

Now, I'm sure that you know that he does have a lot of influence on "the people." Perhaps you do not know that this influence is scattered all over the world; for his books have been translated and read all over, for a third of a century, beginning with The Jungle, which had wide distribution in both Germany and Russia as well as in other countries. One of the tragic difficulties of the present is that the average person does not know the magnitude of the difference between Russian communism and what on the European continent is called social democracy and in England Fabian socialism. An example of this difference exists, however, today for all to see, if only the average citizen wanted to trouble himself to see. I mean the difference between

Russia under communism and England under the British Labor Party. Russia is a police state, threatening the freedom of all peoples everywhere. In England there is an extension of the New Deal, as we had it during the Roosevelt regime. In Russia there is violence and ruthless suppression. In England there is freedom of speech, the secret ballot, and the decent self-discipline of a people using these instruments of freedom to further achievements of democracy.

This is a heart-to-heart letter from Upton's wife to a United States Senator who was his running mate on the Democratic ticket in the epic campaign of 1934. I hope you give it a little of your thought.

Our foreign policy at this hour is more urgent than any legislation concerning our internal affairs, urgent as these may be.

I am supplementing this letter with a copy of a statement Upton has just sent off to the New Leader for publication in that rather small but excellent New York newspaper. I feel sure I am not asking too much of your time, crowded as I know that time to be. As I said before, I know, or have known, individual Communists, and so can see the meaning of Russia's "peace" offensive.

Sincerely,

MARY CRAIG SINCLAIR.
(Mrs. U. S.)

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I was a candidate for Lieutenant Governor of California on the Democratic ticket in 1934. Upton Sinclair was then the Democratic candidate for Governor. During several months of the campaign I became intimately acquainted with him. Throughout his life Mr. Sinclair had been an ardent, outspoken, and crusading Socialist. Although I had never believed in the same political principles as had he, I recognized always his candor, his burning genius, and his profound devotion to the welfare of all humanity.

It is said that his works now are more widely read throughout the world than are those of any other American or foreign author. In the past decade Mr. Sinclair has written nine great books, known as the Lanny Budd series, on international subjects. One of them, Dragon's Teeth, received the Pulitzer prize in 1943.

These novels constitute, in my opinion, one of the greatest outpourings of genius, both in quality and quantity, that have ever occurred in the literary world.

The statement which was enclosed by Mrs. Sinclair, from her husband, is very brief, and I wish now to read it to the Senate:

(By Upton Sinclair)

I have been asked by the new leader to elaborate on my statement concerning Russia which was embodied in an article by Prof. George Counts, published in the March 19 issue of that paper. Last January Professor Counts kindly wrote me that Mr. Fadeyev had included me in a published list of the "finest writers, artists, and scientists of the capitalist world" who "invariably have become friends of the U. S. S. R."—the "whole flower of world culture." On January 6 I wrote Professor Counts the reply which he published in the above-mentioned article. In this reply I called Russia "a reactionary, nationalist imperialism" and said that "the present party line is bound to lead to another world war." I told Mr. Fedeyev that either he "had not read my books" or that "they have been incorrectly translated in the Russian editions."

Mr. Fedeyev's kind of misrepresentation of Socialists had become an old story to me. It began in the 1920's when Willi Munzenberg in Berlin took to signing my name to manifestos which I had never seen; I warned him twice in letters, and when he did it again I exposed him in an article in Vorwarts, the Social-Democratic newspaper of Berlin. But no writer whose books are published as mine are in most of the countries of the world can answer all the falsehoods and misrepresentations made about him by individual Communists. It would take a staff of translators and secretaries and a small fortune, none of which I ever possessed.

For the past 12 years I have devoted myself to writing a series of historical novels depicting the world in our time. I have tried in these books to give all sides a hearing, as an honest historian should. I could only hope that they were honestly translated.

I have defended the right of the people of Russia to choose their own form of government, as long as I could hope they were choosing it. But I have been forced to realize that it does not happen. The Communists themselves make it impossible for an honest man to defend anything they do. They take advantage of any such defense by pretending that he approves of everything Russia does, just as Mr. Fedeyev did.

I have spent my life in upholding American democracy by criticizing its imperfections in order to help all of us to continue improving it. For this right to openly criticize, I thank my God and those great American revolutionists who gave us our freedom and the Constitution under which we enjoy this right.

The Russian people were given a Constitution which proclaimed their freedom, but it is never made effective in practice and is nothing but camouflage. Indeed it turned out to be one of those many devices by which the Communist leaders have, throughout the years, misled the liberals outside of Russia into believing that Russia was building a free state.

If any one in Russia dared to criticize the evils of the present Russian system, as I have criticized those in my own country, he or she would be shot, and countless thousands have been so shot.

The failure of the Russian leaders to improve upon the inhuman regime of Czarist Russia has brought all the truly liberal forces of the world into danger. Russia's brutal Communist regime has made it all too easy for fascism to proclaim that all brands of liberalism are dangerous and lead to despotism.

It is necessary for the world outside of Russia to show up the Russian rulers and keep them from expanding their power. Incidentally, this is the only thing we can do to help the people of Russia. The free peoples everywhere must be saved from the war of world conquest which Russia's leaders are fomenting. For that reason we must unite wholeheartedly with the other free peoples of the world in the Atlantic Pact.

I have thus quoted at some length from Upton Sinclair because of my conviction that his noted voice, both in America and abroad, should be heard in this debate, and by his millions of devoted readers scattered everywhere.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, how much time have we remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The Senator has 28 minutes remaining, so the Clerk advises.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I shall add just a few words to the debate because of the regret I feel over the interpretation of this pact as made by my distinguished friend and colleague the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If I interpreted the pact in the way he does—as an incitement to war and a balance-of-power armament race—I would be as much opposed to the pact as he is. But I hope I can indicate my own interpretation of the pact in a few words; and I express the hope—I admit it is a very vague one—that if the Senator from Ohio could only interpret the pact in the way I do, he would vote for it.

I have put down my points in order, and I shall present them briefly in an endeavor to make clear what the whole debate means to me.

First of all, Mr. President, it seems to me that the North Atlantic Treaty is the essential next step since the United Nations Charter was ratified in the great movement toward international collaboration to preserve the peace. The only reason we have to have this treaty at this time is that the United Nations failed to function as intended because of the abuse of the veto power. Because of that difficulty, we now have no way to use the collective force of the world to stop aggression. It is my considered judgment that had Hitler faced an Atlantic Pact he would never have started World War II.

My second thought is this: This treaty is the logical next step in the development of our conception of the Monroe Doctrine, and it makes possible the extension of the Monroe Doctrine because the nations affected welcome it and are a part of it. The whole purpose of the Monroe Doctrine was to preserve our independence, our way of life, and our democracy. As I construe the North Atlantic Treaty, it has exactly the identical purpose and is a logical development of our original Monroe Doctrine conception.

My third point is that the Atlantic Pact is basically an expanded Monroe Doctrine, which the Senator from Ohio has stated he hoped we might have, but with this important difference—and here is where I differ from the Senator from Ohio: It is not a unilateral declaration but is a collective assumption of responsibility. I think this treaty is a multilateral acceptance of responsibility, and I believe that the nations participating in the treaty desire to have it work in that way. Certainly the nations of South America no longer wish to be treated paternalistically, but they wish to accept their own responsibility and be treated accordingly. The Act of Chapultepec and the Rio Pact are evidence of the development of a unilateral Monroe Doctrine into a multilateral doctrine. Today our independence, our way of life, and our democracy are threatened, just as they were in the days of Monroe and Canning; but we have learned that in order to preserve them in the present contracted world we must include in our pacts of mutual aid the democracies of western Europe, as well as our fellow Republics of the two American continents. Mr. President, I submit that this treaty is a logical development of the principle of the Monroe Doctrine.

My fourth point is that the treaty obviously creates obligations, but a vote for the treaty does not bind any of us to vote for an armament program which may call for specific armament aids to specific countries. There should be no arming of separate countries. There should and will be, undoubtedly, recommendations from the Council set up under article 9, and a joint defense program undoubtedly will be recommended and probably will be adopted, with all the treaty countries participating. That will be a joint, over-all interpretation of what the treaty means—not an armament race, but just the reverse, namely, an attempt to reduce armaments by this approach.

My fifth point is that it should be pointed out and emphasized that beyond any specific military preparations—I admit that in the near future such specific military preparations on our part would be inadequate in case Russia were to decide to move aggressively immediately; and I believe that too much stress has been placed upon that point—the big value of the pact is its psychological effect in warning any aggressor country that very definitely we will be lined up with the other Atlantic Pact countries to protect the whole area against aggression. We intend to bring out clearly that we favor all attempts for self-help and mutual aid, other than merely military aid, and that we will do all we can to make the participating countries strong economically, socially, and spiritually. It is this emphasis which, to my mind, has been overlooked in our debates, but I believe it is the all-important emphasis. The spotlight should be taken off the military phases, and should be placed on the psychological value of the pact as a whole and the mutual aids, such as ECA and other operations, given to participating countries, which will make all of them a united front against the threat of another world war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wonder whether I can obtain an additional half minute, in order to conclude my remarks.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield an additional half minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, my sixth point is that any proposals for joint military aid must be treated on their own merits, and can be adequately considered after the pact has been ratified and the over-all psychological defense has been perfected.

My seventh point is that the pact is within the spirit of the United Nations, and will aid in the development of the over-all purposes of the United Nations in the preservation of peace.

We need the pact in order to make the United Nations succeed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 9½ minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a few moments ago, as I sat back of the pillars and listened to the argument on the floor of this Chamber, the clock seemed to be turned back, and I remembered that Webster stood upon this floor and in his reply to Hayne, he began with the general idea that it was well to pause and chart our course. I think all of us are grateful that, under a government such as ours, we can pause, even if it takes weeks and weeks, to chart our course. I think we have charted the course here. While the pact has made queer bedfellows, I think that out of the discussion we are charting a course. I have no fear of the result. I trust the fears which we have heard expressed will vanish, and we shall know that light of the right kind has entered our minds to direct and guard and guide these people. We are but the servants of a great people, and we should not fear.

I have spoken twice on the pact. In a series of interchanges with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] on March 30, I stated my conclusion as to the meaning and obligations of the pact.

Mr. President, the pact means something. We are not entering into a mere scrap of paper.

Something was said a few minutes ago about our breaking with tradition. We broke with tradition in 1776. We have broken with traditions through the years of our national life when it meant progress. That [pointing to the painting] was a breaking with tradition when Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

The world has been contracted through our ingenuity. The question is whether we are going to be adequate to meet the responsibility. I think we are. So I would say to those who have expressed a little fear, "Fear not, God's in His heaven, all's right with the world." The Lord has looked after us, and if we play the game squarely as we should, as men, this Government will perform its obligations and the world will be our debtor.

I shall not discuss the reservations; they have been fully covered. I merely want to say the English language is a vehicle, a queer vehicle at times. One distinguished Senator said, on an occasion when he was leaving the old Senate, "The human mind is a queer contraption. Men can see what they want to see." I listened to the argument by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and I listened to the argument of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I think they were complementary. I felt they both demonstrated clearly that the great result which would come out of this international arrangement or agreement was that America—America, Mr. President, mind you, the leader among the nations; your country and mine—speaks definitely, concretely, and dynamically in an age of uncertainty; speaks to the world as to where we stand. It says, in other words, "One for all, and all for one." Under one part of the pact it says, "If there is an attack, we are in there shooting." It says, in no uncertain language, that if and when the Congress of the United States deems it necessary to take steps to look after ourselves and the peace of the world, it will become necessary to take other steps in the nature of insurance. Some have called it providing arms, some have called it consultation, some have called it this and that. I care not what it may be called.

Mr. President, we are living in an age which is entirely different from the one in which our fathers lived. The traditions of our fathers which have been demonstrated to be sound and healthful, and applicable to world conditions today, we should maintain and retain. Let us recognize that the world of today is a different world from what it was in the days before World War II. We have planes now that will travel from 700 to 900 miles an hour. We have guided missiles that will go 3,000 miles. We have other instrumentalities. The good Lord only knows what is around the corner. It is not the same age. What is more, we have gravitated to a position of responsibility, and we are either going to meet it head on, or we are going to fail in our leadership in this critical age.

So, Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to say a few words at the conclusion of this debate. I have no fear of the results. This pact will not bring the millenium. It will not cause war. It will not by itself make for peace. Russia and the peoples of the earth will decide the course of history. But this pact will, I hope, make for unity among the contracting parties and restrain any potential aggressor.

Within the four corners of this pact or treaty will be found the intent of the pact makers. Its purpose is clear, to provide unity of action to resist aggression.

Walter Lippmann, in his column as it appeared in the Washington Post of July 14, 1949, sets out clearly the argument in relation to the obligation of this country as interpreted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and Secretary Acheson, the obligation in relation to supplying arms. It was this editorial of Lippmann's that caused me again briefly to restate my own viewpoint.

I am of the opinion that if this pact becomes the law of the land—

First. It does not in any way delimit the right of Congress to say what the implementation shall be, if any, under the pact.

Second. This, to me, is particularly clear because under article 9 there is the specific provision that the Council can only recommend the measures for implementation under 3 and 5. Recommend to whom? Answer: To the signers of the pact.

I hold that the international conditions or circumstances, as they develop, will determine the character and need of the implementation, and then the Congress will determine how this Nation shall meet that need. Of course, as a practical matter, if an emergency arises, the President, under his powers, would act. That power to act can be delimited neither by treaty nor by act of Congress.

In view of the fact that a military-aid bill is in contemplation and that previous discussion by the State Department with the leaders of other nations in relation to military aid may have created in the minds of some of the statesmen of the

other pact-signer nations the conclusion that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has contended for, namely, "that every one of the other signatories now believes it would acquire a treaty right to receive arms and that we have a treaty obligation to supply arms to each and every one of them," I believe the suggestion of Walter Lippmann in relation to any arms assistance that is to be given should be carried out, to wit: Make the European arms bill a part of the American military budget. Authorize the Pentagon to furnish arms to the European defense system up to a specific amount out of surplus, if that is found to be the right thing, and instruct the administration to find the money by economy within the existing military appropriations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, how much time have we left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON].

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, we do not make any facts when we ratify this treaty. We did not make any facts when we negotiated it. The treaty is the recognition of the facts which have been made largely by others. The policy we set forth in the treaty is a policy which every thinking man in the country knows we would have to adopt in the event a conflict should break out. The sensible part for us is to see that that conflict does not commence again. There are those who say we do not know whether the Kaiser and Hitler would have marched, if we had had this kind of instrument in existence in 1914 and 1939. But there are hundreds of thousands of our dead, and the dead of other lands, who lie buried all over the earth, who bear mute testimony to our failure to speak bravely and in time. The pact is an effort to prevent that terrible catastrophe from happening again. We have pledged our troth one with another to see to it that no aggressor dares again make war on the world.

The Senator from Ohio has referred to the fact that he wants to face realities, but it seems to me that he and every other Senator who has taken the position he has, has flown away into the stratosphere, and has denied the realities the Soviet Union imposes upon this country and upon the world. We who shall support this treaty are the ones who face reality—the reality of a despotic and cruel power which has said time and time again that it intends to inherit the earth. That, Mr. President, is what at all costs we are determined to prevent. That, Mr. President, is the reason for this treaty.

The Senator from Ohio talks about our facing an arms race. I pointed out last night that the greatest arms race the world has ever known is not faced—we are in it. We might as well admit it. There will undoubtedly come a time when the Soviet Union will be in possession of weapons of mass destruction, with which in sufficient quantities, she might be able to impose her will upon the world. When that day comes, the safety of this country will depend entirely upon the kind of combination we have with other free peoples of the earth. This is a step, and a mighty effective one, looking toward that day—that day which we are going to face just as surely as we are here in this Chamber today. That is facing reality, and any attempt to deny it is running away from it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, how much time have we left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Twelve minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall vote for ratification of the Atlantic Pact and against amendments or reservations. In voting for the pact, I refuse to assume any commitment, moral or otherwise, to vote for the military-aid program. This does not necessarily mean that I will be against the military-aid program. As a matter of fact, I favor a practical and intelligent military-aid program if it appears necessary. I favor anything that is a timely challenge to destroyers of peace. But I certainly reserve my judgment and my right to determine the kind of such military aid, its amount, and its duration.

I can see no inconsistency with this position as taken by myself or by my colleagues who, having voted in favor of the ratification of the pact, may vote against the military-aid program in the form recommended by the administration; nor would it be inconsistent for other Senators to vote against the ratification of the pact and yet support a military-aid program in a form satisfactory to them.

The Atlantic Pact and the military-aid program, although possibly dependent upon each other, are each separate and distinct. Their joining together is entirely dependent on the will of the Congress. The two may meet. But it is for the Congress of the United States, exercising its sovereign constitutional right, to determine the time and the conditions for such a meeting, and even whether this meeting should take place at all. It is with this understanding, confirmed by the distinguished senior Senators from Michigan and Texas as well as by the State Department, that I intend to vote for the pact.

I have no quarrel with those of my colleagues who will vote against the ratification of the pact. I respect their earnest determination to abide by the principles which guide them. It is perfectly clear by now that a more practical and more powerful instrument of peace than a mere military alliance could have been devised by the State Department. I can see behind some of the articles of this pact dark clouds of confusion leading possibly to mutual dissatisfaction and dissension among its signatories. A far better pact could have been written had the State Department taken the American people more into its confidence instead of conditioning and pressurizing American public opinion with its official propaganda machine.

In the political field the Atlantic Pact, like the Marshall plan in the economic field, contains a great idea. The idea is to ally a united front of peaceful nations against any design for conquest by a desperate nation feverishly rearming behind the iron curtain.

The American people are ready to meet this threat and are willing to undergo any sacrifice necessary to maintain peace in the world.

The State Department is apparently not yet quite ready to meet the challenge squarely. It could have produced a pact with a more practical and more effective instrument to carry out the great idea of cooperative defense of peaceful nations against the scheming war lords of any nation.

Thus, we are confronted with a most unwelcome choice: We must either vote for the pact, realizing that it is but little better than a military alliance and that it offers no permanent solution to the problem of world peace; or we must vote against the pact and run the risk of further encouraging aggression and discouraging our peaceful Atlantic neighbors. In voting for the ratification of the pact, I believe I choose the best of these two alternatives.

After the submission of the Atlantic Pact, the task of those who now favor its ratification would have been less difficult had the State Department been more logical and less inconsistent in its statements about the pact, its purposes, and its commitments. Instead of frank and direct statements on the relation between the Atlantic Pact and military aid to other signatory nations, we were given statements which tried to satisfy everybody and pleased no one.

At first it was stated officially that the Atlantic Pact constitutes a moral commitment for military aid to Europe now. Later it was officially stated in the Department of State Bulletin that the military assistance program was formulated, not only separately, but even before the Atlantic Pact was formulated. And as for commitments, legal or moral, the latest position in the State Department is that the ratification of the Atlantic Pact does not commit us in any way, shape, or manner to the military assistance program.

Again, until quite recently, the speeches of State Department officials were bristling with the phrase "implementation of the pact"—meaning the military aid program that would follow the ratification of the pact. Today, I understand, the word "implementation" is taboo.

I submit, Mr. President, that when the American Nation is about to be launched on a new and perilous journey of peacetime military alliance, when we are about to undertake a new and gigantic experiment jointly with the nations of western Europe, numbering about 200,000,000 people, it would have been far better not to have been confronted with the contradictory and illogical statements of the framers of the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. President, I have delivered approximately half of what I had prepared to say, and I now ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my remarks may be printed in the RECORD, in order that I may give back a little of the time allotted to me by the Senator from Texas.

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

The remainder of Mr. AIKEN's speech is as follows:

There are other circumstances that make the passage of the Atlantic Pact more stormy than it should be. It is a strange coincidence that the latest of the inevitable series of British pound crises should have coincided with the debate on the Atlantic Pact.

Another strange coincidence is the reported demand by the British Government for detailed information and assistance to build atomic bombs. Why is this demand—a demand which apparently is so weighty and so urgent as to cause the President to call an extraordinary meeting—why, I ask, is this demand made now during the critical phase of the debate on the Atlantic Pact? Is it by any chance to impress the United States Senate with the thought that unless Britain is lifted once again from her deep financial pit—a pit which in large part is of the British Government's own digging—that unless we rush to her assistance with extra billions of dollars she will regretfully have to produce her own atomic bombs and make her own arrangements with other European nations and perhaps with Soviet Russia?

I should have much preferred to hear about an extraordinary meeting under our President in which there would be discussed not the question of how to produce British atomic bombs with the help of American dollars, but the question on which our survival might depend, and that means how to stop ideological fanatics from producing and using any atomic bombs; how to avert the impending atomic catastrophe; how to lift from the backs of the farmer, the working man, and others, the back-breaking load of the armament race; how to put out the flames of violence and war that are breaking out more and more often over the fear-drawn face of the earth; how to use the might of America and the yearning of humanity to establish a world organization based on a world law against aggressors, interpreted by a world court and enforced by a world police from all peaceful nations.

We have been disappointed with the results obtained by the United Nations. Although it has many fine and constructive accomplishments to its credit, particularly in the economic and cultural fields, the stern fact remains that it has failed, and failed sadly in its primary purpose, as stated in the UN Charter: "To maintain international peace and security."

Ever since the United Nations was founded, well-intentioned people have been asserting that its structure was sturdy, that it needed only time to grow and become strong. I have been one of those people. Now, however, it has become apparent to all that in preventing armament races and ridding the world from the fear of war it has been impotent. Impotent because of the veto right.

It has been said that it is the Russian misuse of the veto which prevents the United Nations from functioning. This is not technically true. The veto right is there in the Charter, duly approved and signed by all members of the United Nations. Russia has a perfectly legal right to use this power.

It is not Russia's vetoes that are endangering the future of the United Nations and the world. It is the obvious defects in the Charter itself, which enable Russia or any other permanent member to paralyze it at will.

It was not the absence of the United States that caused the downfall of the League of Nations. It was the presence of the same defects we see now in the Charter of the United Nations. Great promises made in the United Nations Charter have been betrayed through these fatal defects. It was promised there to eliminate the armament race. That promise is a tragically empty phrase.

Only 4 years after the United States Senate ratified the United Nations Charter we are witnessing the biggest armament race of all time. The substance of America, of Russia, and of the world is being sapped by this cancerous growth. No nation in the world is immune from this all-devouring plague that could spell certain disaster even to America in spite of our vast resources. Even the Marshall plan with its gigantic appropriations is but a stream flowing into the raging sea of destructive armament production.

It was solemnly promised in the United Nations Charter to build an international police force to protect the many peaceful nations against the violence of the few. Today, after 4 years of fruitless efforts, the United Nations has not even a company of soldiers, nor is it likely to have, except as private guards to its officials.

When the United Nations was confronted with the terrifying problem of the atomic bomb, it failed after its Commission held over 200 meetings.

Yet it is clear to every thinking American that unless we can stop the armament race, remove the atomic threat before it engulfs us, and establish an international police force of all peaceful nations, this Atlantic Pact, or a hundred Atlantic pacts, can only postpone but never prevent a catastrophic war of nations.

But if we use the Atlantic Pact as an instrument to produce a greater influence for a truly effective world organization, then the Atlantic Pact may prove to be the foundation stone for a world pact within which the American, the Russian, and all other peoples may work side by side for lasting peace.

This is the reason why I, together with 10 of my colleagues, subscribed on July 8 to the resolution so ably presented to this Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama for the extension of the Atlantic Pact either into a revised United Nations or into a world pact open to all nations including Russia, should she choose to join, and for the establishment, meanwhile, of an Atlantic contingent from smaller nations as a nuclear international police force. We intend to pursue the principles and methods of this resolution when the military aid bill is introduced.

We seek no war with Russia, nor do we condone the appeasement of Russia. We believe there is a third way—a stronger and a nobler way. That way lies in the completion of the task begun by the nations of the world in San Francisco in 1945—the task of saving the world by the only way that the world can be saved—the way of a world organization under lawful authority to punish the actual, and to disarm the potential, aggressors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seven minutes remain.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, whether one favors the ratification of the Atlantic Pact or opposes it, I am sure there is not a Member of the Senate who does not regret the necessity for this decision. It is not a choice we voluntarily assume, Mr. President, but it is a necessity which we feel compelled to face. There are some who see in the pact more danger than the uncertainty of not ratifying it in this body. On the other hand, others feel conscientiously that its calculated and unknown risks are better to be assumed than others of which we know not. So, Mr. President, I shall cast my vote for the advice and consent which I hope the Senate will give to the ratification of the pact.

I think it will be proven that the important part of this proposal is not that one which has been causing the most concern to some—the assumed obligation to furnish arms. The important part of the pact is the express obligation which we for the first time assume to go to the aid of any country in this group which is the victim of armed attack. We give up our freedom of choice to be neutral or to take sides; we abandon the previously enjoyed prerogative of debate and discussion, and we commit ourselves irrevocably to the defense of a nation which is the victim of an armed assault. That is a new and, it may be, a dangerous departure from our previous course in international policy.

I believe General Marshall stated the basis of this proposal when he appeared last year before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House and said that the purpose of this pact is to bring about an equilibrium in world power which we will make possible the effective functioning of the United Nations as it was intended to function when it was originally conceived. Because I think the pact, under all the circumstances, will contribute to a stronger United Nations and, in the end, an effect in world government and universal peace, I shall support it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I have in my hand a letter from the Secretary of State dealing with reservations. I do not think I shall have time to read it all, but I ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD in full.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 15, 1949.

The Honorable TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: In response to your request for my views concerning the various reservations which have been proposed with respect to ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty by this Government, I should like to deal with them collectively in this letter. I am also writing you concerning each of them individually.

The effect of the proposed reservations would be to cast doubt upon the determination of the Government and people of the United States to do their utmost for peace and thereby substantially to nullify the effectiveness of the treaty as an instrument for accomplishing its great purpose—the maintenance of peace.

The treaty has been negotiated and signed by the United States as a major step in carrying out the advice given by the Senate when it adopted Senate Resolution 239 by an overwhelming vote. Among the objectives which that resolution advised the President that the United States should particularly pursue was:

"Contributing to the maintenance of peace by making clear its determination to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 should any armed attack occur affecting its national security."

I attach great importance, as I am sure the Senate does, to those words "making clear its determination." The treaty has been designed, with full and complete constitutional safeguards, to make our determination just as clear as is humanly possible. In transmitting it to the Senate the President stated:

"The treaty makes clear the determination of the people of the United States and

of our neighbors in the North Atlantic community to do their utmost to maintain peace with justice and to take such action as they deem necessary if the peace is broken."

This vital element was also stressed by the Foreign Relations Committee's report in dealing with the main purpose of the treaty and in its summary of reasons for recommending ratification.

I cannot stress too much the importance of making clear our determination if we are to accomplish our great objective of maintaining peace. Anything which casts doubt upon our determination, or the will of the American people, as would adoption of the proposed reservations, would greatly reduce the effectiveness of the treaty as a contribution to peace.

I can think of few events that would cast more doubt upon our determination to do our utmost for peace than for the Senate of the United States to accept amendments to the pending resolution which would involve the renegotiation of the North Atlantic Treaty. The treaty has been concluded after long and painstaking negotiations in which there was full consultation and cooperation between the United States negotiators and the Foreign Relations Committee, and in which the United States negotiators scrupulously followed Senate Resolution 239 as their directive, even to the extent of embodying some of its actual language in the treaty. It has the strong and unanimous support of the Foreign Relations Committee. To reopen negotiations with 11 other nations, 5 of which have already deposited their ratifications, would give rise at least to prolonged delay in bringing the treaty into effect and would certainly create the greatest uncertainty as to the intentions and dependability of the United States. Such action by the United States would not only raise doubts as to our determination in the minds of those who might be considering aggression, but would certainly raise the gravest doubts in the minds of our partners in the pact and thereby destroy the momentum of confidence which has been growing steadily as the result of the determination hitherto shown on the part of the free nations to act resolutely together.

In view of these considerations, which I know from statements you and Senator VANDENBERG have made during the debate that you have much in mind, I strongly hope that the treaty will be approved by the Senate without any reservations whatever.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Mr. CONNALLY. One of the most important portions of the letter is as follows:

I can think of few events that would cast more doubt upon our determination to do our utmost for peace than for the Senate of the United States to accept amendments to the pending resolution which would involve the renegotiation of the North Atlantic Treaty. The treaty has been concluded after long and painstaking negotiations in which there was full consultation and cooperation between the United States negotiators and the Foreign Relations Committee, and in which the United States negotiators scrupulously followed Senate Resolution 239 as their directive, even to the extent of embodying some of its actual language in the treaty. It has the strong and unanimous support of the Foreign Relations Committee. To reopen negotiations with 11 other nations, 5 of which have already deposited their ratifications, would give rise at least to prolonged delay in bringing the treaty into effect and would certainly create the greatest uncertainty as to the intentions and dependability of the United States. Such action by the United States would not only raise doubts as to our determination in the minds of those who might be considering aggression, but would certainly raise the gravest doubts in the minds of our partners in the pact and thereby destroy the momentum of confidence which has been growing steadily as the result of the determination hitherto shown on the part of the free nations to act resolutely together.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, permit me to say that the purpose of all reservations is to dilute and water down the treaty itself. The purpose of those who propound reservations is to cut and chisel away some parts of the treaty they do not like. I hope Senators will vote against all reservations and in favor of the ratification of the treaty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's 2 minutes' time has expired. He has two more minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield the balance of my time to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for a minute and three-quarters.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that will be sufficient time. I merely asked the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for a minute or two in order that I might at this time pay a tribute to all members of that committee. The painstaking way in which the members of that committee exhaustively considered every phase of the North Atlantic Pact seems to me to deserve the appreciation and the sincere commendation of all Members of the Senate, irrespective of how they shall vote.

I wish to pay special tribute to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the committee, as well as the leading minority member, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. From the beginning to the end of the hearings and throughout the debate on the floor of the Senate the discussion has been kept upon a high and dignified plane. Not one utterance, I believe, will be found in which there was any partisanship shown in connection with this great, controversial issue, an issue perhaps as soul searching and far reaching as any that has ever been debated in the Senate of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired. All time for debate has expired. The vote first comes on reservation No. 1, as modified, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], for himself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the reservation, as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add the following at the end of the resolution of ratification:

The United States of America ratifies this treaty with the understanding that article 3 commits none of the parties thereto, morally or legally, to furnish or supply arms, armaments, military, naval or air equipment or military, naval, or air supplies, including atomic bombs and information relating thereto, to any other party or parties to this treaty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the reservation as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed an adviser to the delegation of the United States of America to the Second World Health Organization Assembly, meeting at Rome, Italy.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 74, as follows:

YEAS—21

Brewster	Flanders	Schoeppel
Bricker	Jenner	Taft
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Taylor
Byrd	Kem	Watkins
Cain	Langer	Wherry
Cordon	Malone	Williams
Donnell	Martin	Young

NAYS—74

Aiken	Hoey	Morse
Anderson	Holland	Mundt
Baldwin	Humphrey	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Myers
Capehart	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kefauver	Pepper
Douglas	Kerr	Reed
Downey	Kilgore	Robertson
Dulles	Knowland	Russell
Eastland	Lodge	Saltonstall
Ecton	Long	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Lucas	Smith, N. J.
Frear	McCarran	Sparkman
Fulbright	McCarthy	Stennis
George	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Graham	McGrath	Thye
Green	McKellar	Tobey
Gurney	McMahon	Tydings
Hayden	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Hendrickson	Maybank	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Miller	Withers
Hill	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—1

Ellender

So reservation No. 1, offered by Mr. WHERRY, for himself, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. WATKINS, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to remark that with the exception of one Senator, who is absent abroad, by leave of the Senate, on official business, every Member of the Senate voted on this roll call.

The question now is on reservation No. 2, offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], which will be stated:

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the said resolution of ratification it is proposed to insert the following:

The United States understands and construes article 5 of the treaty as follows:

That the United States assumes no obligation to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area or to assist any other party or parties in said area, by armed force, or to employ the military, air, or naval forces of the United States under article V or any article of the treaty, for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military, air, or naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so provide.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the roll was called.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed an adviser to the delegation of the United States of America to the Second World Health Organization Assembly meeting at Rome, Italy.

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 84, as follows:

YEAS—11

Butler	Langer	Watkins
Donnell	Malone	Wherry
Jenner	Taft	Young
Kem	Taylor	

NAYS—84

Aiken	Hendrickson	Miller
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Baldwin	Hill	Morse
Brewster	Hoey	Mundt
Bricker	Holland	Murray
Bridges	Humphrey	Myers
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Connally	Kefauver	Robertson
Cordon	Kerr	Russell
Douglas	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Downey	Knowland	Schoeppel
Dulles	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Long	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Lucas	Sparkman
Ferguson	McCarran	Stennis
Flanders	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McFarland	Thye
George	McGrath	Tobey
Gillette	McKellar	Tydings
Graham	McMahon	Vandenberg
Green	Magnuson	Wiley
Gurney	Martin	Williams
Hayden	Maybank	Withers

NOT VOTING—1

Ellender

So reservation No. 2, offered by Mr. WATKINS, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is agreeing to reservation No. 3, offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. The reservation will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the resolution of ratification it is proposed to insert the following:

The United States further understands and construes article 5 to the effect that in any particular case or event of armed attack on any other party or parties to the treaty, the Congress of the United States is not expressly, impliedly, or morally obligated or committed to declare war or authorize the employment of the military, air, or naval forces of the United States against the nation or nations making said attack, or to assist with its armed forces the nation or nations attacked, but shall have complete freedom in considering the circumstances of each case to act or refuse to act as the Congress in its discretion shall determine.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the roll was called.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed an adviser to the delegation of the United States of America to the Second World Health Organization Assembly meeting at Rome, Italy.

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 87, as follows:

YEAS—8

Butler	Kem	Taylor
Donnell	Langer	Watkins
Jenner	Malone	

NAYS—87

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Anderson	Hill	Mundt
Baldwin	Hoey	Murray
Brewster	Holland	Myers
Bricker	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Downey	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Dulles	Long	Sparkman
Eastland	Lucas	Stennis
Ecton	McCarran	Taft
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Frear	McFarland	Thye
Fulbright	McGrath	Tobey
George	McKellar	Tydings
Gillette	McMahon	Vandenberg
Graham	Magnuson	Wherry
Green	Martin	Wiley
Gurney	Maybank	Williams
Hayden	Miller	Withers
Hendrickson	Millikin	Young

NOT VOTING—1

Ellender

So reservation No. 3, offered by Mr. WATKINS, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the resolution of ratification, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive L, Eighty-first Congress, first session, the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Washington on April 4, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed an adviser to the delegation of the United States of America to the Second World Health Organization Assembly meeting at Rome, Italy. If present, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—82

Aiken	Douglas	Hayden
Anderson	Downey	Hendrickson
Baldwin	Dulles	Hickenlooper
Brewster	Eastland	Hill
Bricker	Ecton	Hoey
Bridges	Ferguson	Holland
Butler	Frear	Humphrey
Byrd	Fulbright	Hunt
Cain	George	Ives
Capehart	Gillette	Johnson, Tex.
Chapman	Graham	Johnston, S. C.
Chavez	Green	Kefauver
Connally	Gurney	Kerr
Kilgore	Miller	Smith, Maine
Knowland	Millikin	Smith, N. J.
Lodge	Morse	Sparkman
Long	Mundt	Stennis
Lucas	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
McCarran	Myers	Thomas, Utah
McCarthy	Neely	Thye
McClellan	O'Conor	Tobey
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Tydings
McGrath	Pepper	Vandenberg
McKellar	Reed	Wiley
McMahon	Robertson	Williams
Magnuson	Russell	Withers
Martin	Saltonstall	
Maybank	Schoeppel	

NAYS—13

Cordon	Kem	Watkins
Donnell	Langer	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	Young
Jenner	Taft	
Johnson, Colo.	Taylor	

NOT VOTING—1

Ellender

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of ratification having received the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present, and a quorum being present, it is agreed to, and the treaty is ratified.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—EDWARD B. LAWSON

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is it desired to take up at this time the nominations on the calendar?

Mr. LUCAS. We may as well dispose of the nominations to which there is no objection. I am not sure whether there is objection to the nomination of Mr. Lawson.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection, but I believe objection was made the last time from the other side of the aisle. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois knows about that. I think there was no objection from any Senator on this side of the aisle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward B. Lawson, of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iceland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG STAMP—RESOLUTION OF PITTSBURGH LODGE, NO. 46, LOYAL ORDER OF MOOSE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask

unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Pittsburgh Lodge, No. 46, Loyal Order of Moose, of Pittsburgh, Pa., relating to the selection and sale of an official pledge-of-allegiance-to-the-flag stamp.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas through the efforts of the Americanism committee of the Allegheny County Committee of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, the United States Congress approved a resolution in 1945 officially adopting the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, thereby vesting said pledge of allegiance with the same reverence that attends our national anthem; and

Whereas this same Americanism committee from the county of Allegheny, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, under the leadership of Col. John H. Shenkel, sponsored House Resolution No. 4320 presented by Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER on April 25, 1949, whereby Congress authorized the issuance of a new stamp having thereon an imprint of the Capitol of the United States, the United States flag, and the official pledge of allegiance to the flag; and

Whereas the authority of the Postmaster General of the United States to select commemorative issues of stamps is limited to 12 from more than 70 requests submitted for consideration; and

Whereas the selection of the official Pledge of Allegiance Stamp would be in the interest of Americanism and in view of the fact that the resolutions of Congress to make the pledge of allegiance to the flag official and to authorize the Pledge of Allegiance Stamp were first sponsored by the Americanism committee of the American Legion in the county of Allegheny, Pa.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the governor and members of Pittsburgh Lodge, No. 46, Loyal Order of Moose, Supreme Lodge of the World, in meeting assembled, That the Postmaster General of the United States be requested to select the official pledge-of-allegiance-to-the-flag stamp as a commemorative issue and further, if said stamp is selected that it be first placed on sale in the post office at Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa., on August 11, 1949, the second day of the convention of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, and further, that copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. Jesse M. Donaldson, Postmaster General of the United States, Senator Francis J. Myers, Hon. Joseph J. Lawler, Assistant Postmaster General of the United States, Senator Edward Martin, Congressman Harry J. Davenport, Congressman Robert J. Corbett, Congressman James G. Fulton, Congressman Herman P. Eberharter, and Congressman Frank Buchanan.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 2298. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands and to lease certain other land to Milwaukee County, Wis.; without amendment (Rept. No. 738).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution authorizing Federal participation in the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the Founding of Port-au-Prince, Republic of Haiti, 1949; with an amendment (Rept. No. 739).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution to provide that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland and American books and technical equipment for institutions of higher education in Finland; with amendments (Rept. No. 740).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1973. A bill to further amend the Communications Act of 1934; with an amendment (Rept. No. 741).

ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN COLLECTING SALES AND USE TAXES ON CIGARETTES—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF S. REPT. 644)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 11, 1949,

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, as a Member of the Committee on Finance, submitted his minority views on the bill (H. R. 195) to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes, which were ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JULY 21, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Sourwine, J. G., counsel	$10,330.00	$4,849.34
Davis, Joseph A., chief clerk	9,222.11	4,582.03
Rosenberger, Francis C., assistant chief clerk	7,484.07	2,640.20
Ruddy, J. Carlisle, professional staff member	9,222.11	4,582.03
Young, Robert B., professional staff member	9,064.11	4,529.62
Covert, Maurice W., professional staff member	9,064.11	4,433.28
Green, George S., professional staff member	8,037.08	2,991.55
Mathews, John H., professional staff member	8,037.08	2,076.22
Rogers, Mary, clerical assistant	5,529.08	2,650.23
Fox, Miriam O., clerical assistant	5,529.08	2,650.23
Canon, Mildred E., clerical assistant	5,529.08	2,485.83
Sheaff, H. Joan, clerical assistant	4,701.44	1,906.50
Duborg, Barbara E., clerical assistant	4,701.44	1,565.80
McNamee, Patience E., clerical assistant	4,701.44	1,411.94
Creesy, Orrin E., clerical assistant	4,453.15	1,373.03
Redden, Doris M., clerical assistant	4,370.38	291.35
Holland, Margaret L., clerical assistant	3,791.04	157.96
Ganss, Helen W., clerical assistant	3,791.04	157.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$121,922.88
Amount expended	45,335.10
Balance unexpended	76,587.78

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION (PURSUANT TO S. RES 137 OF THE 80TH CONG., AS AMENDED)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 3 to June 30, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Tota salary received
Arens, Richard, staff director	$9,538.12	$4,690.04
Blair, Drury Harvey, staff member	7,405.06	2,330.07
Cochran, William F., staff member	3,956.56	636.47
Davis, Dorothy A., stenographer	3,956.56	1,879.34
Davis, Thomas J., staff member	7,405.06	3,623.48
Dekom, Otto J., investigator	6,931.05	2,021.53
Earl, Owen K., staff member	2,406.80	557.95
Grefe, Charles A., staff member	6,025.66	2,447.06
Johnson, Ethel L., staff member	7,010.05	3,499.84
Loftus, John A., staff member	7,800.07	3,755.16
Lojewski, Stephanie E., stenographer	3,956.56	1,978.26
Massey, Guy M., staff member	7,010.05	3,499.84
Mechling, Margaret M., stenographer	3,956.56	1,681.52
Mesmer, Fred M., staff member	7,405.06	3,623.48
Messersmith, James C., staff member	6,931.05	3,465.48
Morrill, Mary E., stenographer	3,956.56	1,278.84
Noyes, Anne F., staff member	6,931.05	3,292.21
Odham, Lois Catherine, stenographer	4,453.15	2,157.58
Randolph, Frank P., staff member	6,931.05	3,292.21
Redden, Doris M., stenographer	3,956.56	1,278.84
Schroeder, Frank W., investigator	6,931.05	2,021.53
Smithey, Wayne H., staff member	1,713.80	680.73
Stevens, William A., staff member	6,931.05	2,406.58
Turner, Mary A., stenographer	3,956.56	1,175.96
Williamson, Francis L., staff member	6,931.05	1,656.30
Zimmermann, John F., staff member	6,025.66	2,327.46

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 2299. A bill to amend section 60 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 2300. A bill to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, pertaining to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2301. A bill to promote interstate and foreign commerce and strengthen the national defense by providing for commercial cargo and transport aircraft adaptable to military transport service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2302. A bill for the relief of Morris Linde, Sonia Doreen Linde (wife), and Mary Linde (mother); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2303. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Stefanos Kaloudis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH (by request):

S. 2304. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2305. A bill to authorize suits against the United States to adjudicate and administer water rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2306. A bill for the relief of Vera Sarah Keenan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. PEPPER introduced Senate bill 2307, to remove the limitation upon the maximum deposit insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2308. A bill for the relief of William Alfred Bevan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION UPON MAXIMUM DEPOSIT INSURED BY FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill raising the limit on bank deposits insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation so that all bank deposits may be insured, which I believe can be done under the assessments now being levied against the banks of the country.

The bill (S. 2307) to remove the limitation upon the maximum deposit insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, introduced by Mr. PEPPER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5268) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. GREEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1875) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4177) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 63, after line 23, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"SEC. 102. (a) No part of any appropriation contained in this title for the Atomic Energy Commission shall be used to confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds, upon investigation and report by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary, wages, stipend, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this title shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Mr. O'MAHONEY also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4177, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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

TRANSFER OF VESSEL *BLACK MALLARD* TO STATE OF LOUISIANA—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on yesterday the bill (H. R. 5365) to provide for the transfer of the vessel *Black Mallard* to the State of Louisiana for the use and benefit of the department of wildlife and fisheries of such State, was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I think it should have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 627. An act for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio;

H. R. 660. An act for the relief of Julia Busch;

H. R. 752. An act 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.;

H. R. 1033. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Barrington MacDonald;

H. R. 1474. An act 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;

H. R. 1631. An act for the relief of John J. O'Mara;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Maurice J. Symms;

H. R. 1799. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacob Ornstein;

H. R. 2594. An act for the relief of Grace L. Elser;

H. R. 2628. An act for the relief of Auldon Albert Aiken;

H. R. 2928. An act for the relief of Dr. Leon L. Konchegul;

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of Public Utility District No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 3300. An act for the relief of Mary Thomas Schiek;

H. R. 3413. An act for the relief of Alfred Baumgarts;

H. R. 3726. An act for the relief of Knickerbocker Insurance Co. of New York and Atlas Assurance Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 3803. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary L. W. Dawson;

H. R. 3837. An act for the relief of Annie Balaz;

H. R. 4653. An act for the relief of the New York Quinine & Chemical Works, Inc., Merck & Co., Inc., and Mallinckrodt Chemical Works;

H. R. 5155. An act for the relief of Francesca Lucareni, a minor; and

H. R. 5160. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giustina Schiano Lomoriello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5356. An act to provide for the conveyance of land to the Norfolk County Trust Co., in Stoughton, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3494. An act 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; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO THE DEMOCRATIC MIDWEST CONFERENCE

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Vice President to the Democratic Midwest Conference, in Des Moines, Iowa, June 13, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF THE SHRINE OF NORTH AMERICA

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President before the Imperial Council of the Shrine of North America in Chicago, Ill., July 19, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUTTER PROVISO IN THE ARMED SERVICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to the proposal to remove from the armed services appropriation bill the so-called butter proviso.

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

Why are the oleo interests so eager to have the butter proviso removed from the armed services appropriation bill? There may be a clue in these figures from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture. In the first 5 months of 1949 butter consumption was approximately 20 percent greater than in the comparable period of 1948. Retail prices for butter were about 20 percent lower.

The lower retail prices for butter, accompanied by the increase in consumption of that product, has reduced the market for oleomargarine. In the first 4 months of 1949 consumption of oleomargarine in the United States was approximately 5 percent smaller

than a year ago, although oleo prices were down about as much relatively as were butter prices.

Are the oleo interests now attempting to recoup their lost markets by passing off their product on the armed forces? I am opposed to any attempts to foist a second-choice butter substitute upon service men and women, and will demand the restoration of the butter proviso.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, AS AMENDED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 256) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, which was, on page 11, line 19, strike out all after "maintained" down to and including "act" in line 23, and insert "solely by water carriers subject to this part which engages in activities relating to the fixing of rates, publication of classifications, or filing of schedules by such carriers."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the bill unanimously. The Senate passed it on the Consent Calendar unanimously. There are a number of items in the bill and the House amended one of them very slightly. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF MINIMUM-WAGE LAW—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senator from Illinois announced to the Senate that, following the disposition of the North Atlantic Treaty, we would then proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 653, Calendar 640, which is a bill to provide for amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill, S. 653, to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is debatable.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to make an inquiry of the majority leader about the further program after this bill is disposed of. I should like to understand, if I may, what is to be taken up following the bill to which the Senator refers. Certain legislation is pending in which many of us are very much interested. If the able majority leader will advise us further, it will be appreciated.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be very glad to advise the Senator from Arkansas, and I was going to do that following the adoption of the motion to consider Senate bill 653. What we expect to do, and what we will do, is, on tomorrow, lay the pending business aside and take up the appropriation bill known as the Economic Recovery Act, or House bill 4830, which is on the calendar. It is an act making appropriations for foreign aid for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will it be the purpose of the majority leader from time to time during the pendency of Senate bill 653 to lay it aside and dispose of appropriation bills?

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that we have a dead line on all these appropriations, which I understand, is July 31, it is the intention of the majority leader to continue on with the appropriation bills until we conclude consideration of all of them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Until they are all concluded. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the able majority leader yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Some time ago, and I believe it was the 13th of June, there was reported by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Senate Joint Resolution 108, generally known as the economy resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. I am familiar with that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Thereafter, I believe on the 27th of June, a petition was presented, signed by some 61 Senators, and subsequently, I think, by 63 Senators, to both the majority leader and the minority leader, requesting the schedule of legislative business be so arranged that the resolution might come before the Senate. May I inquire of the able majority leader whether there is any prospect that that resolution can be brought up and action had on it prior to concluding the disposition of the regular appropriation bills?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my very distinguished friend from Arkansas that it seems to me we should not consider the petition which has been presented to the majority and minority leaders, until we have disposed of the remaining appropriation bills. As I understand, there is approximately $30,000,000,000 to be considered in the four appropriation bills. I further understand that some reductions have been made by the Appropriations Committee, and probably other amendments will be offered when the bills come before the Senate for consideration, amendments to effect further economies. It seems to me, as I said once before, it would be premature to take up consideration of the resolution referred to until we conclude action on pending appropriation bills.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield so that I may further interrogate him with respect to what action has been taken by the policy committee of the majority with respect to the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has any action been taken by the Policy Committee? Some of us are very much interested in having the resolution considered. It has been quite some time since it was reported. Nearly a month has expired since such a large number of Senators expressed their desire to have the resolution considered. We were hoping it might be considered before all the appropriation bills were passed, so we could know and be advised whether there is any prospect of reduction by this process, and whether, if not by way of specific cuts, the cuts might be made across the board indiscriminately on these bills? In other words, it poses a pretty difficult problem here in the situation we are in, and we are trying to determine how it is best to proceed in order to give expression to what appears to be the majority sentiment of this body.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say, to the Senator from Arkansas that the majority leader is attempting to carry on a program in the Senate in the manner he conceives to be in the best interests of all, and in line with the decisions of the Democratic policy committee. That committee has considered the resolution. We took no action on it. I think I can safely say it was almost the unanimous consensus of the committee that it was premature at this time to give it consideration. I know that is the judgment of the committee, and it certainly is the judgment of the majority leader. I would not consent to taking up the resolution ahead of the appropriations bills.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If I may ask the majority leader, has the majority policy committee indicated at what time, or can the majority leader indicate to this body, at what time he thinks it would not be premature to bring up the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. No, I cannot indicate to the Senator from Arkansas just when it can be brought up. I should like to proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bills and see what progress we make. It is my understanding it will take probably about a week to dispose of the appropriation bills, because there is controversial matter in most of them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If I may further inquire of the able majority leader, is he in position now, or does he anticipate he will be in position at any time within the next few days, to indicate whether in accordance with the request as expressed in the petition of a majority of the Senate, we shall have an apportunity to vote upon the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. I could not give the Senator from Arkansas any commitment at this time as to when we are going to take up the resolution. I cannot do it, because there is other important legislation on the calendar. The reciprocal trade agreements program has been laid aside from time to time. I want to express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Finance Committee, who has been very kind and considerate in agreeing to have this measure set aside for other important legislation. The deadline was June 30. We hoped to take that measure up following consideration of the appropriation bills and the minimum-wage law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is, the reciprocal trade agreements program?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then I assume it will take about a week to pass all the appropriation bills, and possibly another week to dispose of the pending business, the wage and hour bill, and we will then go into the reciprocal trade agreements for another period of several days, possibly. So there is no prospect of getting to this resolution until the very closing hours of the session, as I understand the program announced by the able majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. I would not say that that is the program we will follow word for word, or bill by bill. I may say to my good friend, the Policy Committee will consider it again at the next meeting. We try, in the Policy Committee, not to schedule action on bills too far ahead.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can the able Senator advise us when the next Policy Committee meeting will be held, and when we may know the result?

Mr. LUCAS. There will be a meeting of the Policy Committee next Tuesday. I should be glad to have the Senator come before the committee to give us his ideas about the resolution. I am sure the members are very much interested and would like to ask the Senator a few questions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should be very happy to do that. In fact, I can answer the questions now, if anyone cares to ask them. I shall be very glad to make a statement before the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 653, the minimum-wage bill.

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

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

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to cease and desist with my friend from Arkansas, if he has any more questions along this line to ask me.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am afraid my able and distinguished friend, the majority leader, ceased and desisted before we started. I have not been able to get anywhere yet. I am trying to determine whether there is any hope of bringing up this resolution in the regular way and letting the Senate pass upon it in its own right, as a measure which is on the calendar awaiting consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want the floor in my own right.

Mr. LUCAS. I have a motion pending.

Mr. WHERRY. I know. The motion is debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the so-called minimum wage bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the inquiry which was addressed to the majority leader by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas involved a colloquy with reference to which I should like to make a few observations.

First, the senior Senator from Arkansas asked the distinguished majority leader what the majority policy committee had done relative to a resolution, and particularly a petition asking that the resolution be brought up. That petition was also directed to the attention of the minority leader, and I want the distinguished Senator from Arkansas to know that when it came to my office I took it up with the policy committee of the minority, at the very next meeting, which I think was 2 weeks ago, or at least a week ago——

Mr. BRIDGES. It was 2 weeks ago.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, for the information of the majority leader and of the Members of the Senate, that the minority policy committee unanimously agreed that the resolution should be brought up as a part of the agenda and made a part of the program at the proper time and as quickly as may be possible. I think that information should be in the RECORD at this point.

I should like to say further to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that I realize the difficulties of getting a program at the close of the session. There is considerable justification for the majority leader not to know whether he can bring a particular matter up at a particular time, but I feel that inasmuch as 63 Senators signed the petition, it behooves the Members of the Senate and the majority leader to arrange ample time for such consideration. When 63 Senators wish to have a resolution debated, the will of the Senate is involved, and not the will of any one Member of the Senate. I say that kindly, and I say it constructively. I should like very much to see the resolution brought before the Senate as quickly as is possible.

Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the minimum-wage bill. I understand from the majority leader that it is to be the unfinished business tomorrow, and that it may be temporarily set aside to permit consideration of one of the appropriation bills. But I think the record should show and the Members of the Senate should know that the petition requesting that the resolution which has been referred to be brought up should be given our most rerious consideration and attention.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I can appreciate the problems and the difficulties of the policy committee and of the majority leadership, in view of the crowded calendar which we have, in trying to arrange a schedule satisfactory to the Members of the Senate and accommodating them, but, Mr. President, some of us feel that this resolution is of great importance. We do not want to wait until the closing hours of the session of the Congress, and pass a resolution with no opportunity for the House to act on it. Assuming the House should act on it, it will probably meet with disapproval and there will be no opportunity to express ourselves. I want to be assured that the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on the resolution. In view of the fact that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reported it, and in view of the fact that 63 Senators have expressed themselves as desiring an opportunity to discuss and vote on the resolution, I feel that I have some responsibility at least to do everything in my power to persuade the leadership to assure the Senate that the resolution will be scheduled in an order which will permit it to be brought up before the adjournment of the Congress, so that we can have full, appropriate, and final action on it. I cannot get that assurance.

I do not say this in criticism, but if that assurance cannot be given, then we have one other alternative, namely, to offer the resolution as an amendment possibly to some bill. I said there was only one alternative. That is not quite correct. Of course, I could move, as could any other Senator, to lay aside the unfinished business at any time in order to take up the resolution. I certainly would be most reluctant to take that action, because it would have the appearance of my undertaking to usurp the leadership of the majority party. I was hoping that the problem could be worked out so that we would have an opportunity to discuss the resolution on its merits and in its own right, and to act on it in time to make certain that it would go through the proper processes and either become law or fail to become law after it had gone through those processes. Then we would know where the responsibility might lie if it failed to become law, or where it might lie if it should become law.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the minority leader a question, after listening to the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and the majority leader, and also between the Senator from Arkansas and the minority leader. I have listened to the very smooth, suave, astute, and diplomatic reply of the Senator from Illinois, and I ask the minority leader whether he has any commitment to bring up the resolution which has been referred to?

Mr. WHERRY. I think we have no commitment in any way whatsoever. That reply might be a little more blunt than the Senator from Illinois would make it.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Illinois took such a roundabout, smooth, suave, diplomatic way to reply that I wondered how the Senator from Nebraska interpreted it.

Mr. WHERRY. I interpret it to mean that there is no commitment on the part of the majority leader to take up the resolution about which the Senator from Arkansas has been speaking. That is the reason I thought the Senate should know and the RECORD should show the action of our own group on this side of the aisle. I wished to call attention to the fact that 63 Senators have petitioned the majority leader and the minority

leader, asking that the resolution be brought up. I feel that is a consideration which should appeal to all Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe, based upon what has been said and upon his experience, that those who believe in economy in the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. I believe there will be an opportunity to vote on the resolution. I think such opportunity should be provided, and I hope it will be provided in the program which will be submitted by the distinguished majority leader. I want to say that I shall cooperate with him in every way.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe that if a resolution is presented, bearing the names of 63 Senators of both political parties it is a reflection upon the Senate if 63 Senators whose names are on a petition are not allowed to vote on such a resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. My answer to that question would be that I think if 63 Senators ask that a certain piece of proposed legislation be brought up they are entitled to their day in court, and that it should be brought up as a part of the program which is to be submitted to the Members of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Can the minority leader assure me that he will use his influence with the majority leader to see that this resolution is voted upon, not at "some time," but in plenty of time so that action may be by the House?

Mr. WHERRY. My answer is, unequivocally, "Yes." I shall use all the influence I have at my command, and I am satisfied that the majority leader will provide an opportunity for 63 Senators to consider legislation which they want brought up on the floor of the Senate.

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

The motion was agreed to and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 653) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement of some interest to all Members of the Senate with respect to next week.

I anticipate, from the information I receive from Members of the Committee on Appropriations, that there will be rather lengthy debate upon the appropriation bills. We are moving along toward the end of the session. No one knows just what date the session will end, but I am going to make a suggestion that next Tuesday and Thursday there be night sessions to consider the business before the Senate. I make the announcement now so that Senators may have notice of the night meetings just as far as possible in advance.

Mr. WHERRY. What are the majority leader's plans for Saturday sessions?

Mr. LUCAS. If we can have night sessions, I think we can dispense with Saturday sessions. It is a little difficult to get Senators to attend sessions on Saturday. Every Senator must have the same problems the Senator from Illinois has with respect to the mail which piles up during the week, and dispensing with Saturday sessions will give us an opportunity to do some work in our offices.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators on this side have come to me and asked that we press for Saturday sessions. Many of them feel that the date when the session will end, referred to by the distinguished Senator, might be brought about earlier provided the Senate held Saturday sessions and, as the Senator has suggested, night sessions. I would not say that opinion is unanimous, but for instance, the junior Senator from South Dakota said to me, "Why do you not get the majority leader to have Saturday sessions and night sessions and get the legislative program over?" I merely wanted to call that to the attention of the majority leader. I thank him for his statement as to next week.

Mr. LUCAS. Let us try two night sessions next week, and if everything goes along well, we might accommodate the Senator from South Dakota the following Saturday, and perhaps the Saturday after that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, now that we are through with the North Atlantic Treaty, I wonder if the Senator can tell us about the oleomargarine bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator think that is more important than the economy resolution?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since I have been in the Senate I have been very much impressed by the rule of seniority, and I believe the oleomargarine bill has seniority over any other bill on the calendar. It has been before the Senate a number of years, and I think it is high time it be given consideration. It is of very great economic importance.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas as to the importance of the bill. As to the question of priority, however, we might disagree as to when we should consider it. However, I am just as much interested in the oleomargarine bill as is the Senator, and I can virtually assure him that we are going to consider that bill before we conclude the present session. We are going to be in session perhaps longer than many think, if much time is taken on some of the bills, as I anticipate will be the case, judging from what has happened in the past. We thought we were going to get the Atlantic Pact through in about 10 days, and it looked at one time as if we would vote on the pact about Tuesday after having had it under consideration for about a week. Yet we have taken 3 weeks, or double the time anticipated. That is a typical example of how the speculative legislation schedule may be upset.

I anticipate that Senators representing dairy States will want to do a little talking on the oleomargarine bill. I do not think they will carry on a filibuster, because the Senators from the dairy sections are opposed to filibusters, and I am certain they would not violate this principle on the oleomargarine bill.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if there is any contemplation of bringing up the civil rights bill during the session.

Mr. LUCAS. That is another possibility. It could be.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a very able colleague has asked me if there was a definite statement as to whether or not Saturday sessions were out or might be in.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not believe we will have a session the coming Saturday.

Mr. WHERRY. There will be an announcement later about Saturday of next week?

Mr. LUCAS. As we move along next week, we will make the determination. The Senator from Illinois has no objection to Saturday sessions.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4830) making appropriations for foreign aid for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4830) making appropriations for foreign aid for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE VAN A. BITTNER

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a tribute which I intended to deliver on the floor of the Senate to Van A. Bittner, who died in Mercy Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pa., on Tuesday night. Mr. Bittner was a man who shortened his life by his hard work with the War Labor Board during the war. He was a great labor leader, and a very dear friend of mine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

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

Mr. President, I rise to pay my humble tribute to Mr. Van A. Bittner, one of the truly great Americans, who passed on late Tuesday night in Mercy Hospital in Pittsburgh, Pa.

Although Mr. Bittner had been in ill health for several months his death came as a great shock to his many friends throughout the Nation.

I visited with Mr. Bittner in the hospital last Saturday afternoon. He was very ill, but I could not bring myself to believe he was nearing the close of a great career.

Mr. Bittner was a close and valued friend for many years. I first met him more than 20 years ago when he came into West Virginia from his native Pennsylvania to organize the coal miners.

His life was one of constant struggle for the "underdog." I shall not at this time review his life, but I do wish to mention a few events. Mr. Bittner started working in the mines adjoining his home when he was only 11 years of age. Even though he was in the mines several hours each day he managed to continue his school work and he was graduated from Vanderbilt High School.

Deeply devoted to the cause of trade-unions, Mr. Bittner early in life charted his course that led him to the top in the trade-union movement. To the end he remained a self-sacrificing man who fought for what he believed to be right.

When he was only a boy of 16 his fellow miners elected him president of the local of the United Mine Workers. Seven years later he was elected vice president of district 5, United Mine Workers, and in 1911, when he was only 26, he was elected to the presidency of the district which included the Pittsburgh area.

Later as an international representative of the union, he went into Tennessee, Alabama, and West Virginia coal fields to earn the reputation of being a fearless organizer during one of the most turbulent periods in labor history.

Mr. Bittner developed a close friendship for Mr. Phil Murray during those dark, bitter days, and it lasted to the end of his life. In many respects they constituted the team that built the Congress of Industrial Organizations into one of the world's great union combinations.

Mr. Bittner's great success in organizing the West Virginia coal fields, a feat accomplished in the face of bitter opposition from mine owners, was considered by many people to be the outstanding organizing job in that union's history.

Mr. Bittner served as president of district 17, the large southern West Virginia area of the United Mine Workers, and for many years he played an important role in the Appalachian Coal Conference.

Later Mr. Bittner became nationally famous as the trouble-shooting international vice president of the CIO. When he was stricken a few months ago he was directing the CIO's southern organizational campaign.

Mr. Bittner believed that through unions our democracy could be made to function better, not alone for the membership but for the entire Nation. To that end he devoted his life.

My friendship for Mr. Bittner will always remain as one of my most valued possessions. He was an honorable man in every respect, a leader who inspired his followers in the true meaning of democracy.

I well recall an incident that for me remains an outstanding example of Mr. Bittner's attitude toward his fellowmen. At the time I was seeking public office, and I asked Mr. Bittner for his support.

He said he would support me if I would make one promise. Before I could answer him he said: "Harley, promise me that regardless of the circumstances you will always do what you think is right."

Mr. Bittner fought for his rights and the rights of his fellowmen. It can truthfully be said he made this a better place in which to live.

Van A. Bittner, a man of great magnetic personality, deep devotion to democracy, fervent, unflinching courage in the face of tremendous odds, lives on in the hearts of millions of Americans.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 22, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 21 (legislative day of June 2), 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Philip M. Kaiser, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Walter D. Luplow, Corps of Engineers, for appointment as member, California Debris Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. Samuel N. Karrick, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John S. Denise, Sr., of Washington, to be United States marshal for the western district of Washington, term expired July 2, 1949.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be captains

Adair, Philip Reed, 11927A.
×Adams, William Pierman, Jr., 11810A.
Alber, George Dearborn, 11917A.
Anderson, Alfred Ivan, 11863A.
Anderson, Conrad Austance, 11888A.
Anderson, David Samuel, 11954A.
Baker, Dexter Kingsley, 11929A.
Baker, Ellsworth Albert, 11862A.
Beller, Albert Joseph, 11892A.
Bergeson, Harold Max, 11809A.
Bissonnette, Alfred Gilbert, 11916A.
×Bolen, Robert Joseph, 11948A.
×Boswell, Benedict Arden, 11895A.
Boyle, Francis Thomas, 11845A.
Brazee, Donald Francis, 11803A.
×Brittle, Kent Heath, 11886A.
Broach, William Gardner, Jr., 11820A.
Brockhouse, Frederick Willard, 11790A.
Bruson, George Francis, 11813A.
Bumgarner, Amon Grant, 11818A.
Burns, Carlton Lee, 11841A.
Burns, Richard Lee, 11840A.
Byington, Telford Smith, 11928A.
Carkeet, John Lamar, Jr., 11950A.
Carmody, Francis Charles, 11910A.
Carter, Joseph Watkins, 11855A.
Clampitt, William Arthur, 11938A.
×Clark, James Francis, Jr., 11866A.
×Cogswell, Robert Whitney, 11889A.
Coleman, David Harold, 11819A.
Cook, Robert Frederick, 11800A.
Corrigan, Thomas Francis, 11953A.
Cote, Elmer Lee, 11865A.
×Cox, William Thomas, Jr., 11802A.
×Crahan, Francis Edward, 11825A.
Cuddington, James Cedric, 11951A.
Culp, Alben Barkley, 11894A.
Ducat, Kenneth Holberg, 11941A.
Dupont, Rene George, 11836A.
Edington, Leonard Edward, 11875A.
Edwards, Clifford E., 11912A.
×Elarth, Vernon Homer, 11851A.
Emrich, Daniel Carl, 11824A.
Esch, Maurice Eugene, 11873A.
Felice, Carman Paul, 11816A.
Fisher, Jay N., 11926A.
Fortney, Robert Stewart, 11815A.
Gibson, William Melvin, 11874A.
Good, Arnold Noble, 11918A.
Grinsted, Albert Hugh, Jr., 11901A.
Grove, Francis Miller, 11852A.
Guelich, Frank James, 11799A.
Guernsey, Harold Jackson, Jr., 11806A.
Haines, Carroll Eugene, 11868A.
Hall, John Jay, 11933A.
Halloran, James Paul Stacy, 11955A.
Hamby, Malcolm Conner, 11880A.
Hange, Richard Harold, 11944A.
Hannon, Leo Joseph, 11914A.
Harrison, Robert Burfoot, 11946A.
Hayes, Leland Ray, 11792A.
Hein, Gordon Einer, 11942A.
×Henderson, Daniel Eli, Jr., 11828A.
Henderson, Vernon Junior, 11899A.
Hirshberg, Sidney Stuart, 11838A.
Hockin, Robert Arnold, 11871A.
×Hughes, William Austin, 11833A.
Ilmanen, Ralph Werner, 11913A.
Isbell, Thomas Winn, Jr., 11956A.
Johnson, George Lowder, 11870A.
Jones, Dean A., 11893A.
Kimbrough, Donovan, 11919A.
×Klein, Junior Fremont, 11939A.
Korger, Harold Francis, 11856A.
Kuhn, Francis LeRoy, 11943A.
LaBerge, Vincent Robert, 11915A.
Lairmore, Glenn Emmett, 11905A.
Laridon, Loren Brooks, 11853A.
Leenerts, Gordon Jerome, 11945A.
LeFrancis, Richard George, 11937A.
Lethers, Edward William, 11831A.
LeVan, Jay Edwin, 11839A.
Long, John Barrett, 11885A.
Marsden, Roy Franklin, 11921A.
×Marshall, George Lewis, 11909A.
Maxwell, George S., 11896A.
McAusland, Douglas George, 11795A.
McCauley, Lon Albert, Jr., 11787A.
×McDonald, Gorman A., 11791A.
McElroy, Wilson Freeman, 11908A.
×MacKay, John Alexander, 11812A.
Mercogliano, Albert Paul, 11861A.
Moffat, Harold Larson, 11931A.
Murphy, James Joseph, 11957A.
Myers, Horace Herman, 11923A.
×Myers, Robert Arthur, 11881A.
Nagel, James Paul, 11882A.
Nance, Ernest Theodore, 11904A.
×Nealon, Robert Joseph, 11794A.
Newstrom, Carroll Marion, 11850A.
O'Brien, Alden Walton, 11872A.
O'Carroll, Thomas Kane, 11898A.
Okey, Joseph Theodore, 11887A.
Otis, James Dwight, Jr., 11821A.
Overstreet, Jack Stone, 11857A.
×Pallo, John, 11891A.
Pearson, Samuel Leroy, 11897A.
Phillips, Arthur Garfield, Jr., 11817A.
Pinson, Claud Carrol, 11900A.
Poindexter, William Ranstead, 11843A.
Poulson, Raymond Peter, 11867A.
Prout, Donald George, 11949A.
Pryor, Gaillard Stoney, 11906A.
Ralph, John Henry, 11911A.
Ramirez, Norbert Donald, 11924A.
Ray, Robert Jackson, 11823A.
Renner, Robert Nelson, 11879A.
Richardson, Glen Wehrly, 11848A.
Roberts, Thomas Carlisle, 11859A.
Robinson, Hunter Rudolph, 11788A.
Salmon, Delbert Junior, 11834A.
×Sampson, George Archibald, 11858A.
Santala, Eugene Walfred, 11940A.
Sapp, Roger Elias, 11789A.
Schaitel, Leonard Jacob, 11907A.
Schlabs, Frank Wayne, 11832A.
Schnauber, Louis George, 11793A.
Shiver, Arthur Marvin, Junior, 11844A.
Simpkins, Alan Patrick, 11814A.
Snell, Lester Daniel, 11878A.
×Solomon, Edward Thomas, 11811A.
Sparks, Belmont Earl, 11846A.
Squillace, Dominick Paul, 11864A.
Stevens, Howell Edward, 11902A.
Stine, Donald Arthur, 11837A.
Streit, William Fred, 11932A.
Stumpf, Oscar Joseph, 11826A.
Tenold, Leslie Alvin, 11835A.
Thompson, Arnold Frederick, 11883A.
Tissue, Jimmie Lee, 11822A.
Van Noy, Glen Scott, 11920A.
Vetter, Lawrence Edward, 11829A.
Wagner, James Bertram, Junior, 11947A.
×Wakeman, Coyd Victor, 11922A.
Walker, James Osborne, Junior, 11804A.
Walker, Samuel Augustus, Junior, 11807A.
Watkinson, Arlie Gerald, 11884A.
Wilkerson, Harold Houston, 11801A.
Wilson, Ernest Ben, 11930A.
Wood, George Ray, 11860A.
Wright, Hanford Ralph, 11827A.
Wright, John Wesley, Junior, 11934A.
×Wyckoff, Frank Marvin, 11935A.
Yraceburn, Joseph Raymond, 11805A.

NOTE.—These officers will complete 7 years' service for promotion during the month of August. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Harold C. Borth	Albert I. Haas
Irvin V. Masters	Nathan Segal
Melvin E. Mosier	William V. Schwebke
Carlton G. Cole	

The below-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

William E. Bateman
Erving F. White
Carl W. King

The below-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Frederick Belton	Lee E. Roberts
John G. Johnson	Stephen Lesko
Emanuel Yalowitz	James D. Ludvigson
Marvin L. Ross	Irvin V. Masters
William E. Word	Carlton G. Cole

The below-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Irving N. Kelly	Lloyd O. Williams
Frederick M. Steinhauser	Ben Sutts
	George R. Eargle
John W. Webber	Willis R. Lucius
Richard Burgess	George W. Torbert
Gilbert McConville	Cecil T. Carraway
Theodore A. Petras	Alexis A. Jedenoff
William L. Woodruff	Clyde T. Waller

The below-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Russell C. White	James B. Seaton
Kenneth A. Walsh	George J. Hanft
Douglas K. Morton	Joseph W. Utz
Edwin M. Clements	Roy H. Bley
Reginald M. George	Donald L. Shenaut
Eugene Anderson	Albert F. Rinehart
Stephen K. Pawloski	Anthony J. Roscoe
Matthew J. Kruszewski	Samuel F. Leader
Elmer R. Wirta	Fred K. Thornton
Richard W. Sinclair	Ruthledge S. Sasser
Ray M. Burrill	Edgar A. McKean

The below-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

William V. Schwebke	Wilburn C. Allen
Robert L. Neef	Ray H. Bishop
Elbert L. O'Banion	James B. Darnell
Robert J. Vroegindewey	Cedric A. Fevurly
	Sidney W. Cooley
Doyle Grimes	Alfred E. Montrief
Clifford A. Youngs	Haldon E. Lindfelt
Harold G. Schrier	Harley L. Grant
James G. G. Taylor	Ralph B. Neal

The below-named enlisted man for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

John L. Self

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be commissioned in the United States Coast Guard:

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Richard H. Britt

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 21 (legislative day of June 2), 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edward B. Lawson to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iceland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 21, 1949

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

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

This day, O Lord, we would acknowledge Thee in all our ways in order that Thou mayest direct our paths. Cleanse our vision that we may discern the things that belong to the peace and welfare of America. Sustain our devotion to all high ideals that we may never disappoint Thee. Clarify our judgment that we may correctly appraise the values upon which the durability of a nation rests. Strengthen our wills that with gladness we may obey Thy commandments which are true and righteous altogether. So may these Members give of their best this day with a feeling that their efforts are linked with Thy eternal purposes. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution to provide for on-the-spot audits by the General Accounting Office of the fiscal records of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the publications entitled "100 Things You Should Know About Communism in the U. S. A.," "100 Things You Should Know About Communism and Religion," as amended, "Spotlight on Spies," "100 Things You Should Know About Communism and Education," "100 Things You Should Know About Communism and Labor," and "100 Things You Should Know About Communism and Government."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5632. An act to reorganize fiscal management in the National Military Establishment to promote economy and efficiency, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 266. An act modifying a limitation affecting the pension, compensation, or retirement pay payable on account of an incompetent veteran without dependents during hospitalization, institutional or domiciliary care;

S. 447. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to regulate the transportation, packing, marking, and description of explosives and other dangerous articles;

S. 584. An act for the relief of Rudolf A. V. Raff;

S. 811. An act to adjust the effective date of certain awards of pensions and compensations payable by the Veterans' Administration;

S. 2010. An act to extend for 2 years the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs respecting leases and leased property.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1184) entitled "An act to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. CAIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have permission to sit during the remainder of general debate today.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that in accordance with an understanding?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is in accordance with an agreement I made yesterday. We were supposed to meet at 11 o'clock but through an honest mistake the adjournment was until 10 o'clock. I like to carry out an agreement I have with a Member.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not care anything about the agreement.

Mr. McCORMACK. By making this request and having it granted I at least can face myself and the Member in the future.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not see any of our Republican members of the Labor Committee present.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this request is for the balance of general debate, which is about 1 hour?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have no objection to that.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5632) to reorganize fiscal management in the National Military Establishment to promote economy and efficiency, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, BROOKS, KILDAY, DURHAM, SHORT, ARENDS, and COLE of New York.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1184) to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, MONRONEY, WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, and SMITH of Ohio.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Richmond Times Dispatch.

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

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

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

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

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Bristol Courier of July 19, entitled "Arms and Pump Priming."

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague, Mr. LEFEVRE.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of the House will read in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the shocking revelation made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] in which he disclosed that the president of the National Farm Bureau Federation, one Allan Kline, has been deliberately spreading false propaganda in regard to the so-called Brannan plan. Every Member of Congress from a district where a Farm Bureau organization is located has received telegrams from the Farm Bureau denouncing the production-payment provision of the Brannan plan. Yet, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] quoted from the official Senate and House hearings where Mr. Kline had not only approved but had actually advocated the principle of the Brannan plan.

I know that the farmers of America will agree when I say that it is time for the Farm Bureau to change its leadership and get a man who will not consider the interest of the American farmer as secondary to the interest of the Republican Party.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AWARD TO EZRA LOOMIS POUND

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, we hear much about the infiltration of Communist ideas, but too little about the infiltration of Fascist ideas. Last February Ezra Pound, who was then under an indictment for high treason, the prosecution of which had been suspended because he had been declared insane, was awarded the Bollingen Library of Congress $1,000 prize for the highest achievement in American poetry in 1948. Ezra Pound's indictment was for aiding and abetting Mussolini and the Fascist enemies of the United States in World War II. Since then a controversy has raged in literary circles over the propriety of this award and the Librarian of Congress has found it necessary to justify it in an extended letter published recently in the Saturday Review of Literature. My colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON], has inserted all the material on the controversy in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4617.

For the literati the question is whether art has anything to do with the character of the man who creates it, but for us the question is whether the 15 appointees of the Librarian of Congress who made this award, called Fellows of the Library of Congress in American Letters—one of whom incidentally is a British citizen though United States born—appropriately represent the people of the United States of whose will the Library of Congress is one expression; for the Librarian of Congress specifically states "every step was taken to insure that the prize, when awarded, would in fact be that of the Library of Congress made on its own responsibility." Under these circumstances I urge that Members on both sides of the aisle join with Mr. PATTERSON and me in calling for an investigation by the House Administration Committee, which has a Library Subcommittee, under its general powers of oversight over the operations of the Library of Congress.

We have heard much—and rightly—about the dangers of communism to our democracy and congressional committees are quick to investigate them; the dangers of fascism are just as great and need just as much examination. I have today written the following letter to the Hon. MARY T. NORTON, chairman of the House Administration Committee, which has oversight over the Library of Congress, demanding an investigation of this situation:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 21, 1949.

Hon. MARY T. NORTON,
Chairman, House Administration Committee, House of Representatitves, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. NORTON: Reference is made to the award by the Fellows of the Library of Congress in American Letters, a board of 15 appointed by the Librarian of Congress, to Ezra Loomis Pound of the $1,000 prize for the highest achievement in American poetry in 1948. At the time of this award, Ezra Pound was under indictment for aiding and abetting Mussolini and the Fascist enemies of the United States in World War II. Prosecution of this indictment had been suspended because he was adjudged insane.

I have been investigating this matter since early June. I had deferred action pending the explanation of the Librarian of Congress which was published in the Saturday Review of Literature recently, as this journal had brought out the whole situation. My colleague, Mr. PATTERSON, of Connecticut, has inserted all the material bearing upon this award as revealed by articles from the Saturday Review of Literature and Mr. Evans' reply in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A4617.

For the literati the question is whether art has anything to do with the character of the man who creates it, but for us the question is whether the 15 appointees of the Librarian of Congress who made this award appropriately represent the people of the United States, of whose will the Library of Congress is one expression. The Librarian of Congress specifically states in his letter of reply referred to above that "every step was taken to insure that the prize, when awarded, would in fact be that of the Library of Congress made on its own responsibility."

Your committee has a library subcommittee. Among its other responsibilities your committee has legislative oversight over the Library of Congress. The circumstances call strongly for an investigation by your committee of this situation. We hear much about the infiltration of Communist ideas and congressional committees are quick to investigate them. Must we not be equally diligent to investigate the infiltration of Fascist ideas especially in so august an institution as the Library of Congress?

I would appreciate very much your advising me at the earliest possible time whether your committee will undertake this investigation as I will have a number of witnesses who will desire to be heard.

Sincerely yours,
J. K. JAVITS, *Member of Congress.*

CHICAGO TRIBUNE PURCHASE OF WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress will be greatly gratified to learn that Col. Robert McCormick, publisher of the great Chicago Tribune, has purchased the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C.

This will afford Colonel McCormick an opportunity to render a still greater service to the Nation by disseminating on

Capitol Hill and on the eastern seaboard through the press, the policies of Americanism which the Chicago Tribune has championed for over a century in the Middle West.

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 a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. 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. 131]

Barrett, Pa.	Dolliver	Norrell
Bland	Eaton	O'Neill
Buckley, N. Y.	Engle, Calif.	Powell
Bulwinkle	Fellows	Rains
Byrnes, Wis.	Gilmer	Reed, Ill.
Case, N. J.	Hart	Rivers
Chatham	Hays, Ark.	Roosevelt
Chiperfield	Heffernan	Sabath
Chudoff	Holifield	Shafer
Clevenger	Kennedy	Staggers
Crosser	McDonough	Stanley
Davenport	McGregor	Stigler
Davies, N. Y.	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson	Morrison	Towe
Dingell	Moulder	Withrow
Dollinger	Murphy	Woodhouse

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 289, Rept. No. 1086), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide parity for tung nuts, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 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.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] had 35 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], had 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN].

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, the annual memorial services for deceased Members were held on May 25. Under the resolution adopted for the program, all Members were given 60 legislative days within which to extend their remarks without the necessity of obtaining permission. Only a short time remains for those Members who desire to extend their remarks to include eulogies on any of our departed colleagues. This is merely to call that to the attention of some Members who may not have realized the time has passed so quickly.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the author of the substitute bill, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], referring to the passage of the committee bill, stated:

> I do not think we should take this leap in the dark.

Let us see just who, if anyone, is taking a leap in the dark and why.

I cannot speak and I will not attempt to speak for my Republican colleagues. Their record on leaping in the dark goes back to 4 o'clock in the morning, June 20, 1948. The Aiken bill was indeed passed in physical as well as mental darkness early that Sunday morning. Unfortunately, it seems to me, there still lingers some mental darkness about that bill. Certainly I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee would not come here and suggest the continuation of that bill had he dispelled the mental darkness which now undoubtedly befogs him and that undoubtedly befogs some other members of this committee. Certainly, the gentleman from Tennessee, had he but directed the sunlight of intelligent study upon the Aiken bill, would not be before us today to ask us to reduce the floor on cotton from the 27.99 cents per pound that this committee bill provides to the 16.25 cents per pound bottom floor provided by his measure. That is just what he is doing. His substitute proposes to continue the Aiken bill.

Surely, had he dispelled the mental darkness, he would not come before us and ask us to reduce the effective floor under corn from $1.46 to 85 cents a bushel.

Surely, had he dispelled that darkness, he would not have asked this committee to reduce the effective floor under the price of wheat from $1.88 a bushel to $1.09 a bushel. I say he would not have done that, because I know the gentleman from Tennessee is interested in maintaining a sound farm economy and in maintaining a sound national economy. I am sure that every member of this committee knows that you cannot let the price of wheat drop down to a dollar and keep your factories running and keep your labor employed. It cannot be done. It has been tried. But this Aiken bill, which was passed in darkness and perpetuated in darkness, is based upon the false philosophy that you should control the farmers' production, not by having a referendum among the farmers, and not by letting the farmer decide if he wants to grow a commodity or not, but that you should control the farmers' production by lowering his support prices. It assumes that as production goes up, support prices will drop until you starve the farmer into submission and bring him in line with the views of the bureaucracy in Washington. Yet there are members of this committee who, in the darkness, mental as well as physical, have come before this committee and within the past 24 hours, and have talked about regimentation.

Nowhere in the legislative history of this Nation have we seen a more drastic type of regimentation than is continued under the substitute bill to be offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. It attempts, not by the vote of the farmers, but by edict from the Department of Agriculture, to cut the support prices as the supply of the commodity increases, and in that way try to starve the farmer and hold the price of his cotton down, down until it gets to 16 cents. With present-day wages you know he can no more than pick and gin his cotton for that. Under the Gore proposal his support floor will go down to the point where the farmer will starve. Then you say he will go out of business. The experience of the past is that even this drastic formula will not work. As prices go down farmers actually plant more in a pathetic effort to hold income up. But even if it would work, even if you could control production in this cruel and heartless as well as undemocratic manner, you must remember that when the farmer starves and when he goes out of business in that way, you close your factories in Detroit and you bank the fires in the furnaces of Pittsburgh, and you stop the flow of commerce down Broadway in New York. You stop the economic life of this Nation when you apply that Aiken philosophy of control through starvation.

That is the philosophy of the Aiken bill and it applies that philosophy without anybody's vote because it is automatic. It is direct bureaucratic action to the *n*th degree. I challenge the supporters, if there be any, of the Aiken bill to explain why they did not give the farmer a voice when they proposed to cut those support prices on his commodities.

So much, Mr. Chairman, for the darkness of that June morning in 1948. What about the pending committee bill that the gentleman from Tennessee so vigorously condemns as being a leap in the dark? Your Agriculture Committee started 2 years ago to dispel the darkness. Our committee traveled all over the Nation holding hearings from one end of the country to the other, talking to farmers and traveling by bus, train, and private car. There was pretty unanimous

opinion among those farmers. They thought that the present program was working very well, so far as storable commodities were concerned.

They expressed their desire to continue it as far as storables was concerned, but not one defended the present program as far as perishable commodities was concerned, because they could not defend it. So we came back here and on the first of the year we had before us this evidence:

First. The program is good, as far as storables is concerned.

Second. It is a total failure as far as perishables are concerned.

So we started out with the idea that we would do well to retain that part that had been found good. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] introduced a bill to hold all those portions of the present program which had proven workable. At the same time we set about dispelling the darkness relative to the unsuccessful part of the program. We held 6 months of hearings, and we got at least some light on the problem of perishables. At least we got more light than the gentleman from Tennessee. We know that the present program is good on storables and the committee bill extends that program. We got light on the program for perishable commodities to the extent that we know that it is bad. But nobody on that trip and nobody on that Sunday morning told us how we could handle those perishable commodities. Probably because none of them knew. So we started to work trying to determine if anybody knew how to handle perishable commodities. After 6 months of hearings, most of them extending through both morning and afternoon—I do not think any committee has gone into any subject more exhaustively—this committee decided that we at least could offer a suggestion as to how to handle perishable commodities. We do not claim to know we have the only true and final answer, but we do claim we have an intelligent suggestion. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] brings us no suggestion. The Republican Party brings us no suggestion. They say, "Go on and lose $400,000,000 on potatoes. Go on and lose $80,000,000 on eggs. Go on and lose on every perishable commodity on which you make a purchase. Continue to throw the Government into bankruptcy."

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

Mr. POAGE. I cannot yield. I have only a few minutes. "Go on and lose." That is the only answer they gave us, and that is the only answer they give us in this substitute bill.

Believing that we had an obligation to the Treasury of the United States, believing that we had an obligation to the taxpayers, this committee comes forth with a bill that does continue all that has been tried and proven good. It does continue in the law everything that experience has shown is good, to wit, a support price on storable commodities. In addition, we say, let us try a new and we hope a better program; let us try something and see how it will work, as to perishable commodities, without at the same time bankrupting the Government.

It is true Senator AIKEN says he knew he had a proposal to do exactly the same thing, not for three commodities, but for all commodities. That authority, my friends, is in the bill of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. He now proposes to extend the direct-payment plan on every and any commodity, without limit either as to time, crops, or money. The sky is the limit under his bill. But our committee is a little more conservative than that. The Committee on Agriculture felt we had better go a little slow about this direct payment plan; that we should not try it on everything at one time. Let us see how it works on three commodities. If we can find a program that will work without costing the Government hundreds of millions of dollars that the present program on perishable commodities costs, we have done a great thing for this Nation. We will have enabled the Government to maintain a long-term program on both perishable and storable commodities. And let me remind you, my colleagues, we cannot hope to maintain our program on storable commodities if we let the losses continue to multiply on perishables. If I had nothing more than a selfish interest in this bill, I would seek a more workable program for perishables, because I know as you know that if we are to enjoy a continuation of the supports on cotton and wheat, we must extend similar consideration to those who produce fruit, vegetables, milk, meat, and other perishables. And more than that, we must give the taxpayers a program on these commodities that will not result in the kind of losses we have recently sustained on potatoes. The committee bill offers this kind of program. The substitute makes no effort to lessen these losses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I have only 5 minutes to discuss this question on which, even with the able discussion which the question has had on this floor, a man should have an hour. But I do want to thank Mr. PACE and Mr. COOLEY for their kindness and consideration in extending me 5 minutes which I have at the present time. I do want to ask gentlemen not to interrupt me or ask me to yield during that time because I have only 5 minutes and I do not have time to yield.

I do want to say regarding my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], that I want to recommend to the Republicans of this House, any time you Republicans want a good Republican speech made, I will recommend that you call on the gentleman from Tennessee to make it, because he has better technique along that line than any Republican I have heard speak on this floor.

I want to refer to some figures that were put into the Appendix of the RECORD on page A4517. These figures were put into the RECORD by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Knowing my colleague from Pennsylvania as I do, I know that the figures are very authentic and very reliable. I am referring to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. Those figures show that in 1919 the farm income of the United States was $14,000,000,000. In 1921, just 2 years later and after Warren G. Harding had been President of the United States for 1 year, that was almost halved; it was eight billion one hundred million. Then, in 1932, at the close of Mr. Hoover's administration, the half was halved and it was $4,700,000,000. I was living and farming out in Missouri when those things were happening in 1922. I was selling corn for 26 cents a bushel. Just after World War I closed we had a farm depression out there that bankrupted the farming industry and we had it just as soon as Woodrow Wilson ceased to be President of the United States.

I lived through those days. Hundreds and thousands of men and women in my country who were good farmers, who had helped produce the food and fiber that won the First World War lost their homes, lost their implements, lost everything they had. I was one of them. I used to blame myself for it, but I know I was not to blame. I was a young man and had an abundance of strength and I said: "I will not let this depression whip me." I bred more sows, I raised more hogs, I milked more cows, I sold more wheat; but the more I did the poorer I became, and I wound up in the early thirties sledging rock in a WPA quarry. I am one of those WPA workers who leaned on a shovel handle. I am not proud of it, but I am also not ashamed of it. I was doing the best I could then under the circumstances, and I am still doing the best I can now under different circumstances.

What was happening on Capitol Hill when those things were happening to me and my neighbors? I will tell you what was happening up here on Capitol Hill: This House and the Senate were passing the McNary-Haugen bill. It was vetoed three times by Republican Presidents. Why? Because they were afraid. The Republican Party has always been afraid. They were afraid of the New Deal legislation. I saw something yesterday that was new under the sun. I would like to have had old Solomon witness what happened here in the House yesterday: Republicans getting up here and defending the Roosevelt New Deal farm plan. I witnessed that yesterday. I never expected to live long enough to see that, but I saw it yesterday right here on the floor of the House, they were telling us this program was perfect, that it could not be improved. If that is not something new under the sun, what is? They were afraid then; they are afraid now; they are afraid to let Charley Brannan try out his plan on even three commodities. But they are afraid for a different reason from the one they proclaim. They said they were afraid it would not work; I say they are afraid it will work. It must be tough to have to go before your constituents and tell them that your party has always been opposed to everything; to have to tell them that your party has not conceived, sponsored, and brought into being a plan or program to maintain agricultural purchasing power at any time since Civil War

days. It must be tough for Republicans to have to tell their constituents that through the years they have been against everything and for nothing.

If I ever offer an amendment on the floor of this House and 75 percent or more of the Republicans support it I will know immediately that I am wrong.

One gentleman from the Republican side of this Chamber said he hoped that if the Brannan plan became law, even on a trial run, that milk prices would drop to 10 cents per quart. I want to remind that gentleman that the last can of cream that I sold under Republican administration brought 9 cents per pound for the butterfat it contained.

Another gentleman said his wife was paying 9 cents per pound here in Washington for potatoes but he is still unwilling to let Mr. Brannan have a chance to do anything about it.

Republicans know that the time is at hand when they can no longer tell the farmer that the laboring man in the city is his enemy. The city laboring man has come to realize that the farmer feeds and clothes him and his family, and in addition furnishes the best market in the world for the products of labor.

The farmer has also reached the place where Republican propaganda condemning the laboring man in our cities is no longer effective. The farmer realizes that the laboring people of the United States must have employment at good wages in order that they may earn the money to buy the food and fiber produced on American farms.

I have consecrated my life, or at least what little is left of it, to preaching the gospel of unification of labor and agriculture and I feel sure that the time is at hand when no amount of propaganda will convince the farmer or the city laboring man that their interests are divergent or that one can profit at the expense of the other.

I do want to refer to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]. He probably thinks no different from many other Members on the minority side of this Chamber but he does have more courage than the most of them. He has said today on the floor of the House that it was his desire to save the children of the United States from enslaving and demoralizing effects of all the New Deal measures. I judge from these remarks that it is not his intention to vote for a measure that he has been condemning for almost two decades.

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, the necessity of maintaining a stable farm economy is of prime importance. Our national welfare demands that there must be agricultural prosperity as well as industrial prosperity. The two go hand in hand. It is important to realize that the prosperity of one depends upon the prosperity of the other. If it is lacking in either one the damaging effect is reflected in the other as well. Therefore there is an ever present necessity to be alert to the welfare of each that there may be a prosperous national economy.

The bill before us today is one that deals primarily with agriculture, but, it would not in my opinion promote the prosperity of the farmer. It has become known as the Brannan plan because it is the program presented and advocated by the present Secretary of Agriculture. It is admittedly offered as a trial program. Its sponsors have not been willing to claim that it will prove satisfactory in operation. Nor has anyone been able to even estimate the probable cost of the program. Opponents of the measure have made some calculations of the cost that reach into fantastic figures; an amount that would constitute a tremendous drain upon the taxpayers. The possibility of widespread regimentation that would be possible under its provisions has also created considerable concern. This feature, together with other implications under the terms of the bill, has caused one distinguished economic analyst to express his views under the caption, "Do we want socialism or our American system." This is some indication of the underlying fear that exists in the minds of thoughtful persons.

There is real basis for this fear. The regimentation that could result under the terms of the bill would be far removed from our present American way of life. While there may not be present intention upon the part of the sponsors of the present bill to go beyond a trial program of a few designated commodities, yet, when we consider the extent to which the policy, once adopted could go, there is real reason to stop such a policy being started even though it is limited.

The following news article recently published in one of the Washington newspapers is sufficient to indicate the broad policy that was in the mind of Secretary of Agriculture Brannan when he announced his program, and, likewise is justification for the opposition of farm organizations, and, farmers generally throughout the Nation. The article reads as follows:

BRANNAN CALLS FOR WIDER CONTROLS OF FARM OUTPUT

Sweeping new powers to control farm production were requested by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan yesterday in laying a full draft of the administration's farm program before Congress.

He asked that rigid marketing quotas now usable on only six major crops be permitted on the great bulk of farm products, including meat animals, milk, poultry, eggs, fruit, and vegetables.

STIFF PENALTY PROPOSED

Under quotas, the Agriculture Department could tell farmers how much of any particular crop or product they could sell. Sales in excess of a quota would be subject to a penalty tax equal to half the full return which the administration's new program says any particular product is entitled to receive.

As is the case on crops now subject to sales quotas, the controls would have to be approved by at least two-thirds of the producers voting in a referendum.

Crops which now are subject to marketing quotas are cotton, tobacco, peanuts, corn, wheat, and rice. Quotas are in use this year, however, only on peanuts and major types of tobacco.

MORE MARKETING QUOTAS

Brannan would extend authority for marketing quotas to livestock, including hogs, cattle, and lambs; poultry, including chickens and turkeys; whole milk, butterfat, eggs, hops, honey, honeybees, gum naval stores, corn produced outside the commercial corn area, barley, oats, rye, grain sorghums, flaxseed, soybeans, dry edible beans, grass seed; vegetables, including potatoes, cabbage, and tomatoes; and fruits, including citrus fruits, dried fruits and deciduous fruits.

Quotas may be invoked next year on cotton, wheat, and possibly corn and potatoes as well as tobacco and peanuts. There has been no indication that they might be proposed in the near future for livestock, fruits, or other vegetables.

It can be readily seen that the adoption of a policy such as the Secretary of Agriculture advocates would mean a condition of Government control over the lives and activities of our farmers that would destroy the liberty and freedom that is so dear to the farmers of this Nation. No longer would they be free to sow and reap as they desired. They would be subject to the control of Government agencies. Nor can we overlook the fact that the cost of such a program would be so great that the financial stability of our Nation and the consequent tax burden upon our people would be at the breaking point. It must never be forgotten that whatever you get from your Government must eventually be paid for in taxes levied upon the people. The gentleman from Missouri, Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, presented the situation in a strong and logical way when he said:

Eventually we must pay the fiddler. Let no one have any illusions about that. The money you are adding * * * must be paid either by increasing the public debt or by raising taxes. You can take your choice. And the American taxpayers can take their choice—or at least express their opinion in a very substantial manner.

Time does not permit as full a discussion of this bill as I would like to have made, but suffice it to say that I am opposed to the adoption of the bill because, first, it proposes to center complete control of production, marketing, and prices in the hands of a Government agency; second, it has political implications which will leave the welfare of farm people subject to the whims of a bureaucracy and dependent upon congressional appropriations; third, it will stop the long-time trend toward greater efficiency in farm production, a trend which is in the interest of consumers as well as producers; and, fourth, the program would eventually prove detrimental to consumers.

In coming to the conclusion that the policy set forth in this bill is not in the best interest of either farmers or consumers, I have had in mind that the rank and file of our people are opposed to anything and everything that runs contrary to our American way of life, or that would lead us from the fundamental principles that have governed us throughout our existence as a nation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the debate thus far has been very interesting and enlightening to me. May I say at the

outset that I bow to no Member of this House so far as agricultural experience is concerned. I was born and raised on a farm. I homesteaded, I have milked cows, fed hogs, and fed sheep, among other things. If anyone here has had any more experience than I have had so far as actual work on a farm is concerned, I would like to have him stand up. Perhaps my farming experience has not been as large so far as acres are concerned, as our farms were from 40 to 80 acres.

May I begin by saying, Mr. Chairman, that I impugn the motives of no man so far as his position on this bill is concerned, and, in my opinion, it is about time that every Member of the House, myself included, come to the realization that all of us are in favor of doing the same thing for the farmers. In other words, we all want to accomplish exactly the same purpose. The big argument, the big difference, is over the way we shall go about it.

I was amused to hear my beloved and very dear friend from Texas talk about darkness. If he will read the Scriptures he will find "Those in darkness have seen a great light." Therefore, I want to pay a compliment to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Let me remind the Members on my right that your own political platform of 1948 states definitely that it supports a flexible price program. It is almost identical with the statement of the Republican platform on the same issue and that is the way it should be.

Mr. Chairman, to me the darkest moment in all my career in Congress was when our subcommittee decided—purposely? No; I think not. Accidentally? Absolutely—to make a partisan political issue of the farm program and not follow their own conscience. If we could have the opportunity of talking quietly to each one of you personally, how members of our subcommittee felt in their own hearts about the Pace bill when it was first considered in our committee you would be, indeed, quite surprised.

It was a sorry day in America when those gentlemen out in Des Moines said that "We can do more for the farmers because we are Democrats than you can ever expect from the Republicans."

There never was a more false or insincere statement made. The Democratic Party wants to do everything it can for the farmers; the Republican Party, I am convinced, wants to do the same thing.

I lived through the Hoover trouble. I was operating a hardware and implement store at that time and I know what it means to come downtown and find your banks closed with your help standing around wondering how you are going to pay them. Does anyone want to see that return? I am pretty well fed up with some of these folks who make the statement in the press that the Republicans want a depression. No Republican, no Democrat, has ever conscientiously made any such statement. There is not a Member on either side of the aisle who even remotely feels such a desire. Yet when I see the same thing coming in 1949 that I saw spread over the world when the last depression hit us, I am pretty nervous. None of us are to blame, but this great Nation of ours is not large enough, it does not have influence enough, to stop world-wide deflation.

I would like to just call your attention to a few figures I have in my hand concerning the situation in Europe. Does it bear on this question? My friend, it is absolutely right to the point. What has been going on? I tried to tell the subcommittee, I think I did in a small way, but maybe not plain enough. But here are figures showing recovery in some European nations in regard to industrial and agricultural pursuits. You may not believe these figures but they are absolutely unimpeachable. Listen to the figures as I read them, because they do have a bearing on what we do in this House this very day.

In Great Britain the total production today, that means agricultural and industrial production, is 121 percent over prewar. Now let that have a bearing on your vote.

In Belgium they are producing today very considerably over prewar. I call the attention of my good friend from Texas to that, because he and I walked around through one large city in Belgium one evening 3 years ago when they were very happy and dancing on the streets, and they were having a good time. What do you suppose their production has reached? One hundred and seventy percent over prewar in 1948.

Take Sweden. Now, you would expect them to be higher because they did not enter into either war, but that is not true. Their production is 143 percent in 1948 over prewar, and Poland is 133.

Now, listen to this. Of the 15 countries, including Russia and her satellites, we find their average increase in production since the war in 1948, was 113 percent over prewar.

What bearing has that on this bill? Let me say here this very minute that it has a great deal to do with this bill, because the United States is the only nation in the world—and I defy anyone to dispute my statement—that absolutely bankrupts itself by production. We are the most strange and peculiar and unusual people that God in Heaven has ever blessed. He has blessed us with the greatest crops we have ever had. Even this year, 1949, I was certain that Mother Nature would not smile so abundantly on us, yet we find that probably the wheat crop will be better than last year, and the corn crop will be larger.

What I am driving at is that if we do not have, shall I say, sound thinking, keenness, and smartness to arrange a farm program that fits into a new world, then agriculture surely faces real difficulties. This is a very important bill. To me it is the most revolutionary piece of legislation I have ever read. To me it is a little different when a lawyer discusses a bill, or a hardware merchant, because I discuss it exactly from the language of the bill. This bill is very peculiar. Please look at the bill. On the very first page, what does that bill say? It starts out by introducing the Brannan program. I do not think we should have a discussion about the Brannan program now, because I have enough trouble crossing bridges when I get to them without crossing bridges that I never reach. So, forget the Brannan program. You Democrats have thrown out Agricultural Secretaries before, and I am convinced you can do it again, and you might, even though he is from Colorado. Why, you threw out a Secretary of Agriculture, or he got out, and if I remember, he ran for President. And, you might throw out a Secretary of Agriculture on this issue and find him running for President. Those are things that might happen.

On line 8, page 1 of this bill, I call your attention to the first time you have seen these words: "income support standard." There begins your Brannan plan. The whole thing, the whole scheme is written in those words. Now, I want to turn over to the next page and show you subdivisions 1, 2, and 3, and read them. It tells you how you are going to figure the farmer's income, and for the first time in all your agricultural legislation you have written in the income of the farmers of the United States on an average annual basis. You have written in also parity prices for the farmer's product. Notice how this works. Then, in addition, you have in the bill the expenses that the farmer incurs in producing and operating his farm. Now through the manipulating of a formula proscribed by the Secretary with the weighting of certain elements the Department arrives at a parity price.

Do you understand this? Of course you cannot.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Colorado will carefully read in the RECORD tomorrow the unwarranted accusation he has leveled against his colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture. I have been associated with the gentleman for many years. He started his remarks by saying that he would not impugn the motives of any of his colleagues on the committee, and before he had concluded he said that we were not following the dictates of our conscience, and if he could take the Members of this House out into the corridors of this building he could open their eyes with regard to the considerations which had influenced the decisions of the 17 Democrats on the committee.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute additional in order to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I certainly am entitled to say this, now that the gentleman has put his foot in the halter, as we farm boys say. I did not expect to tell this, but I say to the gentleman I made no charge against any members of my committee.

Mr. COOLEY. I ask the gentleman to read his own remarks in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. Let me tell the gentleman something. He was not present, and I am not talking about the Committee on Agriculture, the whole committee, I am

talking about the subcommittee. Let me say to the gentleman that here is something he does not know. He was not there. I was there. I made this remark, and I make it again.

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

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman take more time so that I can finish my statement?

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. HILL. I will tell later in the Committee of the Whole just exactly what went on in the subcommittee. I did not mean to do that, but I certainly will.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I hope every Member of the House will read in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the shocking revelation made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] in which he disclosed that the president of the National Farm Bureau Federation, one Allan Kline, has been deliberately spreading false propaganda in regard to the so-called Brannan plan. Every Member of Congress from a district where a Farm Bureau organization is located has received telegrams from the Farm Bureau denouncing the production-payment provision of the Brannan plan. Yet, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] quoted from the official Senate and House hearings where Mr. Kline had not only approved but had actually advocated the principle of the Brannan plan.

I know that the farmers of America will agree when I say that it is time for the Farm Bureau to change its leadership and get a man who will not consider the interest of the American farmer as secondary to the interest of the Republican Party.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is pretty difficult these days to keep cool with COOLEY or to keep pace with PACE, but my particular interest is to keep the livestock people of this country from going broke with Brannan. That keeps me busy most of the time. Cheese is 27 cents per pound today and the law states the support at 32 cents.

We used to have hope, faith, and parity, but we are beginning to lose a little of faith and hope, and I guess we are going to lose parity, too, if we do not look out.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should spend a few minutes trying to find out what this is all about. I never realized I could learn so much from people who have been in Washington such a short time.

Let us go back a little bit and think about the Federal Farm Board which we hear about, which in the twenties had $500,000,000 and lost about half of it. Then we had the triple A that we hear praised here today. But in 1939, the seventh year of the more abundant life, what did you have? That was the first year I was a Member of the House of Representatives. In August 1939 we had 5-cent-plus hogs and 8-cent-plus cotton and you had your 54-cent wheat, and you had to pay 27 cents export bounty in order to get rid of the wheat. I do not want to spend time going into that today. We have listened to a discussion about the Aiken bill. That is not the issue here before us today. The issue before us today is whether we are satisfied with the support program that we have or whether we want to take over the Pace bill. As I remember it, in high school there was something—I presume it was in geometry—a rule to the effect that "things equal to the same thing are equal to each other." Personally, that is the reason I will not support the Pace bill. The Pace bill and the Aiken bill are too much alike to merit the support of anybody. If you do not believe that, just read the speech made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] yesterday. It is in the RECORD. Surely the Aiken bill has many of the provisions of the Brannan plan in it. So has the Pace bill. So, "things that are equal to the same thing must be equal to each other."

For that reason I say to you today that I stand here and feel humiliated—it makes me feel dejected—to see anything as important as this brought in here and glibly discussed the way this particular legislation is being discussed. It is enough to make anyone feel badly to think that he spent any time in agriculture. One could just as well have come down here and obtained all the information in a few short weeks by listening to what goes on here in Washington.

The Steagall bill was passed in 1941. You may make disparaging remarks about the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], but I have known the gentleman ever since I have been a Member of Congress. You can accuse him of being a Republican, or anything else you like. He can take care of himself, as I have observed on many times. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], if you want to know the facts of the case, was the gentleman who did more to give us a support program for American agriculture in passing the Steagall bill than any other Member of Congress at that particular time. Associated with him were present Members of Congress, the gentleman from Georgia, PAUL BROWN, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL], and the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. CRAWFORD]. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] was one of the leaders in connection with placing the Steagall amendment in the Price Control Act. The Steagall bill was the greatest piece of agricultural legislation that this Congress has ever passed. I do not care what anybody says, no other piece of agricultural legislation in the history of this country compares with the Steagall amendment.

Mr. PACE. If the gentleman will yield, would he permit me to add to the list of names that he has mentioned the name of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; I was not a member of that committee. I was not a member of the committee, although I sat there and listened to the hearings because I knew if we had support we were going to get production, but I take no credit for it myself.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I would not want the gentleman to belittle his service. He conferred with the gentleman from Tennessee and with other Members who were vitally concerned with the adoption of the amendment and he did contribute valuable services.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to break my arm patting myself on the back, or anything like that. But I do say to my colleagues today that we had better think twice before we discard the Steagall amendment. All the Hope bill is really a continuation of the Steagall bill. So any time you are criticizing the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] today you are criticizing one of the men who has made one of the greatest contributions to American agriculture of any Member of Congress in the history of this Congress.

This program worked before the war, it worked during the war, and it has worked since the war. I listened to Members yesterday about how bad they feel because they spent a few million dollars on eggs. Oh, that was terrible. If they had shipped as many eggs as some of these other products, there would not have been any loss on eggs. If they had a little of that money which was spent in sending tobacco over there to feed the starving people of Europe, we would not have had any loss on eggs at all. My good friend from Arkansas was worried about the losses that had been made. The gentleman did not say anything about the fact that last year we shipped $86,000,000 worth of rice abroad. The farmers received only $172,000,000 for the entire rice crop. So half the crop was exported.

My good friend from Georgia—I do not like to mention this, because I think he was on good ground during the war when they did not need cotton—but he expanded the benefit program to peanuts. The peanut crop last year was worth only $220,000,000, and we were able to get rid of $77,000,000 worth of it largely through the Marshall plan. So let us not get the tears running down our cheeks too much about any little livestock products. The Government has never lost a dollar in connection with the livestock program up to this time. It has been difficult to get them to use any section 32 money. They could figure out all the excuses in the world to use that section 32 money but they did not want to do it when it came to the livestock industry, which, after all, is 50 percent of the agriculture of this country.

Under the Pace bill, as I said before, it is too much like the Aiken bill to have anyone support it. As previously stated, things equal to the same thing are equal to each other. There are a lot of things in the Pace bill that you have not heard discussed at all. It is honeycombed, if you please, with special privilege. Look through it. You see that throw-back to

the days of Henry Wallace, with 75 percent support for corn in one county, and right across the line, in another county, 100 percent support. Such a silly thing to have in a bill in 1949.

Mr. PACE. That has been the law. It is now the law and has been since 1938—the difference between commercial and noncommercial corn areas.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I realize it is in the present law. Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN on many occasions tried to get it out of there. There is no reason to repeat it and put it in the permanent law, because I do not like to live in a 75-percent-support county and have somebody else in a 100-percent-support county, because that is not democracy in action. That may be the idea of Democrats in action, but that is not democracy in action.

The only change in the Hope bill was that, instead of saying "not less than 90 percent of parity," it says "90 percent of parity. The Hope bill provided the sliding scale for perishables which all Democrats voted for. Please do not go out like you did last year and say you believe in a sliding scale and try to make anyone believe there is not any sliding scale in the Pace bill, because you have got two of them. You slide clear down to the cellar in this one. Fifty percent of agriculture is covered in the Pace bill and the other 50 percent is left out of the picture altogether. Under the Aiken bill, only about 20 or 30 percent of agriculture has any protection. The rest of it is simply a matter of discretion.

So I say to you, let us keep the present law that we have. Let us amend it. Let us do something that is not going to be detrimental to the American farmers. They have done a good job during the war, and we owe that not only to them but also to the American people.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have only one additional speaker, and I would like for him to close.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has 9 minutes remaining, the gentleman from North Carolina 17½.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Gore substitute. I do not believe the issue here before us today is the issue of the Brannan plan or the Aiken plan; I believe sincerely it is the issue between the experimental Brannan plan and a tried, and time tested, and constantly improved Democratic farm program which I feel the people of this country endorsed in the election last November.

I am not ashamed of this Democratic program; it had bipartisan support; it has worked for many years and has been gradually and slowly improved to where I think it is a good plan.

I will admit that it has perhaps several faults, but I do not believe it is worth while to burn down the house in order to get rid of a few bugs. It is a plan that is well reasoned out and has been put on a sound, safe, and sane basis.

I am afraid of the Brannan plan, although I have an intense respect for the able and sincere Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan. I have a tremendous respect for the members of this Agriculture Committee. I do not think anyone has done more for agriculture than the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

But I cannot bring myself to follow anyone's lead blindly when after further careful study and consideration I think the program will lead us down the road to economic ruin. I am afraid this launches a program which will soon become so stupendous in cost that this Nation could not remain solvent.

When we accept the Brannan program we accept the principle of food subsidies, of high producers' prices, low consumers' prices, and the Government making up the difference out of money from the Federal Treasury. If we can accomplish this trick of high producers' prices and low consumers' prices without the outpouring of billions of dollars from the United States Treasury, then we have discovered something as great as the discovery of perpetual motion, and I do not believe we have found it yet.

This program, the more I study it and look at it and see it, makes me think of the OPA production payments, subsidies, low consumers' prices, high producers' prices, billions from the Treasury. It seems to me we are inadvertently drifting back to the old days of the OPA again.

I apologize to the Committee for speaking of this bill. They studied this question of food subsidies for a few months, ever since April 7, when, I believe it was, the matter was first submitted to the Congress by Secretary Brannan.

But I have the temerity to say that I have studied food subsidies for 3 years. My effort goes back to the days of the OPA when I had to fight in every session of Congress to try and continue food subsidies to keep from breaking the line of inflation and having a third, fourth, or fifth round of wage increases.

As I defended that program here and in my district and all over the United States by radio, I realized many of the difficulties, many of the thousands of complications and dislocations that a program of food subsidies once started would lead us into. It was a war-caused necessity then—a temporary thing to be killed when the inflation danger was over.

Make no mistake about it, in this bill we commit ourselves knowingly or unknowingly to a system and principle of food subsidies in such a way that we cannot turn back. The committee has written some fine provisos into this legislation, but you must remember that when you embark upon this program you are starting something that will spread like a flood and be as difficult to control.

Think back to the original idea and what they expected to do. It was not a trial run on three products, but unlimited authority to use production payments on any perishable commodity that they determined.

I am fearful of a mighty Department of Agriculture and a very capable Secretary of Agriculture who are not committed to a food subsidy on only three commodities; they never backed up from their position that it must be a comprehensive program on those perishables which they think need support.

So we will find after the camel's nose is under the tent that it will be an entering wedge instead of a trial run. I have seen many programs start as trial runs only to become gigantic programs. Government programs always have a habit of expanding.

If the Committee on Agriculture was the only one expounding this trial on three commodities, that might be a different situation. But you and I know that this full-blown Brannan plan, advocated and aggressively supported by the entire Department of Agriculture, combining with consumer groups, can soon force this far beyond the limits the Agriculture Committee now advocates.

It is a program which can become self-accelerating, self-enlarging, self-expanding.

It is only a matter of time until the program gets bigger and bigger and is added to in its appeal, not only to the consumers, but to the producers as well. And so the United States Treasury eventually picks up the check which I fear will result in this program becoming absolutely unlimited as to skyrocketing costs.

Food subsidies under OPA, too, started in a very small way. I remember when the subsidy was put on milk of 1 cent a quart. It was not very long before we found that the subsidy on fluid milk was dislocating the cream supply of butter. So we had to put it on butter. Then we found after we had placed subsidies on fluid milk and butter that we had dislocated the supply of milk for cheddar cheese.

So you go into a general program and you finally go from one commodity to the other and the end is never in sight. Yes, before we were through with that dairy program the cost was $1,243,000,000. The OPA subsidies, which I supported as cheaper than breaking the line of inflation for the war, cost us $3,947,000,000. For the last partial year 1946 it cost us a total of $1,763,000,000.

It is costing England, less than one-third our size, in food subsidies nearly $2,000,000,000.

Do you remember the fun it was to run a Congressman's office on those hundreds of problems of production payments, the quarrels, the difficulties, the missing records of bureaucracy, the men who ran all over this country auditing the farmer's receipts and the processor's records? Do you remember the millions of pages of regulations that any such program entails? You talk about bureaucracy. This program cannot be self-enforced and self-maintained because you are paying out Government money to the egg producer or whatever else is in this subsidy program. Each one of millions of transactions has to be audited, and finally they have to clear through the General Accounting Office.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Was not the gentleman from Oklahoma the most ardent advocate of OPA in this entire House?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have tried to say that very clearly, because I felt it was a wartime necessity in battling inflation. I do not see how subsidies could have been so repulsive to so many Members of the House under OPA and now have a sort of holy attitude for farm prices in peacetime.

I think the committee admits it cannot be sure that these production payments will be passed on by processors to benefit the consumers of this country. Only through price controls, which I am sure no one now wants, can you prevent the benefits of processor payments from being absorbed by the middleman. The committee even points out, in the case of wheat, which has fallen one-third in the price the farmer receives, that the cost of bread has not gone down at all.

The only excuse given for the trial run in this bill is that it is going to furnish experience. Experience for what? For the full Brannan farm program because that is what the Department of Agriculture is committed to and if you pass this trial run you will find it will be ever-expanding and ever-accelerating within a short time.

What will the program cost? Nobody can give the cost. Secretary Brannan testified that to lower the price of milk 1 cent a quart across the country would cost from $200,000,000 to $250,000,000. That is a reduction of 1 cent a quart to benefit the consumer. That is almost as much as it would cost to have the Federal-aid-to-education program for the coming year. That is 1-cent-a-quart effect to the consumer.

On eggs, to lower the price, and this is the figure the Secretary used, by 4 cents a dozen across the country, his estimate was it would cost $172,000,000.

On pork, and that was not spelled out quite so clearly, but 20,000,000,000 pounds of pork which we will probably have, lowered 4 cents a pound, figures $800,000,000. So I think you have just a little peak at the eventual cost of this full program. We should therefore stop, look, and listen. Let us continue our present tested formula for another year and see what can be done to improve it. You cannot solve agricultural problems with subsidies. You merely multiply them. You start a chain reaction that can destroy our economy.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that in the closing moments of the general debate I may be able to be of some service to the Members. I hope you can do me the kindness to forget for a moment that you are a Democrat or a Republican, and turn our entire attention to a future constructive farm program for the farmers of this Nation.

I think the best service I can give you is to tell you how and why this bill is now before you. The subcommittee started hearings on January 7. You may remember that was even before the House was organized. Then on February 23 through March 18, we devoted our time to a study of the Aiken Act which, you recall, we did not have an opportunity to analyze before its enactment in the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress. But, here is what we found, and please follow me closely. We found that Senator AIKEN on June 15, 1948, while his bill was before the Senate, had this statement to make: "Price supports on any agricultural commodity through loans, purchases, payments, or other operations would be authorized." That is in the Aiken Act. "This authorization provides the necessary flexibility in the choice of methods to be used in supporting prices. Thus it authorizes not only loans and purchases, but also direct payments to producers."

That is, we learned that under the statement of the author of the bill himself the entire Brannan plan, lock, stock, and barrel, without any limitation, is now in the Agricultural Act of 1948, commonly known as the Aiken bill.

Then we found in the bill itself this section, which I think you should know about, section 302 (a):

> The Secretary, through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him, is authorized to support the price of agricultural commodities to producers through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

There is the production payment or Brannan plan authorized without limit.

Then we had before us the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Hunter. He testified, and I think the date is significant, in February—quoting him without reading his exact language—that under the language of the Aiken Act they were now, for the first time, granted the authority to use production payments in the price support program.

Then the Secretary of Agriculture came before our committee, and I think I should read to you exactly what transpired:

> Mr. PACE. You do now have authority under the Aiken bill, if it goes into effect on the 1st day of January, to support prices in all of the methods you now suggest?
>
> Secretary BRANNAN. Yes.
>
> Mr. PACE. By payments, by loans, by purchase agreements, and by direct purchases?
>
> Secretary BRANNAN. Yes.
>
> Mr. PACE. This payment question, which has been so much inquired about, is now authorized by law if the Congress gives you the money?
>
> Secretary BRANNAN. That is right.
>
> Mr. PACE. I think that needs to be made clear. We have not brought here, whether it is good or bad, a request for any authority that the Congress has not already written into the law.
>
> Secretary BRANNAN. That is correct, sir.

Let me say in passing, when you rise here today and condemn Mr. Brannan, please bear in mind that he could have remained quiet, he could have come to our committee and suggested some changes in the Soil Conservation Act or the like, he could have withheld mention of the fact that his entire proposal was authorized by law, and the probability is that it would have remained in the act just as it is at this time. I think you should thank the Secretary.

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

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

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is not saying, is he, that this Congress should have permitted the Aiken act to become law? I thought it has always been the gentleman's position that we should not permit the Aiken bill to become law, and until it did become law these production payments would not be possible.

Mr. PACE. That is exactly right. I think if Secretary of Agriculture Brannan had not developed the problem and his views, neither the gentleman from Kansas nor the gentleman from Georgia would have had a full comprehension of the problem. Therefore, this is what we were faced with, and get this clear. I think you ought to understand what is in the minds of the committee. Here was the Aiken Act authorizing the production payment plan without limit. Here was the Secretary of Agriculture saying, "That is the plan I want. That is the plan I want to put into effect with certain changes and additions." Our committee could not agree with either of them. We thought it was such a comprehensive change that it required considerable study and, if you please, we concluded we could study it for 40 years and talked about it and never would have known how it would work. We concluded there was but one way in the world to determine the feasibility of the payment plan, and that was through experience, by an experiment. Nobody on the committee, be he a Democrat or a Republican, was ready without additional information to accept either the unlimited authority contained in the Aiken bill or the unlimited authority which the Secretary proposed that he exercise.

But that is not all. We began to look closely into these losses. As I told you yesterday, you have only two methods now of supporting prices. One is through loans, which you can use only on a few commodities like cotton, corn, wheat, and tobacco, and the other method is for the Secretary to go out and buy up the surplus.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] missed the issue as completely as I have ever seen it missed. The question here is not, under this bill, to set up an unlimited subsidy program for consumers.. That is not the issue. The issue here, may I say to the gentleman, is whether or not your Government will continue to buy food and to destroy it when there are people in this country that need it to eat. That is the only issue here.

Now, here is some information we had. This is the statement made to our committee on the 7th day of June by Mr. Leslie S. Hubbard, president of the National Poultry Producers Federation, Lancaster, Pa. He was an impartial witness. He came there of his own accord.

He is interested in the protection of the producers. Here is what he says. Please listen to this:

If the Congress decides to extend into 1950 title I of the Agricultural Act of 1948—

That is the Gore bill—

I can say with complete assurance that the Department of Agriculture will have to buy from 15 to 20 million cases of eggs at a cost of approximately one-quarter of a billion dollars.

When you vote, please understand what you are doing. That is all I ask. I do not care how you vote, because I know how you will vote if you do understand. When you vote for the bill offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] which contains the egg program just as it is, where the only thing the Secretary can do is to go out and buy up eggs, then you are voting for a program to buy a quarter of a billion dollars' worth of eggs and take them away from the consumers of the country. Could anybody here stand up and say that they expected me or the Democrats or the Republicans, if you please, on my committee to continue title I with the testimony before us?

Then, what else did we have before us? It is said that the farm organizations did not have a part in this bill. All right, here is the testimony of Mr. Davis, secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. This is found on page 616 of part 3 of the hearings:

Mr. PACE. Do you or do you not approve of the Secretary's production payment proposal?

Mr. DAVIS. We would approve of it on an experimental basis, I think. It seems to me that you need some experience with a thing like that before you go all out to apply it.

Is that not the committee bill?

Here is the testimony of Mr. Kline of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Mr. HOPE asked the question:

Mr. HOPE. 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. * * * we have proposed some amendments to make effective the act of 1948 and we have not made any suggestion with regard to the elimination of this provision. In fact, we do not suggest it.

He proposed to leave in the Aiken bill the unlimited authority for the production payment plan—for the Brannan plan, if you please.

Now, here is the testimony of Mr. Goss, which is found on pages 565 and 566 of part 3 of the hearings:

Mr. GOSS. We discussed a straight subsidy, and said that that might be necessary, * * * We recognize that there may be emergency conditions where it might be necessary, nevertheless. * * * our whole stand might be summed up by saying that we want to use any possible devices that will bring about the best results.

Mr. WHITE of California. Will the gentleman please tell the Members that Mr. Goss is with the Grange?

Mr. PACE. Of course, Mr. Goss is the master of the National Grange.

What were we to do? What would you have done? Would you have come here asking the Members to extend title I with that testimony before our committee, that on potatoes last year you bought up $225,000,000 worth and let them rot in the fields and fed them to the hogs? Somebody mentioned something about making flour of the potatoes. The testimony shows that we not only had to give them to the flour mills, but we had to pay the freight to deliver the potatoes to the mills. You spent $225,000,000 on Irish potatoes last year. You have already lost $128,000,000 on eggs. And you are preparing to buy another quarter of a billion dollars' worth of eggs if you continue title I.

Could we have come here and recommended the extension of title I? You know we could not. It was not cotton, corn, and wheat we were worried about. Those producers are all right. But we think that the perishable commodity producers of the Nation are entitled to equal treatment and we know that you cannot give protection to them if the only method you have is to go out and buy up food and let it rot. And we know that if it is done much longer then the American people will revolt and our entire farm program and the support-price program will be endangered. Any farm program, to be successful and to continue in effect, must be sensible, must take into account the welfare of all the people, and must be administered without unreasonable and unnecessary cost.

So here is what we have done: We have taken these three commodities; eggs, with probable losses of $128,000,000; Irish potatoes, where you have lost $408,000,000; and wool, where you have lost $80,000,000, and authorized an experimental program for the next 2 years to find out how the production plan will work, what the costs will be, whether it is practicable, whether the benefits to consumers will be in keeping with the costs, and how to fix the production limitations.

We could accept the all-out program of the Secretary; we cannot accept the unlimited authority in the Aiken bill, but we do agree with the Secretary that the time has come in this Nation when the welfare of the consumers, who pay the bill, must be taken into account, and these enormous losses and this destruction of food must be stopped.

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

Mr. PACE. I yield briefly.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is it not a fact that all these losses have been because there have been no controls, which the Secretary for the last 3 or 4 years has asked both the Democratic and Republican administrations to impose?

Mr. PACE. CLINT ANDERSON, when Secretary of Agriculture, sent three letters to Congress asking it for authority to put some controls under the potato program, and it has not been done, and there is nothing in title I of the Gore bill that will do it. But there is in the committee bill authority, where the Secretary can require the producers to conform to reasonable limitations on production.

Let this be my last word. I do not know what the future holds. Some say that this experiment is just getting the camel's nose under the tent. I say this to you, if you do not try this plan out and see whether it works for the perishable producers, about 50 percent of agriculture, or more, they will never have a support program like the producers of the basic commodities, and enjoy the same protection.

I do not see how a man from California can vote against the committee bill. I do not see how a man from Florida can vote against the committee bill, or a man from New Jersey, or any of these great areas where the perishables are grown. If you vote against the committee bill, then come and tell us, if you please, how you think we can give some help to the perishables. Come to us, if you please, and tell us if you do not think the consumers of this Nation have some rights. Come to us and tell us whether you think that instead of providing food for millions of our people who are entitled to have it, and for which they are paying, you should spend a quarter of a billion dollars buying up eggs and then throwing them away. Tell us whether or not you think we should continue to provide no authority except that of going out and buying and destroying. Those are the issues.

As a final word let me add that my principal interest is in the welfare of those millions of our people who work in the fields and produce the food and fiber to feed and clothe all the people. I think they are entitled to the protection and security of fair support prices, to full parity prices. But I know we cannot secure and keep for them that protection and that security unless the program is sound, unless the losses are kept to the lowest possible figure and unless the welfare and interest of those who pay the bill is also considered and protected.

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

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Agricultural Act of 1949."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment contemplated under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"TITLE I—1950 PRICE STABILIZATION

"SECTION 1. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed through any instrumentality or agency within or under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, by loans, purchases, or other operations—

"(a) To support prices received by producers of cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts marketed before June 30, 1951, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such commodity for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which the crop is harvested. The price support authorized by this subsection shall be made available as follows:

"(1) To cooperators at the rate of 90 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year;

"(2) To noncooperators at the rate of 60 percent of the rate specified in (1) above and only on so much of the commodity as would be subject to penalty if marketed.

All provisions of law applicable with respect to loans under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall, insofar as they are consistent with the provisions of this subsection, be applicable with respect to loans or other price-support operations authorized under this subsection, except that for the purpose of computing the parity price for Maryland tobacco the base period shall be the period August 1936 to July 1941 in lieu of the period August 1919 to July 1929.

"(b) To support until January 1, 1951, a price to producers of commodities with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture by public announcement pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 1, 1941, as amended, requested an expansion of production of not less than 60 percent of the parity or comparable price therefor nor more than the level at which such commodity was supported in 1948, except that milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs shall be supported at 90 percent of the parity or comparable price. The comparable price for any such commodity shall be determined and used by the Secretary for the purposes of this subsection if the production or consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for the commodities referred to in (a) hereof. In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support.

"(c) Sections 1 and 3 of the act approved August 5, 1947 (Public Law 360, 80th Cong.), are amended by striking out in each section the date 'June 30, 1950' wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the date 'June 30, 1951.'

"(d) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the lending and purchase operations of the Department of Agriculture (other than those referred to in subsections (a), (b), and (c) hereof) shall be carried out until January 1, 1950, so as to bring the price and income of the producers of other agricultural commodities not covered by subsections (a), (b), and (c) to a fair parity relationship with the commodities included under subsections (a), (b), and (c), to the extent that funds for such operations are available after taking into account the operations with respect to the commodities covered by subsections (a), (b), and (c). In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to require compliance with production goals and marketing regulations as a condition to eligibility of producers for price support.

"SEC. 2. From any funds available to the Department of Agriculture or any agency operating under its direction for price-support operations or for the disposal of agricultural commodities, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to use such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this act.

"SEC. 3. Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as added by section 31 of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 773), reenacted by section 1 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (50 Stat. 246), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 22. (a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

"'(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President: *And provided further*, That in designating any article or articles, the President may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine.

"'(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States.

"'(d) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section.

"'(e) Any decision of the President as to facts under this section shall be final.

"'(f) No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party.'

"SEC. 4. Section 8 (a), as amended, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended (a) by striking out 'January 1, 1949' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof January 1, 1951,' and (b) by striking out 'December 31, 1948' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1950.'

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act, the act of July 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 506) shall continue in effect.

"SEC. 6. This title shall take effect on January 1, 1950, except that sections 3 and 4 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

"SEC. 7. Section 303 of the Agricultural Act of 1948 is amended by striking out the figures '1950' and inserting the figures '1951'."

Mr. GORE (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I asked for a thousand additional copies to be printed and available, and since all are familiar with this, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

Mr. LEMKE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have a small amendment to the amendment.

Mr. GORE. That will not affect the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I had my say on yesterday. The Committee was very indulgent, and I shall not undertake a lengthy debate today. I do, however, wish to call to your attention that the distinguished and capable gentleman from Georgia has by his statements on eggs pointed up the issue between food subsidies and the program of price supports that we now have. I had a good deal to say to you yesterday about the egg program. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has now made some statements that I wish to analyze. He said that the Secretary of Agriculture predicts that next year we will have to buy $250,000,000 worth of eggs.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PACE. That was not the Secretary of Agriculture; that was the head of the Poultry Association of the United States.

Mr. GORE. I stand corrected. Thank you. Let us analyze the statement, nevertheless.

The gentleman from Georgia said that by buying these eggs the Government would take away from the consumer. However, eggs, as well as other commodities, will not fall below a reasonable price, which is all the farmer asks, until the market is glutted; so we will not be taking away from the consumer; he can still buy all the eggs he wants at a reasonable price. Were it not so prices would not fall to support levels. Shall we, then, make the farmer the only man and the only industry to go contrary to the current of American economic life and produce more in order to get less? Shall we make him the only man or industry who will glut the market? What will

happen under the payment program if we do have this enormous egg production predicted by the gentleman?

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

Mr. GORE. Yes; but, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. I just want to call the gentleman's attention to the estimate that was given in the committee by one of the Department's experts on the egg program in which he was asked what was the cost of the egg price support program. He said that in 1937—this must be a mistake, it must be 1947—it was $13,700,000; for 1948 it was $15,928,000; and estimated for 1949, $7,760,000. He goes on to say, however, that the estimate for 1949 was a budget estimate which was going to the Appropriations Committee in February. Since that time the figure would be increased, but I am sure no one in the Department of Agriculture has any idea of spending $250,000,000 on egg-price support this year.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman. Let us continue with this prediction for just a minute. What would it mean if the market were thus glutted? That would mean that instead of 4,500,000,000 dozen eggs there would be perhaps 5,000,000,000 or 6,000,000,000 dozen eggs next year. What would happen to the market? According to the Brannan plan, they would find their level in the market place. Let us say they went down to 20 cents. What would it cost on 5,000,000,000 dozen eggs to give a 10-cent support subsidy? Not $250,000,000, but $500,000,000. So there you have it. Instead of removing sufficient surplus from the market to prevent gluts and disastrous prices as under the present program, the gentleman from Georgia proposes that we permit demoralization of the market and resulting depression of prices with Uncle Sam making up to the producer for his income deficiency.

Let us not make the farmer the only man who produces more to get less and glut the market in order to become a ward of the Treasury of the United States.

I will not now discuss further the issues involved.

I present here an amendment. A number of Members have talked to me about three amendments, and I have agreed to—I have not agreed to accept an amendment from any particular person—but I have agreed that I will have no objection to three amendments. The first is an amendment providing Steagall support from 60 to 90 percent on cottonseed. I would like to make it clear that in my opinion the Secretary has ample authority under present law to provide price support for cottonseed. But the industry is in distress. They do need price support. It is agreed by everybody that the amendment should go in.

The second amendment in which the Maryland tobacco people are interested is meritorious and will have no objection from me or anyone so far as I know.

The third is on the question of postponement or repeal of the Aiken bill. A lot has been said about extension, that my bill would provide an extension of the Aiken bill. My bill provides no extension and could not. The so-called Aiken bill is permanent law once it becomes effective. My bill provides postponement of the effective date.

What did I have in mind to do by my bill? Not to be so presumptuous as to come here and undertake to write a new agricultural policy. Not at all. Out of this confusion and controversy, out of this lack of understanding of what we face, I propose to preserve our status quo for another year.

I suppose 50 or 75 Members on both sides of the aisle have come to me wanting to repeal the Aiken bill instead of postponing its effective date. From a practical standpoint, I do not think there is very much difference in postponement and repeal because, mind you, that issue will finally be settled in a conference between the House and Senate. Furthermore, we will be acting on agricultural legislation again next year. Nevertheless, whoever offers an amendment to repeal instead of postpone, I will accept the amendment, but that does not include the acceptance of a substitute that might involve a number of other things.

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

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr PACE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Agricultural Act of 1949.'

"SEC. 2. Section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) (A) The term "income support standard," as of any date, means the average annual aggregate purchasing power of cash receipts from all farm marketings, including production payments made under section 302 of this title, during a period consisting of the first 10 of the preceding 12 calendar years (except that during 1950, such period shall consist of the calendar years 1939 through 1948, inclusive) computed as follows: (i) Divide such cash receipts for each of such 10 years by the parity index for such year; (ii) add the amount obtained under (i) above for each of the 10 years and divide by 10; (iii) multiply the amount obtained under (ii) above by the most recent parity index.

"'(B) The term "parity index," as of any date, means the ratio of (i) the general level of prices for articles and services that farmers buy, interest on farm indebtedness secured by farm real estate, and taxes on farm real estate, for the calendar month ending last before such date to (ii) the general level of such prices, interest, and taxes during a period consisting of the first 10 of the last preceding 12 calendar years (except that during 1950, such period shall consist of the calendar years 1939 through 1948, inclusive). The parity index for any year shall be the simple average of the 12 monthly parity indexes computed for such year.

"'(C) The term "parity price" for each agricultural commodity means a price computed as follows: Multiply the average of the prices received by farmers (including any production payments made under section 302 of this title) for the commodity for each of the 10 immediately preceding calendar years, or for each marketing season beginning in such period if the Secretary determines that use of a calendar year basis is impracticable, by the ratio of (i) the current income support standard to (ii) the actual average level of cash receipts from farm marketings, including production payments made under section 302 of this title, during the 10 immediately preceding years.

"'(D) The standards, prices, and indexes provided for herein, and the data used in computing them, shall be determined by the Secretary, whose determination shall be final and conclusive.'

"SEC. 3. Section 302 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary, through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him is authorized to support prices of agricultural commodities to producers through loans, purchases, and other operations. In addition, the Secretary is authorized until January 1, 1952 to support the prices of Irish potatoes, eggs, and shorn wool to producers thereof through production payments alone, or in combination with other types of price support, if he determines that the use of production payments is the most effective and practicable method of providing price support, and that the use of production payments will not substantially reduce the market price of, or the demand for, any other agricultural commodity. Except as otherwise provided in this section, the type, amount, terms and conditions of price support operations, and the extent to which such operations are carried out, shall be determined by the Secretary.

"'(b) Price support shall be made available to the producers of corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, peanuts, hogs, milk, butterfat, and shorn wool (including mohair), at levels equal to the parity price for each of such commodities. If acreage allotments or marketing quotas are in effect, the price support level for corn for producers outside the commercial corn-producing area shall be 75 percent of the level at which the price of corn is supported in the commercial corn-producing area. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, if the Secretary determines that the parity prices 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.

"'(c) Price support shall be made available to the producers of cottonseed and of agricultural commodities (other than those specified in subsection (b) of this section) for which the Secretary by public announcement pursuant to the act of July 1, 1941, as amended (55 Stat. 498), requested an expansion of production, at levels not in excess of the parity price, taking into account the following factors: (1) The supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor; (2) the price levels at which other commodities are being supported, including the feeding values of other grains in relation to corn; (3) the perishability of the commodity; (4) the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation; (5) the need for offsetting temporary losses of export

markets; and (6) the ability and willingness of producers to keep marketings and supplies in line with demand.

"'(d) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that the price-support operations of the Department of Agriculture or any instrumentality or agency under the supervision or direction of the Secretary with respect to agricultural commodities (other than those required to be supported by subsections (b) and (c) of this section) shall be carried out so as to bring the prices received by the producers of such commodities into a fair and comparable relationship with the prices received by producers of other agricultural commodities taking into account the availability of funds and the factors enumerated in subsection (c) hereof.

"'(e) The levels of price support provided herein shall be based upon the parity prices for the respective commodities, computed as of the beginning of the marketing year or season, in the case of those commodities marketed on a marketing year or seasonal basis, and as of January 1, in the case of commodities not so marketed (the parity price as of July 1 may be used for the last 6 months of the year, in the latter case, if the Secretary so determines).

"'(f) If producers have disapproved marketing quotas with respect to any agricultural commodity in a referendum held with respect to such quotas, no price-support operations shall be undertaken with respect to the crop of the commodity to which the marketing quotas would have been applicable: *Provided*, That the disapproval of marketing quotas in any one referendum shall not prohibit price-support operations with respect to more than one crop of the commodity. The Secretary may also require, as a condition to undertaking a price-support operation for any agricultural commodity, that appropriate marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, be in effect for the commodity in applicable regional production or marketing areas prescribed by the Secretary.

"'(g) Nothing in this section shall prevent the announcement of the level of price support for any agricultural commodity in advance of the beginning of the marketing year or season (January 1 or July 1 in the case of commodities not marketed on a marketing year or season basis) if the level of price support so announced does not exceed the estimated parity price, based upon the latest information and statistics available to the Secretary when such level of price support is announced, and the level of price support so announced shall not be reduced if the parity price, when determined, is less than the level so announced.

"'(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, price support for any agricultural commodity at a level in excess of the parity price for such commodity may be undertaken whenever it is determined by the Secretary, and public notice given thereof, that price support at such increased level is necessary in order to increase or maintain the production of such commodity in the national interest.

"'(i) In carrying out the provisions of this section, compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices (including marketing quotas when otherwise authorized by law), as prescribed by the Secretary may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support. If acreage allotments are in effect for any commodity, the Secretary shall prescribe, as a minimum condition of eligibility for price support, that the producer shall not have knowingly overplanted such acreage allotment.

"'(j) Appropriate adjustments may be made in the support price for any commodity for differences in grade, type, location, and other factors, except that the support price for milk shall be adjusted so that milk used in the manufacture of dairy products shall be supported at not less than 88½ percent of the parity price for whole milk, subject to the feed ratio adjustment authorized in subsection (b) of this section, and in the case of cotton the standard grade for purposes of price support shall be middling seven-eighths-inch cotton.

"'(k) No producer shall be personally liable for any deficiency arising from the sale of collateral securing any loan under this section unless such loan was obtained through fraudulent representations by the producer. This provision shall not, however, be construed to prevent the Secretary from requiring producers to assume liability for deficiencies in the grade, quality, or quantity of commodities stored on the farm or delivered by them, for failure properly to care for and preserve commodities, or for failure or refusal to deliver commodities in accordance with the requirements of the program.

"'(l) If the price of any agricultural commodity is supported by production payments (as authorized in section 302 (a) hereof), the Secretary may determine the rate or rates of payment annually, or periodically, on the basis of the amount by which the estimated average price to producers of the commodity nationally, or in such areas as the Secretary may determine, for the period to which the rate relates is less than the level of price support therefor; and such rate or rates may be adjusted by the Secretary, for differences in grade, type, location, and other factors, if he determines that such adjustments are practicable and essential to the effective operation of the price-support program for such commodity. Production payments shall, so far as practicable, be limited to the quantities of the commodity marketed by the producer. Production payments need not be made with respect to any commodity or any producer thereof 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.

"'(m) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at less than the current price support level for such commodity plus an allowance for approximate carrying charges, except that the foregoing restrictions shall not apply to (1) sales for new or byproduct uses; (2) sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil; (3) sales for seed or feed if such sales will not substantially impair any price support program; (4) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or of commodities where there is a danger of loss or waste through spoilage; (5) sales for the purpose of establishing claims arising out of contract or against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful act with respect to the commodities; (6) sales for export; (7) sales of wool (including mohair); and (8) sales for other than primary uses.

"'(n) The Secretary, in carrying out programs with respect to any agricultural commodity under section 32 of the public law numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, and section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, may utilize the services and facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation (including but not limited to procurement by contract) and make advance payments to it.

"'(o) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act, section 2 of the act of July 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 506), shall continue in effect.'

"SEC. 4. Section 8 (a), as amended, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended (a) by striking out 'January 1, 1951' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1953,' and (b) by striking out 'December 31, 1950' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1952.'

"SEC. 5. Section 32, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 612c), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The sums appropriated under this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for the purposes of this section until expended; but any excess of the amount remaining unexpended at the end of any fiscal year over $300,000,000 shall, in the same manner as though it had been appropriated for the service of such fiscal year, be subject to the provisions of section 3690 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 712), and section 5 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes" (31 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 713.'

"SEC. 6. Section 4 of the act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1946 ed., 713a-4), is amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end of the next to the last sentence thereof and adding the following: '*Provided*, That the foregoing shall not limit the authority of the Corporation to issue obligations for the purpose of carrying out its annual budget programs submitted to and approved by the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act 31 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 841).'

"SEC. 7. All references in other laws to parity, parity prices, prices comparable to parity, or prices determined in the same manner as provided by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, for the determination of parity prices, shall, after January 1, 1950, be deemed to refer to the parity prices for such commodities determined in accordance with the provisions of section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by this act: *Provided*, That any marketing agreement or marketing order, including any regulation issued thereunder, in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, or the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, on December 31, 1949, shall continue in effect without the necessity for any amendatory action relative thereto, and all terms and provisions of such agreements, orders, and regulations are hereby expressly ratified, validated, and confirmed.

"SEC. 8. Titles II and III of the Agricultural Act of 1948 are repealed.

"SEC. 9. This act shall become effective on January 1, 1950, except that sections 6 and 8 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this act. No provision of this act shall affect price-support operations or announcements thereof with respect to any agricultural commodity the marketing year or season for which commenced prior to January 1, 1950."

Mr. PACE (interrupting reading of the substitute). Mr. Chairman, in the interest of saving time, I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request. The substitute is identical with the committee bill except there are two amendments in section 302 (a). I ask unanimous consent that section 302 (a) be read and that the reading of the balance of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I shall take at this time only a moment to explain to the House the terms of the change made

by the substitute. As was announced by our chairman 2 days ago, the committee authorized that the bill be amended, and this form of amendment is used, to definitely limit the experiments to 2 years and to name the commodities on which the experiments would be undertaken. That was decided upon, Mr. Chairman, because there were all sorts of rumors flying around, many of which came to the committee, some so fantastic, that the Secretary was going to use the payment plan on cotton; others that he was going to use the payment plan on wheat, and others that he was going to use it on hogs. I had previously announced, as chairman of the subcommittee, that the three commodities would probably be eggs, potatoes, and wool. Therefore, this amendment is to conform with the original plan of the committee to allay any rumors or any doubt as to what the commodities would be on which the experiments would be undertaken, and then to make it definite that it is no more than an experiment. The substitute provides that this authority be given to the Secretary for only the years 1950 and 1951.

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

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

Mr. HILL. Did I understand the chairman of the subcommittee to make the statement that we agreed on those three commodities?

Mr. PACE. I did not say that the gentleman from Colorado has agreed to anything, because I do not believe he has.

Mr. HILL. Did the gentleman say that the subcommittee had it brought before them?

Mr. PACE. The gentleman's recollection is a little faulty. We had several days of hearings on eggs, chickens, milk, potatoes, wool, and hogs. We not only had the Secretary, but the producers of those commodities before us and had extensive hearings. Wool, eggs, and potatoes were among them.

Mr. HILL. Read the hearings, and I think you will find that we did not decide on any commodities to be considered on a 3-year extension basis.

Mr. PACE. I did not say that the gentleman from Colorado was a party to it. But, the majority members of the committee did determine and agree upon these three commodities.

Mr. HILL. Now the gentleman says the majority members of the committee.

Mr. PACE. I beg your pardon.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman said the majority members of the committee.

Mr. PACE. That is right.

Mr. HILL. That is a different story. That is not the committee by any manner or means.

Mr. PACE. I realize that at the present stage the minority Members are not in agreement with the majority Members.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman explain to the Committee of the Whole if there is any difference between the committee bill and the Gore amendment on section 32 funds.

Mr. PACE. Quite a substantial difference.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is very important. That relates to the school-lunch program and many other activities, and I think that should be made clear.

Mr. PACE. I should mention that now, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] does not authorize what I think the unanimous wish of the Committee on Agriculture, both Republicans and Democrats, and that is that the unexpended balance of section 32 funds be preserved until the fund is built up to $300,000,000. Title I proposed to be extended does not provide that. The committee bill does provide that and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has stated, it is a matter of great importance to the perishable producers of this Nation and to the school-lunch program and to many other features of the farm program. That is a very important difference between the committee bill and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, is it not the custom during debate under the 5-minute rule for the Chair in recognizing Members to alternate from side to side? At least I suggest to the Chair that that would be the fair procedure. The Chair has recognized three Democrats in a row.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that the matter of recognition of members of the committee is within the discretion of the Chair. The Chair has undertaken to follow as closely as possible the seniority of those Members.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOPE. For the information of the Chair, the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has been seeking recognition, has been a Member of the House for 10 years, and the gentleman from Tennessee is a Member whose service began only this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would refer the gentleman to the official list of the members of the committee, which the Chair has before him.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON to the Gore amendment: On page 8, line 13, strike out section 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 7. Titles II and III of the Agricultural Act of 1948 are repealed."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] first presented the rule to this body I stated that I would offer an amendment to repeal the Aiken Act. That is exactly what I have done here. To any substitute that is offered for the Gore amendment or the Pace bill or any other bill I shall offer the same amendment. I am indeed glad that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], has agreed to go along with the repeal of the Aiken Act.

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

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

Mr. GORE. I accept with pleasure the amendment of my distinguished colleague from Tennessee. I have just read the amendment at the Clerk's desk. The amendment strikes out the final section in the bill, which postpones the effective date of the so-called Aiken bill, and inserts a provision repealing titles II and III of the 1948 act, generally known as the Aiken bill. My young friend from Tennessee has made a valiant fight and has worked hard for what he conceives to be in the best interest of the farmer. I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Chairman, and am glad to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SUTTON. I thank my colleague from Tennessee. I believe he and I take the same position with regard to the Aiken Act, that it is a monstrosity, that it is one of the most damnable things that was ever forced upon the American farmers. It is an act which will bring about the slow starvation of the agricultural people of America.

May I point out some of the things the Aiken Act does in comparison with the present program and the committee bill. Under the Aiken Act, corn could be 85 cents a bushel. Under the present program it could be $1.41 a bushel. Under the Pace bill, not the Brannan plan but the Pace bill, corn could be $1.46 a bushel. Cotton under the Aiken bill can be 16¼ cents a pound. Under the present program it can be 27.34 cents a pound. In the Pace bill it can be 27.99 cents a pound. And so on all down the line you will find that the Aiken bill is a club over the farmers of the country. It is a monstrosity which should never have been brought into this Chamber or any other chamber on Capitol Hill.

I do not believe that Senator AIKEN realized what he had in the bill and I do not believe today that if he knew what it would do to the farmer he would insist on it. I am delighted to see that my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has accepted this amendment. And since he has accepted it and the issue is clear before us, with the acceptance of this amendment the issue narrows down to one of two things: we are either for our present program, plus the repeal of the Aiken bill or we are for the Pace bill.

Much discussion has been had over the Pace bill. There is one observation I would like to make. I do not think the

press of the country, including the radio commentators, have been just and fair to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. They have condemned this program as the Brannan plan. I am glad that the press is in this Chamber and can realize what I am saying, because I want to tell them that this is not the Brannan plan, it is the Pace bill, drawn up by the subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am proud to be a member, and proud to have had a part in bringing this Pace bill to the floor.

I would like to direct these few remarks to my southern friends. I want to repeat a few statements I made on yesterday. I wish every one of them was out of the cloak room and in this Chamber and on the floor, so that I could ask them this question. I cannot see how my good friends from Mississippi, and how my good friends from Alabama, and how my good friends from Georgia, and my good friends from Texas, and the other cotton-producing sections of this great country of ours can go back home to their people and tell them, "I voted against the Pace bill," when the Pace bill will permit the farmers of the country to have a support price on their cottonseed at $67.50 a ton, where the Gore bill provides no support. How can you go back to your farmers and explain that? How can you, Mr. WHITTINGTON, go back to Mississippi and tell your people down there, "I had a chance to give you $67.50 a ton for your cottonseed, yet I voted against it." How can my friends in the tobacco sections, and I am proud that I am from a tobacco section, how can you people in Kentucky and you people in North Carolina, and you people in Tennessee, and you people in Georgia, and you people in Maryland—how can you go back to your people and say, "Well, I had a chance to give you 49.6 cents a pound for your tobacco, but I did not want you to get that. I wanted you only to get 41.1 cents a pound."

How can you go back and tell your people, "I wanted to cut your price on tobacco 8½ cents a pound?" I cannot tell my people that, I am not going to go go back to the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee and tell the old farmer friends of mine, "I am going to cut the prices on your commodities," I want my people to prosper. I want my people to get as much for their products as they can, so that they can buy the cars from you people in Detroit, so that they can buy refrigerators from our people in Chicago, and so that they can buy electrical products from the people in New York. I cannot go back to my people and—feel at home unless I do everything in my power to get them just wages for their honest toil. They are justly entitled to the increases provided for in the Pace bill. Far be it from me to ever deny them of their just dues. May I say to you farmers from the Midwest, and I want to say to my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], that he is an able man and an able member of our committee. I am glad he is on our committee, but I want to say how can he go back to his hog-producers and tell those farmers out there, "I had an opportunity to get $19 a hundred for your hogs, I do not want you to have that much money. I just want you to have $16."

How can my friend go back and tell his constituents that? How can my friend go back and tell the farmers of that section?

He does not want the farmers of this country to have an increase in price for their eggs. He wants the middleman and the broker to have that increase.

That is what your egg program does today. The farmer does not get the advantage of that price support. When the Government goes in and buys up these eggs, who does he buy from? Does he buy from the farmer? No, he does not. He buys them from big business. No wonder my Republican friends are against this bill. I am for the common man. I am not for special interests. If there is any payment of any support price for eggs, let it go to the farmer instead of the middleman.

Let us look a little further. Who do you want to help? Do you want to help that middleman and big business? As for me, I want more money for my farmer friends. I want them to have the money that is rightfully theirs instead of the middleman and the broker. I understand why some of my friends are interested in carrying on the present program. I can see why some of them want the middleman to get this money, because they are middlemen and the sponsors of big business themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] has expired.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

Mr. MASON. I object.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] in wishing to take the Aiken bill off the books, once and for all. The trouble with the bill, to start with, it was written down here in the Department of Agriculture. That is enough reason for being against it.

I would not take this time, but the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] wondered what I would say when I got back home to my constituents. Well, I always tell them the truth. If you tell them the truth you know it and you will remember what you said. I will say, "Surely, the gentleman from Tennessee got up and told of some great things. He said he would get 19 cents for hogs." He did not tell about the little gadget that was in there that took 10 percent off that price. He did not tell about the little gadget in there that can raise the price of feed. These gadgets may result in a support for hogs less than that provided in the Gore bill. Surely I know that the Pace bill has that bait in it. It sounds nice.

I am looking forward to the next campaign when some fellow will get on the radio and say, "You could have had 67 cents for butterfat, but your Congressman wanted only 59." I do not like to be accused all the time of being for the farmer. I have an idea that there are some folks in this world besides farmers. I have to represent consumers as well. The farmers of this country purchase 40 percent of the manufactured goods of this Nation. All the farmers I have contacted are satisfied with the present support law. The only thing they would like to do would be to buy the things they buy on the same index that they sell their commodities on.

One thing more I will tell them, and I tell it to them now. I shall tell them: "You can't believe what those Fair Dealers tell you. They promise you a lot of things but their promises do not amount to much. It is the performance that counts."

You have heard me say more than once, "Go out and give them something besides promises, because you are not living up to your promises at present." Today the farmers of this country at the present rate are going to lose a quarter of a billion dollars. That is more than all the peanut crop is worth, more than all the rice crop is worth, and some other crops. Why? Because the present law is not being followed. The gentleman does not have to tell me what to go out and tell my people. I have been in politics long enough to know what to tell my people; I shall tell them the truth; I shall not indulge in a lot of fancy explanations but tell them the truth as I have during the 10 years I have been here. If I had to do anything else I would not be here, I would just retire. Let us just tell the people the truth; let us not deceive them. The plain truth is that we are not doing at the present time what the law says we should do, and the people in Wisconsin are going to lose $50,000,000 to $70,000,000. The Secretary of Agriculture is to go out to Wisconsin on the 31st day of July 1949. I told the Commodity Credit Corporation yesterday, "You had better get that straightened out, follow the law and give us the proper support price on cheese and milk, give us what the law says we should have or I do not think the Secretary should expect a too hearty welcome."

So I say to you, let us not fool ourselves or our people either. When we fail to recognize the fact that the administration is not carrying out the laws we have, we merely show how ineffective the present Eighty-first Congress really is.

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

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct an inadvertence on my part. The bill on page 4 defines shorn wool, including mohair. It should have been in the section I submitted. I ask unanimous consent to insert in parenthesis the words "including mohair," after the words "shorn wool."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman state that he omitted shorn wool and mohair in his amendment?

Mr. PACE. No; the support price on page 4 is on shorn wool and mohair. In submitting my substitute I made the error of not including mohair. I am just trying to correct it so that both will be covered

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Was that one of the provisions agreed to by the majority when they had their meeting or was that agreed to in the full committee?

Mr. PACE. That was agreed to in the full committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then I will not object.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I have discovered a typographical error in the amendment which I offered. Will the gentleman amend his request to make the year on page 4, line 2, read "1951" instead of "1950"?

Mr. PACE. I shall be glad to incorporate that also.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment by adding in parenthesis on page 4 after the words "shorn wool", the words "including mohair"; and on the same page to change the date "1950" to "1951."

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think we should come to an agreement right at this point as to whether all of us are going to have time to speak on these major amendments. I certainly will not object to the majority leader's receiving this additional 5 minutes, but I wish to ask the chairman of the committee what is going to be his intention relative to closing debate?

Mr. COOLEY. We want the matter fully considered and debate will continue as long as necessary for the Members to be heard.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is no present intention to close debate?

Mr. COOLEY. We will try to close debate at the appropriate time later in the day.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What does the gentleman mean by "appropriate time"?

Mr. COOLEY. We want to finish the bill some time today, if possible. I think the gentleman will have ample time to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it is about time that somebody in this debate say a few words for a forgotten class in America—the consumer. I have sat here and witnessed the division among Members of the House representing agricultural districts. I see men in my own party, that we from the cities for years have so loyally followed, rise and make certain statements. It raises a very serious question in my mind as to whether or not we can follow them with confidence in the future. Those of us who have an over-all national interest in mind but represent consumer areas are wondering whether we can follow them with confidence in the future or whether we might feel constrained, in view of the inability of representatives of the agricultural area to serve the farmers correctly in the national interest, that we from the urban districts might feel we have a responsibility to take care of the farmers as well as the consumers, and undertake to write a basic bill for agriculture.

It grieves me to see the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and I on opposite sides. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] spoke about this committee bill being a trial-run proposition. I spoke on behalf of the first Bankhead Cotton Act which was passed by the House years ago by six or seven votes. The supporters of it asked me not only to vote for it but to speak for it. I did that on a trial basis. When we started the farm program there were only a few basic commodities involved. There was not one of us but what recognized the fact that we were experimenting and that it was a trial run for agriculture, so that it may survive in an intensely industrial country and so that it might receive some compensatory considerations legislatively. I recognize the power of that argument, but I recognized it was also a trial. I have seen it expand. This commodity has been included and that commodity has come in which has made a good, just case. Certainly it has grown far beyond what any of us contemplated back in the early thirties, but it has grown because of necessity. So the original farm program was a trial run and it still is. Only the other day we had a bill reported out of the Committee on Agriculture to include under support prices tung nuts and honey. I do not know whether they should be or not, and my mind is open when the bill comes up. But, it shows that it is still a trial; that we are still experimenting.

I am concerned somewhat about the consumer. When the consumer sees millions of bushels of potatoes—and that is the glaring example—purchased under support prices, and the Department being unable to dispose of them, and they are destroyed, no one can answer any inquiry as to why that is done. And, I know that should be of special interest to agriculture, because you cannot have the people seeing a thing like that done without a reaction which is harmful to the whole agricultural program.

So, no matter what you do, that has got to be met. No matter what bill this House might pass in the interest of agricluture, and speaking for agriculture, coming from an urban district as I do, you should not—I will not say you cannot, because a majority can do almost anything—but you should not permit any bill to pass this House whereby in the next year or 2 years, under the support-price program, perishable commodities can be purchased, stored, and not disposed of in some way. Something has got to be done. If the committee recommendation is not the answer, come in with some other suggestion. The responsibility rests upon those who oppose the committee bill, as I see it, to bring in a recommendation or suggest an amendment in lieu of those provisions contained in the committee bill.

As I see it, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has ably presented the issue, and that is, if Government will buy food and destroy it. That is indefensible; it is intolerable, and it cannot be understood by any person in America, whether he lives on the soil or whether he works in the factory. Now, that is the main issue as I see it. It is probably apparent that the Aiken repeal will go through. I think about everyone is opposed to the present Aiken bill, whether Republican or Democrat. The question is on the continuance of support prices. I am for it. I am voting for parity prices in the committee bill. But, all I am voting for in addition is to allow an experiment on three commodities, now specifically mentioned, and confined to a time limit to see whether or not through an experiment in those commodities we can give to agriculture the support that is needed in an intense industrial system and at the same time prevent this situation of buying and being unable to dispose of the commodities in any way, bringing about a reaction that ultimately, as everyone of us knows in our own minds, will destroy the whole farm program and bring about a general disrespect for government itself.

I could go into the history of the Aiken bill, but that is unnecessary. We know in the closing days of the last regular session of Congress the situation that arose, but why go into that. That is unnecessary. That is water over the dam. We are faced now with the bill before us. As I see the main issue, it is, What can we do to maintain a sound agriculture, with a proper regard for the consumer? Parity is also included. The question is, How can we maintain proper farm prices and justifiable consumer prices when the Government is compelled to step in, and not have a situation develop such as did develop in the case of potatoes?

That is a constant threat to agricultural legislation that should address itself particularly to you ladies and gentlemen who represent agricultural districts, entirely or in the main. We from the urban districts have supported you. We did not consider the question of politics. When my good friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] proposed things, we supported him. We supported him all along the line.

We recognize that the solution of the agricultural problem is an important part of our national economy and in maintaining a strong national economy. It is vitally important to the success of our country. We view it from the broad

angle. But, again, you cannot have the situation continue, as I see it, without there developing by way of reaction a public opinion that will demand that farm legislation be repealed or seriously impaired.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that the problem rests upon the shoulders of all of us, particularly those from agricultural districts, if you repudiate the committee bill, to offer some amendments so that a situation such as occurred in the case of potatoes will not occur again.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague the distinguished majority leader has just made a plea on behalf of the administration bill, using the American consumer as the individual to be benefited under this bill. I am wondering whether he has read the bill. I am wondering whether he has discussed or wants to discuss in any way one part of this bill that so far has been almost completely overlooked. It is that part of the bill which the consumer of the United States has every right to look at.

There are two controversial provisions in this bill. One is the experimenting on three unknown commodities, the other is the fixing of an entirely new parity formula.

If Members will refer to the report of the committee on page 17, they will find the comparative prices to the consumer under the new parity formula. Eight of the ten basic commodities are increased.

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

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

Mr. PACE. Would not the gentleman want to modify that statement by saying it fixes the parity prices and not necessarily the support levels except as to the 10 commodities in the first section of the bill?

Mr. HERTER. That is quite true. I was about to say that under this bill there is compulsory support at 100 percent of parity figured under the new formula as against the existing 90 percent of parity under the old parity formula.

On page 17 of the report you can see the comparable prices. I just want to take one that I think those who live in large city districts may have to account for to their constituents, and that is butter. The price of butterfat under the support price here is increased just under 9 cents per pound. In other words, with the adoption of the new parity price here every consumer in the district of the majority leader and in my district is going to pay 9 cents per pound more, for butter is a basic commodity.

They are going to have to pay approximately 70 cents more per 100 pounds of fluid milk under this formula. They are going to have to pay more for corn and for rice. In other words, the consumer is going to have to pay more, except for two minor changes, one being wheat and the other peanuts, where the change is infinitesimal, because there is a new parity price fixed which is considerably higher than the existing parity price. I do not think the plea for this bill can be made on the ground that it helps the consumers.

Throughout the hearings before the Committee on Rules on this legislation we did our best to find out what the three commodities were going to be on which the experiment would be tried. The committee admitted freely that they did not wish to specify the three commodities because if the Congress specified the commodities and the experiment did not work out well, then the blame would be on the Congress and not on the Administrator. Hence it was left up to the Administrator to make the selection. Then they limited the choice in the selection of the three commodities by saying that no commodity could be chosen which, if it dropped in price, might affect the price of another agricultural commodity. How you can find any single commodity that is going to do that is a little beyond me. Somewhere, somehow, the Secretary of Agriculture is going to have to do some awfully tall research work to find that the drop in price in the open market of one commodity is not affecting some other commodity.

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

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The original theory of the Brannan plan was that milk, which is now selling for something like 21 cents a quart to the consumers, should be allowed to sink to its market level. He said it should be 15 cents, which is a 6-cent drop from the 21 cents. The farmer was supposed to get the 6 cents from the Federal Treasury. For every cent drop in price it would cost the Government $150,000,000, and if it was brought down 6 cents, it would cost $900,000,000. If you figure out the same formula for all milk, it would cost the taxpayers $2,700,000,000.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is quite right. However, milk is specifically excluded from being one of the three products mentioned here, so the consumer is going to have to pay an additional price.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yet they say that is for the protection of the dairy farmers of the country.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we know now, of course, what the three commodities are upon which the price will be supported by payments. Therefore, we are not in the dark, and we can discuss those particular commodities, which is perhaps a good thing.

It seems to me, however, the commodities selected are not particularly good commodities upon which to support a trial run program. A great deal has been said on the subject of potatoes. The distinguished minority leader spoke about the potato program, and other Members have held that up as a horrible example of the kind of program which we have under existing legislation. Yesterday I called attention to the fact that as far as the cost was concerned, if we had had the Brannan plan in operation last year, and it had operated just as it did operate, except that it was a payment program instead of a purchasing program, the cost, according to the Secretary's own estimate, would have been twice what it was, or would have been $450,000,000, instead of $225,000,000.

Something has been said about destroying food and destroying potatoes. I submit there was not a person in the United States last year who wanted to buy potatoes who was not able to do so at a reasonable price. That is, if we accept the theory which I believe most people do, that parity prices are fair prices. Potatoes, of course, were supported at 10 percent less than the parity price.

I do not know of any potatoes being destroyed. Potatoes were fed to livestock. Alcohol was manufactured out of potatoes. Starch and other by-products were manufactured out of potatoes, but I know of no potatoes which were destroyed.

If we had had the Brannan program for payments on potatoes in existence, I am convinced there would have been no greater consumption of potatoes, because potatoes are not a commodity like dairy products or meats which the people buy according to the price that is prevailing. Potatoes are the cheapest food that we have, as far as calories are concerned. The consumption of potatoes, year after year, has been almost constant, no matter what the price was. Our people would not have eaten any more potatoes, no matter what plan had been in effect last year. No potatoes were destroyed that people wanted or needed to consume. As a matter of fact, under the program, Government and local charitable institutions received potatoes by merely paying the freight on them. So that there were potatoes consumed under those circumstances that did not cost those who consumed them anything. That is, poor people in the charitable institutions were able to get potatoes for nothing.

So, as far as the potato program is concerned, there is no advantage to be gained by shifting at this time to the Brannan plan of payments. If experience counts for anything, I think it will cost a great deal more to carry out the program under the Brannan plan than it has under the existing operation.

Most of the discussion has been on the potato program in past years. Not much has been said about the program this year. This year it is operating under exactly the same provisions as are contained in the Gore amendment. It is operating this year in the way that the potato producers of this country want it to operate. They asked us to pass the present legislation putting a support price of 60 to 90 percent upon potatoes.

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. We followed the request of the potato producers. They have recently appeared before the committee. They have stated they are thoroughly satisfied with the program this year. They pointed out that so far it has cost

only 20 percent of what last year's program cost up to this time, and they are asking that for the time being it be continued. They are opposed to the Brannan plan. They are opposed to the payment plan in the Pace bill.

So those of you who are representing districts in which potatoes are an item, if you are voting for what the potato producers want, you will vote for the Gore amendment and not for the Pace-Brannan plan.

If you are representing consuming districts, I am sure there is no one in your district who will get any particular advantage from the adoption of the Brannan plan, because, after all, the amount that the producer gets for the potatoes amounts to very little in the price that the consumer pays. Most housewives who go into the stores today to buy potatoes buy them in 5- or 10-pound packages. The general over-all costs that go into the transportation, distribution, packaging, selling, and retailing of potatoes are what add up and make the cost.

I repeat that no one went without last year, because of the cost, and no one this year will go without potatoes at a reasonable price, no matter which program we adopt.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that if potatoes are in short supply in some parts of the country, and the price is high, the Department of Agriulture, under the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, has authority to put some of the potatoes which they had purchase into the channels of trade in those areas?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, to prevent them from spoiling.

Let me just say this in the moment remaining, that as far as the egg program is concerned—a 5-cent subsidy payment on eggs will cost $200,000,000. A 10-cent subsidy would cost twice that much. That is on the basis of the production last year. If we have a payment program which stimulates production it will cost much more.

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

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will have to say that if we proceed with that sort of understanding I do not know where we are going. To begin with, this year in the potato program, which the gentleman form Kansas has approved, we have not reached anything but the short production areas, and on that basis it is estimated that they are going to lose $45,000,000 on potatoes. That is still a good deal of money; and the best authority I can get is that even with the support down to 60 percent of parity we are going to have to buy this year and give away or feed to the hogs between $50,000,000 and $100,000,000 worth of potatoes.

I believe it is unfair to compare the program under this bill with the program now in existence, because the gentleman from Kansas, I know without intention, failed to mention the fact that under the terms of the Committee bill in fixing the support price for potatoes there are two things which the Secretary has to take into account. You will find the first of them on line 8, page 5 of the bill. In determining the support price for potatoes the Secretary must take into account the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand. On line 14 it states that he must take into account the ability and willingness of producers to keep marketing and supplies in line with demand. The present low only provides that the Secretary shall fix production goals and marketing practices, but the gentleman knows as well as I do that it has not operated.

The gentleman knows as well as I do that he received three letters from Clint Anderson as Secretary of Agriculture telling him that it would not operate; and the gentleman also knows—let us at least read the bill, will not everybody agree to do that, to read the bill?—in addition to the fact that the Secretary must take into account the supply and demand, in addition to the fact that the Secretary must take into account the ability and willingness of producers to keep supply within demand, in addition to those things, if you look at the bottom of page 7—now, listen to this, please: In carrying out the provisions of this section compliance by the producers with acreage allotments—there is no such thing in title I—production goals and marketing practices, marketing agreements and order, and marketing quotas when authorized by law, as prescribed by the Secretary, may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support. Now, I am willing to match the statement made by my distinguished friend from Kansas, when he said that under the committee bill the potato program would cost twice what it did last year, I am willing to make the statement on my considered judgment that if you put the potato program under the committee bill next year it will cost no more than 10 percent of what it cost in 1948. That would be $22,000,000. That is my mature, considered judgment. The Secretary of Agriculture, under his authority, can keep the production within reasonable limitations and stop this enormous cost and destruction of potatoes. That is why we put this authority in the bill. If that is done under the direction of this committee, the potato program next year should not cost as much, and certainly not more than 10 percent of what it cost in 1948.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. To what?

Mr. ABERNETHY. To the Gore substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order at this time until we dispose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is not any perfecting amendmen in order but you would vote on them in the order in which they are presented and assuming there may be a limitation of time, is it not proper to offer an amendment if there be no other perfecting amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. Only one amendment to the Gore amendment may be pending at any one time. The Chair will state that the Sutton amendment must be disposed of first.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Could we not have the amendment read for information?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, if no Member wishes to speak on the Sutton amendment, would not the Chair put the question and let us vote on it?

The CHAIRMAN. If no Member desires to speak on the Sutton amendment, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak on the Sutton amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I have just returned from the Northeast where one of the most devastating droughts in history has stricken the dairymen of my section. The fields up there which should be green at this time of the year are burned as brown as some of those Colorado mountain tops you can see when you approach them from the east. It is a very serious situation, and we are going to need hay up there.

I hope we can get as sympathetic a hearing as we gave the mountaineers and the shepherds and the cattlemen out in the far West when they were stricken. Certainly we have had no sympathetic hearing so far. Ten years ago when we were faced with a similar drought, and we were unable to get the free hay that they have out there, that they were able to get during the winter, we had to go out and pay 40 or 50 dollars a ton for our hay.

I may be speaking a little ahead of time, but when the effects of the drought are felt next winter and our dairymen do not have any hay, I hope that the House will give me as sympathetic a hearing as it did some of the representatives from out West.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a discourse I had on the general farm program with Secretary Brannan when he came before the Committee on Agriculture a few weeks ago. I am quoting from the hearings so there cannot be any question among the sundry wiseacres about whether these remarks were made. It can be found on page 162, part 2 of the hearings:

Mr. HALL. Of course a lot of us feel that there is too much of a gap between the price received by the producer of milk and the final cost per quart of milk to the consumer. Did you anticipate doing anything with that stretch in there?

Secretary BRANNAN. We are not proposing as a part of the price-support mechanism that you will actually go in and try to examine the markets and see whether unreasonable margins are being taken out of the handling between producer and consumer. Study of this problem is authorized by the Research and Marketing Act and our studies will indicate ways of improving the situation. However, it is not involved specifically here.

Mr. HALL. I want you to know that I endorse your idea of 15-cent milk to the consumer. However, I would like to get a little

further information as to how you propose to carry it out.

* * * * *

Secretary BRANNAN. Under the rules of trying to be equitable we would make it apply to all sections.

Mr. HALL. You do not contemplate making the producer give any ground whatsoever in the proposal?

Secretary BRANNAN. None, except as the parity formula itself may require that.

Mr. HALL. But you do feel that the program you propose will bring about the reduction of the price of milk to the consumer by the quart from, we will say, 22 or 23 cents down to 15 cents, thereby increasing production and making this vital commodity available to many more of our people?

Secretary BRANNAN. It might not have to move as low as 15 cents in order to get your maximum production moving, but I suggested that as the area in which it may have to move.

Then there is a differential between whether you buy it with delivery from the wagon to your door or in the grocery store. That is the reason I did not set my finger specifically on 15 cents. It would be somewhere in that range, maybe 1 or 2 cents above it.

Mr. HALL. I think a great many people will be friendly to the idea of milk at 15 cents a quart if it can be put into effect. There may be some difficulty involved before we can arrive at that accomplishment.

Secretary BRANNAN. We did stick our necks out to say it was feasible. I hope we are right.

Mr. HALL. I would say it couldn't be any higher than 15 cents, if you want to justify the expenditure of the vast sum it will require. I can well recall a decade ago as head of a family of six children and having had to purchase milk for them for the past 10 to 19 years. I can remember going out 12 years ago to one of the neighboring farms in my area and getting milk and carrying it back in a 2-gallon can, and the average price of the milk was 25 cents per gallon. In those days we could afford to raise children. Today it is pretty difficult to do it under the circumstances.

I just want to say this in conclusion that to my way of thinking if you are going to spend millions of dollars under the Brannan plan, the only fair way is to knock the price of milk to the consumer to 10 cents a quart. I would like to see that done.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the Pace bill. I will vote for the Sutton amendment in the belief that that is the quickest way to get to a vote on the Pace bill.

Why do I support the Pace bill? Why do I rise now to speak on an agricultural bill? Because I have something to say which I hope will be a contribution. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] stated to the House yesterday that in offering his amendment to continue the program as it is without changes, we would be continuing a program which we have carried on for the last 16 years. He said 16 years, but that is not true. I am sure the gentleman did not mean to misrepresent the situation, but I am afraid he was carried away with his own argument. The price-support program was first initiated in 1933, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has indicated. But the price-support program we have today is not the price-support program of 1933.

The price-support program was originally a part of the general program for economic recovery that was undertaken by the Democratic administration after it took office in 1933. The original program was one of insuring farmers against economic disaster—against the mistakes and tragedies of the twenties.

When the war came along in 1941, the support program was greatly increased. Why? In order to get greater production from our farmers. A support-price program of 90 percent of parity was put into effect not only to feed ourselves, but to feed our allies, so that those who were resisting the Germans would have food. Our farmers went to work. They produced the food that was needed without which we could not have won the war.

In 1933 support prices were initiated for only a few basic commodities. In 1941 Congress not only increased the support prices for these basic commodities which we were supporting through the thirties, but Congress passed the Steagall amendment which guaranteed price supports for such foods as turkeys, chickens, eggs, butterfat, and so forth.

So you see the present price support program is not the one initiated 16 years ago—far from it.

The Steagall commodities were included only as a wartime measure in order to bring about a greater production of food. The promise the Congress made to farmers of the country was to this effect: "If you will come along—if you will gamble with us, even after the experience you had after the last war, we, the Government of the United States, we, the people in the cities, we, who stand together with you to win or lose in this tremendous experience of war, which is threatening the world, we will stand by you. We will see you through."

What has happened since 1941? Agricultural production has increased one-third over the average in the thirties.

In our Committee on Foreign Affairs we sit day after day considering such problems as the Marshall plan. What percentage of our agricultural products were exported before the war? Two and six-tenths percent of our agricultural products. What did we export in 1947? The percentage was 8.7. In 1948 the average ran about 7 percent, or a little over 7 percent.

Economic collapse faced Europe at the end of the war. We came to their aid first with the UNRRA program and then with the Marshall plan. The UNRRA program was designed to give them relief; the Marshall plan to get them back on their feet. It is hoped that we will reach the goals that have been set by 1952.

May I point out, however, that the UNRRA program and the Marshall plan, buying as they have, farm products have permitted us to put off a revamping of our price support program.

I for one think that the time has now come to turn our attention to the farmers and their needs. We hope that by 1952 when the Marshall plan comes to an end, that a basis for sound trade will exist and that there will be healthy trade relations between ourselves and Europe.

However, I think it is overly optimistic to expect that Europe will be able even in 1952 to import enough food from the United States to take care of all our surpluses.

European countries will have increased their own production of food. Other areas of the world will have recovered from the war and will be producing food for export. Even if the most optimistic hopes are realized, there will still be a shortage of dollars in 1952. Since Europe must have industrial materials from the United States, with the dollar shortage they will have to use those dollars for industrial materials and it is reasonable to suppose they will go elsewhere for some of their food imports.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is trying to tell us, or so it seems to me, that we must have a new plan if we are to absorb the farm surpluses of this country—if we are to avoid serious economic trouble. We have changed our farm program in the past to meet changing needs. We must change it today if we are to realistically face the future.

A sound, long-range farm program must benefit not only the farmer but the consumer. And that is exactly what the Pace bill seeks to do.

Now it is not just the potato program we should be worrying about although most of the discussion has been about potatoes.

What are you going to do with this one-third greater production in agriculture? That is the question that must be faced.

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

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The Committee on Agriculture has brought in a program that is a pilot program. If it works, we are all set. If it does not work, do you think the Congress of the United States is going to continue it? I think the trouble with some people is they are afraid it will work.

This is not just a farm program. How does it affect my city people whom I have the privilege to represent? Let me read to you a few figures that we all know but perhaps have forgotten. Between 1929 and 1933, when the depression came, what happened? Big business could control the situation in their plants. They cut down production, and by cutting production low enough they were able to keep the prices from falling too low. In the automobile industry production was cut 80 percent. Prices dropped only 16 percent.

In the steel industry production was cut 83 percent but prices went down only 20 percent. Working people, whether in the factories, the shops or the offices in the cities were thrown out of work.

What happened to the farmer? The farmer could not cut his production because if he did he was on the road. Farm production went down only 6 percent, but how much did prices go down? They went down 63 percent. And that is the story. The fate of the farmer and the fate of the average consumer in the city

are inevitably and irrevocably joined together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has again expired.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sutton amendment. We have all heard the matter discussed very profusely. I think it vitally important to the country and to the welfare of the farmers that this amendment be adopted. None of us in this House, with a few exceptions, desire the Aiken law to ever actually become the operative agricultural program of this country. It was passed through necessity. I could suggest what kind of proceedings might be had to ascertain its paternity, but I will not. The only reason the Aiken law was enacted was through necessity. We heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] say that it was necessary to have some bill because the entire farm program would have fallen through otherwise on December 31, 1948. I say the Sutton amendment does not go far enough. It repeals the Aiken law and extends the present Agricultural Act 12 months unto January 1, 1950. It is my intention at the proper time when I can secure recognition to offer another amendment to the Gore bill extending the present law, permanently. In other words, why extend it for 1 year so that next year when we come here, if the Gore bill is passed, that we will of necessity have to take some other action? All of us agree that there are a number of changes that should be made, that can be worked out, but I for one think that we should have some permanent legislation and let that legislation be amended from time to time. I see no necessity or excuse for extending it for 12 months so that when we come back here next year it will again be necessary to accept some substitute that none of us desires. None of us desired the law we had to accept, and I hope that it will be the pleasure of the members of this Committee to go along with us on the further amendment to the Gore bill. Then if the Gore bill, as amended, is passed—and I do not express any opinion at this time about it—you can amend it, you can change it in any way you desire, and the Aiken bill on the expiration of a program will not be held as a club over the heads of the Congress any more or over the heads of the farmers of this country, thereby compelling us to adopt a program that none of us wants or likes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words and ask unanimous consent to speak for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to lie to the farmers or any other group. Should I again be a candidate for Congress and should the voters of my district decide to retire me to private life because of my position on legislation, I would regard such action as being of little importance to me personally. What really matters to me is that when my service in Congress has ended the RECORD will show that I did what was within my very limited capacity to save the children, born and unborn, from the slavery New Dealism is imposing upon them.

The Pace bill, H. R. 5392, which embodies a part of what is called the Brannan farm program, is exactly what its opponents here on the House floor and elsewhere have claimed—socialism and regimentation of the farmers so completely as to reduce them to a state of abject servitude and a capital fraud upon urban families.

However, every argument that has been brought against the Brannan scheme applies with equal force to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The triple-A law, of which the price-support provision is an integral part, empowers the New Deal to dictate to the individual farmer the kind and amount of crop or commodity he can produce. That act, if left on the statute books, will eventually without any additional legislation completely strait-jacket the farmer. The Brannan proposal, if enacted into law, could do no more than hasten the process.

Complete political control of farm production, marketing, and prices is inherent in the triple A law. The New Dealers planned it that way. And that they are obsessed with the urge to effectuate this end as quickly as possible is all too evident. If the farmers needed anything more to disillusion them, surely the Brannan proposal ought to be it.

There just is no such thing as partial political or socialistic planning of agriculture or any other segment of the economy. Once such planning is begun in any part of the economy it generates its own steam and all the forces making for the destruction of private-property ownership and free enterprise are set in motion. This in turn stimulates class strife, discontent, and misery, the very lifeblood of socialism, which in reality is nothing but political power anyway.

Yes, farmers, likely most of them, believe they have prospered under the New Deal. They have paid off several billion dollars of farm mortgages, improved and painted their buildings, and constructed new ones, bought refrigerators, deep-freeze equipment, new automobiles, and a quantity of all kinds of gadgets, household supplies, and up-to-the-minute farm machinery.

This has, of course, induced a sense of well-being among farmers and has had the effect of influencing them to support the New Deal.

Nevertheless in talking this matter over with farmers I am convinced that many, if not most of them, harbor a suspicion that the prosperity which they have been experiencing may not be all it seems. Some see through the scheme and recognize it for precisely what it is—a socialistic device which if not abandoned soon, promises to reduce them or their children to slavery.

One must be careful to guard against being misunderstood when one says the New Deal cannot give farmers or other groups something for nothing. In the long run, to be sure, it cannot do this but it can so long as the reserves or fat last which, as time goes, must be of short duration indeed. It is accomplished by mortgaging posterity, confiscating the goods of some groups and giving them to farmers along with others, and by expropriating the savings which are normally plowed back for investment in tools of production and arbitrarily distributing them to favored groups.

Whereas the share of the farmers' indebtedness on a per capita basis owed to the Federal Government in 1932 was approximately 12 percent of the total value of all farm land and buildings, machinery and equipment for production, crops held for sale, livestock and poultry, totaling about $5,500,000,000, the farmers' share of the indebtedness to the New Deal in 1948 was about 55 percent of the total value of all such farm property, or roundly $48,000,000,000.

To put it more succinctly, in 1932 the Federal Government held a mortgage against all farm property amounting to 12 percent of its value, which proportion had more than quadrupled by 1948. But the situation is much more alarming. This farm mortgage indebtedness to the New Deal is predicated on the listed Treasury debt statement, $252,000,000,000, but the Federal debt far exceeds that figure and is rising daily.

Deficit spending and lending, which is at the heart of New Dealism, is altogether a process of appropriating the goods of some groups and giving them to others. The New Deal lends money for various economic ventures. It has no money of its own, of course, and can obtain it only by somehow extracting it from private sources. The redistribution of wealth through New Deal lending has been, as all know, enormous. The New Deal has almost annihilated risk capital, mother of America's outstanding agricultural and industrial achievement and standard of living. Our tools of production are wearing out faster than they are being produced, which process, if not quickly reversed must eventuate in destruction of the standard of living.

A war was necessary to give semblance of curing the depression, which is about the same thing as saying it was necessary to put our children in debt bondage to political power in order that the present generation might enjoy an artificial and short-lived prosperity. The cost of the feverish and halting economic gains made before the war that can possibly be credited to the New Deal were also charged to posterity. Of course, back of it all was the greed for political power, not improvement of general well-being.

Farmers, like all other economic groups, are being euchered out of their property and heritage, liberty.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORAND: Strike out the word "shorn" wherever it appears in the Pace substitute.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, the word "shorn" appears together with the word "wool" in the Pace substitute, as it appears in the original bill. I cannot

for the life of me understand why a distinction should be made between shorn wool and pulled wool, when you realize that out of the total production of domestic wool in this country, which amounts to approximately 127,000,000 pounds a year, 33,000,000 pounds of that is pulled wool. It may be that many of you do not know the difference between shorn wool and pulled wool. I did not know it myself until recently.

Shorn wool, of course, we all understand, is that wool which is taken off the sheep with shears. Pulled wool is wool that is pulled off the hides after the animals are slaughtered. As I say, in this country that amounts to approximately 26 percent of our entire wool production.

I discussed this matter with some of the members of the committee, but the only excuse I could get from them for the elimination of pulled wool from the benefits of this legislation was that it was to benefit the packers. I cannot quite see that, because I realize that sheep may be brought to a slaughterhouse, some shorn and some not shorn. If you are not going to give the benefit of this legislation to the pulled wool, it means that the farmer who brings his sheep to market is going to get the same price whether he has shorn or has not shorn his sheep. It means that about 26 percent of the wool, as a result of this pulled-wool operation, will be thrown on the market, and thereby most likely will depress or disturb the wool market.

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

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Would there be anything to keep the producer from clipping his wool before he offers the animal for sale?

Mr. FORAND. Does the gentleman infer that every little farmer who has sheep is equipped to shear his lambs before he has a chance to market them?

Mr. PACE. Well, I had assumed that if there was valuable wool on the animal every sheep producer would have some clippers with which to shear the wool.

Mr. FORAND. The big producer could do that, but, like the gentleman from Georgia, I do not have very many sheep in my country, but I would say that if 26 percent of the domestic wool is going to be left without the benefit of this legislation, the farmer who brings his sheep to market unshorn will be the loser, and the Federal Government will be paying the difference to that farmer in subsidies in order to make up that which he would get if he had shorn his sheep.

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

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. As a matter of fact, lambskin with the wool on it is better than lambskins that have been sheared?

Mr. FORAND. I confess I do not know the difference, but I think I can see what would result if you permit 26 percent of domestic wool to be thrown on the market without any benefit whatsoever, while at the same time you are taking care of the other 74 percent of the domestic production.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The thing that puzzles me about the program is that we are putting wool in with perishable commodities. Wool is as durable as cotton. I do not see why wool should be thrown in with perishables.

Mr. FORAND. I hope my good friend will ask that of the committee. I cannot answer that for him.

But I hope that when this amendment comes to a vote the Members will go along with me and realize that we will be depressing and disturbing the wool market, and we will be depriving the farmers of a fair return on their sheep if we do not strike from the bill the word "shorn."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to oppose an amendment offered by my good friend from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND]. He admits he does not know very much about the sheep industry, and coming from an industrial center I would not expect him to. What he is talking about is not in the interest of the grower at all but in the packers' interest. This is one part of the Brannan plan, one part of the committee bill, that the grower is for. The National Wool Growers Association has heartily endorsed this bill. They are opposed to including pulled wool.

As the gentleman said, pulled wool usually comes from lambs that have been sold for their meat only and not for their wool value. This bill does not preclude in any way the packer who has a lot of lambs, where it will pay him to shear the wool from them. He is at perfect liberty to shear the wool, and the wool thus shorn comes under the provisions of this bill. Otherwise it would not. The inclusion of pulled wool would be a direct subsidy to the packers. They have not asked for it. They have not made any representation for it. If it were a matter of helping the mills in New England, I do not know that I would not seriously object to it.

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

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. Does not the gentleman admit that if a farmer brings a sheep to market that has wool on it, that has not been shorn, and the packer or the slaughterer, whoever he happens to be, does not get any benefit from this legislation, the farmer is going to lose if the wool is on that animal?

Mr. GRANGER. If a farmer had a little band of lambs and the wool was worth it he would shear the lambs. Otherwise, he would not shear them if it did not pay him to do so.

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

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. ABBITT. This being a bill for the benefit of producers, farmers, if it would be to their advantage to shear sheep before they put them into the hands of speculators or into the hands of the packers, it would be comparatively easy for any farm in the country not already so equipped, to equip itself to shear the sheep before they sent them to market. Is not that correct?

Mr. GRANGER. That is correct.

Mr. PACE. Is it not also true that the farmer is not sustaining any loss? He can still offer this pulled wool in the competitive market like everybody else.

Mr. GRANGER. Yes; he is not discriminated against. He can still offer his wool for sale in the market the same as anything else.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. Is it not true that it is not the packer but the farmer himself who is the fellow who is going to lose if the farmer sells his sheep including the wool?

Mr. PACE. Not under those circumstances; he would not get the benefit of the support price.

Mr. FORAND. The farmer would be the loser.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is it not a matter of fact that in the sheep industry in the Rocky Mountain area the lambs are the big cash crop?

Mr. GRANGER. That is right.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Lambs shipped in the fall; and unless they are fed for a long time they are sent to market without shearing.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman from Idaho is correct. They are shipped to market unsheared unless they have been fed for a long period of time and are shipped in the spring. Then they might shear them.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. But it is the regular custom in the Rocky Mountain area that after the little lambs have been born they shear the ewes and the bucks but the little lambs are fed and shipped without shearing in the fall. Is not that the custom?

Mr. GRANGER. That is right.

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

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to ask the gentleman this question to get this straight: In the West, in Utah, and in Colorado, we feed hundreds and hundreds of head of lambs and ship these lambs to Chicago by freight. The packers buy these lambs. Now, if these lambs are sold with the wool on them by our feeders they would not get the support price under this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. GRANGER. That is true except in the case where the lambs are fed over a long period of time and the wool is of much value. The packer then shears the wool and does not pull it.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], in his exchange of comments with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], made a statement with which I am in complete agreement. He said that he wished every Member

of this Congress would read this bill carefully. I rise today to say that I, too, wish every Member of this Congress would read carefully this bill, in detail.

I ask you to refer to the same paragraph to which my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, referred, on page 5 of the bill, if I recall correctly. The Secretary is to take certain factors into account in setting the parity price:

(1) The supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefore; (2) the price levels at which other commodities are being supported, including the feeding values of other grains in relation to corn; (3) the perishability of the commodity; (4) the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation; (5) the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets; and (6) the ability and willingness of producers to keep marketings and supplies in line with demand.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] pointed out so ably in his discussion, the price of steers fell but the price of veal calves remained the same; the price of hogs fell but the price of lambs rose or remained firm. The Secretary is required through this formula in the bill to take into consideration all of these extremely difficult and complicated details, and the relation of the prices of various feeds.

If you will read the bill, you will find that the Secretary of Agriculture is given more power than he has been given in any other enactment by the Congress. My suggestion to the gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House is that they had better dig up King Solomon and make him Secretary of Agriculture.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Would the gentleman want to recommend that in defending the support level on perishable commodities the Secretary should not take into consideration the supply and the ability of the producers to keep the marketings and supplies in line with demand?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think it is an admirable thing, and I would like to see him try to do it. But he would have to take into consideration the use of the different grains in these items to which I referred; he would have to take into consideration factors which are very difficult to compare; then he would come down to item 6, which says he will have to take into consideration "the ability and willingness of producers to keep marketings and supplies in line with demand," which is a very nice way of saying that the farmer would have to agree to the regimentation demands of the party which administered the act.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak about something else. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] spoke about the origin of this idea. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] stated that this is not a new idea. He said this had been commented upon by a witness, Mr. John Davis, of the National Council of Cooperatives, a year ago. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that it goes back further than that and is part of a program of those economists who desire to take us into regimentation.

I hold in my hand the Journal of Farm Economics, of November 1945, volume 27, No. 4, page 737, of the bound edition, which has in it the report of a price policy for agriculture contest, with which you are just as familiar as I am. This contest was inaugurated in January 1945 by a man who was then a dollar-a-year man, I believe, or at least an employee of the War Food Administration, as I recall it. His name is W. H. Jasspon. He gave $12,500 with a stipulation that $2,500 might be used for the cost of the contest and the remaining $10,000 for the awards.

We may be interested in the fact that the first award, $5,000, was given to an economist in the University of Chicago by the name of William H. Nicholls. He called it an integrated farm policy, and it contained the feature which marks the Brannan plan, the feature to which economists refer as "forward pricing." It is an ingenious idea. You determine, or the Government determines, what you should receive for the commodity you grow, and if you do not get that, the Government sends you a check. No trouble, no worry, very little effort. It could easily be carried beyond that; the Government experts, some of whom are probably out of work since the late and unlamented OPA went to join its ancestors—the gold bricks and the Mississippi Bubble—could determine what the income of a farm family ought to be, on varying grades of land, or in different counties. It could even depend a little on how you voted in the elections. If that income didn't materialize, you would get a check from Washington. And all of this is dependent only on two things, the strength of the taxpayers' pocketbooks, and the whims of the Congresses which would have to vote the money. Anyway the writer of this essay received $5,000 for it, in this prize contest. As I said, he was an instructor in the University of Chicago.

The winner of the second prize also came from the same university. In fact, he came from the same classroom, and the similarity of the ideas in these first two papers suggests that both winners had drunk deeply from the same academic spring. His name was D. Gale Johnson, and he got $2,500 of the prize money.

There were other prizes. The third prize, $1,250, went to Frederick V. Waugh, of the United States Department of Agriculture. I have never been sure, Mr. Chairman, how he got into the prize-winning group. He had, and expressed, the old-fashioned idea that we should stimulate demand. He said:

No price program will work very long without a balance between production and consumption.

And he suggested reactionary methods like giving increased attention to the processing, marketing, and distributing of foods and fibers.

He outlined a national nutritional program; he suggested a foreign-trade program. He did mention the possibility of compensatory payments, which probably put him in line for the money, but the fact that he had the old-fashioned idea that the farmer should work, and give thought to methods of selling the stuff he grows, kept him down to third place, and $1,250. In fact he sounded more as if he would have voted today for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee than as if he felt at home in the rarefied stratum of higher agricultural and political economics now occupied by the Secretary, Mr. Brannan, and the gentleman from Georgia.

There were 15 awards of $250 each, but I have not read those essays. I rise only to remark, Mr. Chairman, that the plan is really not quite as new as the gentleman from Georgia indicated. It is, in effect, the first blossom on the tree of complete regimentation which the college-classroom farmers think is desirable for the United States. I for one, Mr. Chairman, do not agree. I shall vote for the Gore substitute. I shall not vote for the Sutton amendment if it is offered separately. I shall vote against the Pace substitute for the Gore amendment. If the Gore substitute is adopted, I shall vote for the bill; if not, I shall vote against it.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the debate has gone rather far afield from the Sutton amendment which was offered to the Gore amendment and which the gentleman from Tennessee indicated he would accept. I am wondering if we could not vote on that at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has not propounded a unanimous-consent request. The Chair has been endeavoring to bring about a vote on the Sutton amendment and would like to put the question if there is no one present desiring to speak for or against the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sutton amendment which would repeal the Aiken Farm Act, the act passed by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress in the closing hours of the regular session. If it should go into operation on January 1, 1950, as the law now provides, it would mean low farm prices, depression on the farm, and difficulty for labor and industry. The 60-percent-parity scale permitted in the Aiken Act is intolerable and altogether unacceptable.

I should like to take advantage of this opportunity to make a few more brief observations as to the agricultural situation. The farmer is entitled to parity prices for his farm products. He desires, deserves, and must have a fair price for his products in the market place and not in the form of a hand-out. The farmer does not want a dole; he wants a fair price in the market place. That is the only proper way, and that is the position which I support.

Reverting again to the Sutton amendment, let me say that the Eightieth Congress should never have passed the Aiken bill, but it should have passed a permanent farm program of a workable character. Take for example this fact. There is no control program on cotton this year. There should have been.

A wise program enacted last year would have saved us from a situation which contains many elements of future danger

to the cotton farmers. In some areas this year nearly 90 percent of the cultivated land is being planted in cotton. I do not blame the farmer. He could not be expected to do otherwise under the circumstances. The fault is with the last Congress. We are now threatened with a tremendous overproduction of cotton. The cotton problem will be a burden from the start with an unwieldy surplus. It will be far more difficult now to devise a fair and workable cotton program

In conclusion let me say that in the light of the mistakes of the last Congress, the present Congress should do a better job. I am not prepared to say that any pending bill or amendment is perfect, but I feel the pending measures should be fully studied and perfected and that Congress should at the present session pass long-range farm legislation which will promote agricultural and national prosperity.

Of course, we realize that there are many complicated problems in agriculture, and that any program adopted will not be acceptable in every detail.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HORAN. I wonder if we could have a clarification of the parliamentary situation right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has submitted an amendment to the bill before the Committee of the Whole. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has offered a substitute for the Gore amendment. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] has offered an amendment to the Pace substitute, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] has offered an amendment to the Gore amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this Sutton amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment, the Sutton amendment, be again read.

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

There was no objection.

The Sutton amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Forand amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Forand amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Forand amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Pace substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY to the Pace substitute: Page 3, strike out line 18 and all down through and including the period on line 4, page 4.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture I find myself somewhat at a difference with my colleagues on that committee. It is very embarrassing to me, and I deeply regret that the situation exists. It is because of that situation that I have until now, and particularly throughout general debate, refrained from addressing myself to the bill.

There is another situation which prevails throughout this Chamber which I think we should all regret, and that is the politics which has crept into the actions of this body. Farm legislation should never be dealt with in a partisan manner. We are dealing with the lives and the happiness of 25,000,000 farm people—working Americans, overall people, mothers and fathers, and little boys and girls, most of whom live far back from the railroad, far from the better schools, and far from some of the conveniences which most of you and I enjoy today. I regret that partisan politics has lifted its ugly head in our dealings with a program that so vitally affects the lives of these great American people.

I am of the opinion—honestly of the opinion—that they do not want any part of a production-payment plan. Being of that opinion, I was one of those who suggested that if we must have a trial run, then let us make it just that by limiting it to 1 or 2 years and naming the three commodities upon which the trial would be had. Although this has been agreed to, I still find myself opposed to the production-payment plan and even the trial-run provision. I am not fully satisfied with it.

I represent a district of 201,000 people. Seventy-five percent of those people, probably 80 percent, live on the farms. They are small hill farms, 40-, 50-, 75-, 100-, or 125-acre farmers. I am satisfied—just as satisfied as I can be—with the information that has come to me in the last week, that they do not want a production-payment program or any part of it. Although the trial run does not directly affect them at this time—at least, I do not think it does—they fear its consequences. I cannot put myself in the position of forcing it upon them if they do not want it. I cannot do that. It is most regrettable that I find myself in disagreement with my colleagues on the committee. On the other hand, I am acting in accordance with the will of my farming constituents.

Therefore, I have offered this amendment. If you want to vote for it, that is fine; if you do not, that is all right. I have offered an amendment to strike the trial run out of the bill. That is the issue, and we might as well get it settled here and now on the committee's bill. That is the place to settle it, and not with this sideshow that has been carried on around here with other bills and proposals. The place to settle it is in the committee bill.

I say to you very frankly, I think the committee bill, with the exception of the trial-run provision, is the best proposition before the House.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I think the committee bill, with the trial run eliminated, is the best proposition before the House. Regardless of what might be said of the new parity formula in the Pace bill, it is in my opinion better than the old 1909–14 formula under which we now operate. The Pace bill modernizes that formula, and we should accept it. Perhaps on some commodities it will fix the parity prices a little higher, but on others it fixes them a little lower. The Pace bill will bring the parity formula forward to a modern day.

There are some other provisions of the bill which are far superior to the old law. It is mighty strange to me, and I do not want to be partisan about this, but it is mighty strange that so many of my friends on the Republican side have come forward and so ardently embraced the present program, when last year you were almost unanimous in your condemnation of it and gave us the Aiken bill in its place.

I would like to direct your attention to page 5 of the bill, which changes considerably the support which is extended to Steagall commodities. These changes will materially reduce the cost. They will widen the range of support on Steagalls, which is now 60 to 90 percent, by supporting them from 1 to 100 percent; and they further provide for not one but six limitations which are imposed upon the Secretary before he can support them. What are they? He must take into account first the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand. He must take into account the price levels at which other commodities are being supported. He must take into account the perishability of the commodity. He must take into consideration the ability to dispose of the commodities to be purchased. If he cannot dispose of them he must take that factor into consideration. He must take into consideration the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets; and last, but of paramount importance, he must take into consideration the ability and the willingness of producers to keep marketings and supplies in line with demand. These all apply to the people who produce eggs and raise potatoes—those producers who have been dragged through this House for 3 or 4 days. These factors will eliminate the troubles we have had with eggs, potatoes, and

other perishables. Unless something is done to correct this situation, then I fear for the future of the price-support program.

These provisions are certainly an improvement over the present law. I would like to direct your attention to page 9, subsection (m), and read for yourselves the requirement that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at less than the current price-support level.

After the Secretary acquires certain commodities under the present law he can dump them on the market and absolutely break it; when that happens he breaks your farmers. This puts a limitation on him intended to prevent such an event.

My distinguished majority leader earlier brought out another very important improvement with regard to section 32 funds, the provision concerning which is found in section 5 of the bill.

There are many other provisions in the Pace bill which improve the present law. I think they should at least have your consideration. I feel that they should be adopted. But in your desire to throw overboard the trial run on production payments, in which I am in accord, you turn a deaf ear to the remainder of the Pace bill. If you will adopt my amendment striking out the trial run, then you can at least consider the improvements provided for in the bill.

I hope this amendment will be adopted. It puts the issue squarely up to the Members on both sides of the House. Do not you at least want to take the benefit of the improvements which the Pace bill offers, or do you just want to throw the whole thing overboard and say, "We are going to go on with the present program with no improvements at all"? For several years you have vehemently condemned the inequities and mistakes in the present law. It is not perfect and you know it. Now do you not want to make these improvements; or will you continue, as you have the past 2 or 3 days, to ardently embrace the old law word by word, line by line, and section by section? Let us be sensible about this matter.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield first to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman represents a large agricultural area in Mississippi. Has the gentleman taken into consideration the cost of fertilizer to produce a crop on that land? I am told it is as high as $50 an acre for tobacco.

Mr. ABERNETHY. We do not happen to grow tobacco commercially in Mississippi. The gentleman used to live down there and I thought he knew that.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I do know that I helped spread fertilizer.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, I think this is beside the point.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was hoping the gentleman would say something about the new parity-index formula. I can see the difficulty as of today, this new parity index might seem to be advantageous where you are translating prices for the first 10 of the last 12 years, against the declining price level and what the farmer has to pay. But what I am bothered about is what you would do if the situation were reversed. For instance, suppose we were going into 1942, and we were building the parity index upon prices which the farmer received between 1932 and 1940, and you used those prices against the recent cost-price level of 1942, would the formula work then?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman's question. In the early part of my statement I did make reference to the parity formula. I am satisfied it is a better formula than the old formula. It is a modernized formula. In a few years I am satisfied, if prices continue to decline, the Pace formula may be such that it will not do justice to our farmers. I think we would have to look at it again. Any formula would certainly have to be reexamined every few years.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. What effect does your amendment have on the Pace bill, so far as support prices are concerned? Will the support price go up at 90 percent of parity or 100 percent of parity? Your amendment will eliminate the Aiken formula?

Mr. ABERNETHY. My amendment eliminates the trial run.

Mr. STEFAN. It has nothing to do with the Aiken amendment?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No. The Pace bill repeals the Aiken bill, and the Committee has already adopted an amendment to the Gore bill to do just that. So, in any event, when the House adjourns today, it will have voted to repeal the Aiken bill. In that situation I am very happy. It should have never been passed. I am convinced that it will drive my cotton farmers, as well as your wheat farmers, into bankruptcy.

Mr. STEFAN. If your amendment is adopted, the Aiken bill will be out, and the support price will be what?

Mr. ABERNETHY. It will be in line with the table found on page 17 of the committee report, as modified by the Pace bill. On the basics the support will be 100 percent of the income support standard, and up to that figure on other commodities. The latter are within reasonable discretions.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to support this amendment. Then we can proceed to perfect the other provisions of the Pace bill, which I assure you is in many respects a vast improvement over the present law. If my amendment to strike out the trial run is rejected, then I am compelled to support the Gore bill with the hope that we will later perfect the mistakes which it tends to perpetuate. Even so, I consider it, which is the present law, a better bill than the Pace bill as long as the Pace bill embodies the production-payment plan.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that we now have all the issues before the House. This is actually the heart of the bill. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], a member of the committee, is agreed to, the real controversy in this legislation is eliminated. The gentleman proposes to strike out the trial run on the three commodities. That is the part of the bill we think should be adopted; we think that it should be adopted so that the Secretary of Agriculture may have one more method of supporting farm commodity prices.

When the Secretary of Agriculture came before our committee, I asked him if he were asking Congress for any power or authority over American agriculture and the lives and livelihoods of farmers which he did not now have and which he would not have in the event the Aiken bill went into effect, except with regard to two matters: First, the method of determining fair commodity prices; and, second, with regard to the method of supporting those prices; and he said that that was an accurate summation and a proper interpretation of the views he had expressed.

As pointed out through this debate, in the Aiken bill he can make payments. He was advised by his legal experts that he could not make payments under the present law; so, when we authorized him in this bill in clear, unambiguous but very carefully circumscribed language to make payments on three commodities when he finds that to do so would be compatible with the letter and the spirit of the provisions of this law, then I say to you that that is an improvement over the situation which exists now, and it is a definite improvement over the situation which would exist in the event the Aiken bill becomes the law of the land.

If you vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], and I want it clearly understood that I do not for one moment question his very great sincerity in presenting this proposition to the House, I knew that the proposition would be submitted to the House; and if it was to be submitted to the House I see no reason why the gentleman from Mississippi, TOM ABERNETHY, should not have presented it—but if this amendment prevails, bear in mind that you have denied the right to the Secretary to make payments to support prices. That means that he has no alternative other than to accumulate and to store away millions of dollars' worth of valuable foods. I pointed out yesterday that we now have in storage 60,000,000 pounds of rotten eggs, or eggs that will soon deteriorate.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Sixty million pounds of powdered eggs, and you would not have a pound of them or a ton of them if he were to give them to you. They are deteriorating. We are trying in our committee bill, with regard to three commodities, to make it impossible hereafter for tons and tons of valuable foodstuff to deteriorate and decay.

It is a strange thing, and I address these remarks to this side of the chamber, that we should see the spectacle which we have witnessed today. This potato program, pile upon pile of rotten potatoes, has been thrown at the Democratic Party month after month. Now the Democratic Party comes in here trying to do something about it only to hear the very distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], argue with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], former chairman, stands on the floor of this House and defends it and says, after all, the potato program was not so bad. I confess it was bad, but I am one of those who are not willing to blame Charley Brannan on account of it. I know where the trouble is and all informed people know. The trouble is Charley Brannan was helpless to relieve the situation, and he will be helpless now if we strike out this trial-run provision.

What else can he do? We charge him with the responsibility of supporting prices and give him only one method to support them. We have the responsibility, Mr. Chairman, if things go bad. The party in power will be charged with that responsibility. I say that we should accept the committee bill. Every intelligent man on the floor of this House knows that you cannot deal with perishable commodities in the same way that you deal with nonperishable, storable commodities.

We have provided three categories. In one category we have the basic commodities. In the second category we have the Steagall commodities; and all other commodities are finally placed in the third category. We deal with all of them in a different way.

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

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

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Is it not a fact that no matter what bill we pass here we will still charge the Secretary of Agriculture with the duty and the responsibility of maintaining agricultural prices at some level?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Is it not also a fact, if we do not begin the trial run on those three, we have effectively tied his hands and therefore he cannot do it?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is right. The only way he can do it is to go out and buy the perishable commodities and try to save them. He cannot buy them and sell them back in the domestic market, since to do so would defeat the very objective he starts out to accomplish. He would have to look around the world to find a market in which to sell these surplus commodities which he had gone into the market at great expense to purchase.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would like to clear up this misunderstanding or misstatement that was made by the gentleman from Tennessee yesterday about eggs. He made a charge in his speech about 60,000,000 eggs when really it was 60,000,000 pounds of eggs.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is far more 60,000,000 pounds of powdered eggs.

Mr. COOLEY. It is. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] read from the RECORD a statement made by the representative of the largest egg organization in America saying that if we did not do this the support of eggs would run to a quarter of a billion dollars.

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

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

Mr. WHITE of California. Is it not a fact the very thing which this amendment proposes to strike—that is, the production-payment plan—is the very thing that the heads of the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange appearing before our committee and the Senate committee endorsed?

Mr. COOLEY. Exactly. The gentleman is correct. Let there be no misunderstanding about this. This is the heart of it. There really is no objection to the change of this formula which is definitely in the interest of the farmers of this Nation. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GATHINGS to the Gore amendment: Page 3, after line 17, insert the following section (changing in line 18 "c" to "d", and changing in line 23 "d" to "e"):

"(c) Price supports shall be made available to the producers of cottonseed at levels not in excess of parity, taking into account the price levels at which other commodities are being supported."

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with the highest of motives. I favor the committee bill, known as the Pace bill, now before you as the Pace substitute. In that bill, as you see on page 5, line 2, cottonseed is included as one of the commodities supported under that particular paragraph. Now I am only asking you to insert it in this bill which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has offered as an amendment. A good price for cottonseed offers more real assistance, outside of a good price for cotton, to the cotton farmer, the sharecropper, the merchant, and business generally, than any other factor in the entire Cotton Belt.

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

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it not true that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] this morning said that he would accept the amendment?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes; and I am grateful and most appreciative.

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

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

Mr. GORE. There seems to be no objection to this amendment on either side. I have talked to numbers of people about it, and although the Secretary has authority to do so now, the people from the cotton sections feel that they can get him to act if they have a mandatory provision in the bill. I accept the amendment.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman. The people I serve are most interested in obtaining a fair price for cottonseed. You are most considerate in accepting this amendment. Its adoption means that the cotton farmer is assured of a stable price for his cottonseed and that means so much to him.

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

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to call attention to the fact that cottonseed is taken care of in the committee amendment.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes; it is, and I would like to include the amendment in both bills. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], who too serves on the Agriculture Committee of the House, worked diligently to get this amendment adopted by the House committee. This amendment and the amendment adopted by the Agriculture Committee is in reality the Abernethy-Gathings amendment. I trust that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to say for the benefit of the Members that this identical proposal was considered and approved by the members of our committee immediately prior to reporting the bill. My colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], and I jointly sponsored an amendment which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to support cottonseed in a manner comparable to the supports for Steagall commodities. Cottonseed's most competitive commodities, such as soybeans, have for a long time enjoyed such a support. This has placed the growers of cottonseed in a very unfair position.

Appreciating this situation, I am very happy to report to you that when the question was put on our amendment there was not a single member of the committee who disapproved and the amendment was adopted by a unanimous vote. Therefore, the Pace bill now pending before you authorizes price supports

for cottonseed comparable to those enjoyed by the so-called Steagall commodities.

The House now has before it two proposals, the Pace bill and the Gore bill. If the Pace bill is adopted cottonseed will benefit by price supports; if the pending amendment to the Gore bill should fail and the Gore bill later be adopted in preference to the Pace bill, then cottonseed would be left in the same unfavorable position in which it has been for so long. So in view of the unanimous decision of the Agriculture Committee that cottonseed is entitled to reasonable price supports, I respectfully urge the adoption of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]. This is the only means whereby the will of the committee to support cottonseed can be carried out.

I would like to add that in previous agricultural legislation every extensively grown commodity has been accorded preferential treatment in the price-support field except cottonseed. Certainly this crop, produced in abundance from one end of the country to the other, is entitled to more equitable consideration. Cottonseed has long been looked upon as the poor man's crop. It offers the source of a little cash to thousands upon thousands of small farmers. It is rather odd that throughout these many long years it has become the forgotten commodity. For no good reason, though probably unintentional, law writers have heretofore given it the silent treatment.

While this amendment would not become effective until 1950, if it be the will of the Congress that cottonseed be supported on and after that date in keeping with the pending amendment, we have reason to believe that the Secretary of Agriculture will find ways and means to support the crop for the year 1949 as he is authorized, although not compelled to do for all crops under the discretionary powers in title I of the Hope-Aiken Act.

I earnestly urge your approval of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Abernethy amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE to the Gore amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike out the figure "90" and insert "100".

Page 2, line 10, strike out the figure "60" and insert "75".

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the Gore amendment simply increases the parity payments from 90 percent to 100 percent, and for the non-co-ops from 60 percent to 75 percent for that part for which they are penalized if they overproduce.

We started this parity program originally with 65 percent, then went to 75 percent, later 85 percent, and finally, because of the good work done by my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] it was raised to 90 percent. There is no reason under the sun why the farmer should not get 100 percent parity. That is real parity. I say in the words of Senator GILLETTE that 100 percent parity is but 100 percent justice to agriculture.

I am for the Gore amendment, but I feel that that amendment should give 100 percent parity to agriculture. They have been receiving the short end of the stick all through these years. I can see no real objection from anybody to 100 percent parity for those who cooperate with the program and 75 percent for those who do not cooperate, for that part for which they have to pay a penalty if they overproduce.

The farmers' cost of labor, farm machinery, building and repairs have gone up to date, not down.

That is about all I can say as to the reason for that amendment. However, I wish to talk on the general program before us.

Mr. Chairman, during the 14 years that I have been a Member of Congress, the farmer has been made the political football—the shock absorber. During those 14 years, about all that he got was lip service, and occasionally subsistence help.

No permanent farm legislation has been passed. We gave him so-called parity which consists largely of parrot talk. We started in with 65 percent, then 75 percent, then 85 percent and finally 90 percent parity-support prices. There never was any reason why we should not have given agriculture a fair break—100 percent real parity—better still, cost of production. This as a floor, not as a ceiling.

If that kind of a bill had been passed, then the farmer would be getting about $2.70 for a bushel of wheat today. That would allow him and his family the average wage that those working in industry get for the time they labor—about 57 cents an hour. Surely no honest person can object to the farmer getting paid for his labor the same as his brothers and sisters working in industry are paid.

In place of giving the farmer cost of production for that part of his products domestically consumed, we have now wrangled and fooled with the brain-trust ideas of the Department of Agriculture from Wallace on down to Brannan. Now we have before us the Brannan baby. No one knows who is its mother or its father. From the debate on this floor, it seems to be the illegitimate offspring of many brain trusters and brain busters.

From what we have heard here on this floor, this illegitimate monstrosity was unanimously rejected by the Committee on Agriculture—even by my able and good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. Of course, there was no politics in it, but may I presume that the Democratic leaders on that committee were called to the White House or maybe just to the Department of Agriculture where the brain trusters and brain busters ganged up on them.

Many of my Farmers Union friends say they want 100-percent parity. Many of their locals wrote me in beginning that they did not want the Brannan program. When I make that statement, I also wish to state that more recently I have received a lot of canned propaganda for it. As far as I know all farm organizations, except one, are opposed to it.

I am and always have been for 100-percent parity—better still, I repeat, I am for cost of production, which is about 15 percent better than 100-percent so-called parity. It is about 25 percent better than Brannan's manipulated parity in his new program. This manipulated parity is 7 cents less per bushel on wheat than 90 percent parity under the present law, and his 100-percent manipulated parity is 29 percent less than 100-percent parity under the present law.

However, I am not for Brannan's illegitimate child, which would compel the farmer to sell his products on the world market in competition with peon, coolie, and slave labor. I have yet to find a farmer, who understands it, who is for that part of the Brannan program. If carried to its logical conclusion that program would require an appropriation each year for agriculture of $8,000,000,000.

That is so staggering that even Mr. Brannan tries to slip in the back door by saying he wanted to experiment first with hogs, potatoes, and wool, and then when the stock raisers objected to the hogs program, he substituted eggs.

I am sure that in his simplicity, the Secretary does not know that if that program were adopted, he would plaster the whole Nation with eggs. He would get mixed up worse with eggs than he was when they had 100,000,000 dozens of eggs on hand and did not know how to hatch them or how to get rid of them, and finally fed them to hogs.

I note that the Secretary says he will pay the farmer the difference between the world market and 100-percent parity. This is lip service. First, he asked to be allowed to experiment with hogs, potatoes, and wool.

Let us take hogs for example. Suppose he had been allowed to experiment with hogs. Then the farmer would have been compelled to market those on the world market, which shortly would be 6 or 7 cents a pound. How would that have affected beef, lamb, mutton, and poultry? Would it not bring the price of these products down to the world market?

The farmer is not going to be fooled. In order to pay that difference Brannan will have to get the money by appropriations. It will have to be raised by taxation. The farmers as a group pay a large part of the taxes.

Neither can Brannan fool the consumer at the expense of the farmer. He, too, is a taxpayer. Both thet farmer and the consumer know that for every dollar they receive in subsidies or lower cost of living at the expense of taxation, they will have to pay $2. The extra dollar will be for the collectors and distributors of the tax and for interest and overhead expenses.

The farmer knows that because of our large indebtedness, appropriations will be hard to get even though they come out of his and the consumers' tax dollar. He knows that the farm population has decreased from 30,000,000 in 1930 to 24,000,000 in 1948, while the general population has increased 20,000,000. He knows that as a result his strength in Congress has been reduced from one-third to one-seventh. He knows that he is already being blamed for the high cost of living. He knows that he must get permanent legislation—100 percent real parity or better still, 100 percent cost of production.

From the days of Wallace to the days of Brannan, the Secretaries of Agriculture seem to have been wallowing in mud. They have been lost in the dismal swamps. If they ever hit upon the right thing, it will not be by the law of averages, but by the law of accident, and I even doubt that they will ever hit it right by accident.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refers to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like 2 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, the Lemke amendment, close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill which I have offered and to which this amendment is offered, is to continue a time-tested program for another year. At no time, not even during the war peaks, have we guaranteed 100 percent of parity. I hope that no one will vote irresponsibly on amendments such as this, because if I do not misjudge the temper of this committee, this is an amendment offered to what will be the bill that finally passes the House.

One hundred percent of parity and 75 percent to noncooperators would, in my opinion, seriously endanger the whole price-support program for agricultural commodities. I know the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota who offers the amendment offers it in good faith. I know he is a friend of the farmers and that he thinks he is doing what is best for the farmers. But I respectfully disagree that this would be for the best thing. I think the best thing we could do is to continue 90- and 60-percent parity support, which has been time-tested and which has worked not too badly so far.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 3:30.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have been here all afternoon trying to get 5 minutes' time. I think the gentleman should not shut us off like that.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill close at 3:45, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The motion may not include the fixing of time for the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the last 10 minutes be reserved to the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have handled this bill in our committee now for some 6 or 7 years. I have tried to get time in general debate but have not been successful. I think we who are familiar with it should have a chance to express ourselves. I would like to have some time.

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly have no desire to cut the time short.

Mr. Chairman, do I understand that all Members standing desire to speak?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not in position to advise the gentleman as to that.

Mr. COOLEY. Even so, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4:15, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments close at 4:15, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, then I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at a quarter to four, with the last 10 minutes reserved to the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, what is the point of order?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That the Committee may not allot time by motion.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending bill and all amendments thereto close at 3:45.

The CHAIRMAN. On the pending amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. COOLEY. On the bill and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that all debate on the pending bill and all amendments thereto close at 3:45.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the names of the Members on their feet indicating a desire to be heard: Messrs. SASSCER, BENNETT of Florida, WHITTEN, MARSHALL, ANDRESEN, VURSELL, MILLER of Nebraska, MORRIS, WICKERSHAM, FISHER, ABBITT, SUTTON, WORLEY, HILL, GROSS, STEFAN, GORE, HORAN, WHITE of Idaho, CASE of South Dakota, HOPE, MURRAY, PACE, GATHINGS, HAYS of Arkansas, BONNER, GRANGER, KEATING, HOEVEN, COOLEY, SHAFER, ARENDS, ABERNETHY, BECKWORTH, JENSEN, O'SULLIVAN, MICHENER, CARROLL, ALBERT, COMBS, and FULTON.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABBITT to the Gore amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the words and figures "marketed before June 30, 1951."

Page 2, line 23, strike out the words and figures "until January 1, 1951."

Page 3, line 20, after the word "date" strike out the remainder of the sentence and insert in lieu thereof "until June 30, 1950."

Page 4, line 1, strike out the words "until January 1, 1950."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is merely a matter of practical procedure. So far as the Gore bill as amended is concerned, it extends the present law for 12 months and it repeals titles II and III, the so-called Aiken bill.

The purpose of my amendment is to do away with the 12-month limitation and extend the present law permanently.

We all realize the only reason we have the Aiken law on the books today is because our entire agricultural program would have been out on December 31, 1948, unless we had an extension. The Gore bill is intended to extend the present law and repeal the Aiken amendment. It extends the law for 1 year only and repeals the Aiken law. That means we will have no law at the end of next year. We will have a hammer over our heads next summer just as we had last year, making it necessary for the Congress to act again in 1950 and agree on some compromise program whether or not we like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SASSCER to the Gore amendment. On page 2, line 2, after the date "June 30, 1951", insert a parenthetical clause reading as follows: "(September 30, 1951, in the case of Maryland and the cigar-leaf types of tobacco)."

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, my amendment does not change the base period, the formula of figuring parity or in any way the mechanics of the support. The amendment in no way changes the substantive law. Through an oversight the proponents in the preparation of the Gore substitute omitted the existing law defining the support

period as to Maryland and certain cigar types of tobacco, including in those cigar types of tobacco produced in Puerto Rico, Wisconsin, or Minnesota tobacco as enacted at this session. Those crops are marketed through August. During the present session a law was passed which extended a termination date of June 30 for the support season until September 30, so that the support would not be withdrawn right in the middle of the reason for these crops that are raised one year and marketed the next and not sold before June 1. This is the amendment which the author of the Gore amendment stated this morning that he would accept. I earnestly urge the House to accept it, as it merely carries on existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SASSCER) there were—ayes 58, noes 37.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I only rise for the purpose of asking questions which I have had some difficulty in getting answers to, due to nobody's fault. There are two questions I would like to ask. One of them is: Why is it necessary to have this new plan in the bill? Why could not quotas, agreed to by the farmers, have been put on for potatoes and things of that kind? The second question I would like to have some members of the committee answer, if he will, is: What will be the result of this so-called Brannan portion of the bill insofar as the consumers, the producers, and the middlemen might get together to see to it that the Government carries the burden?

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

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I would like to state that I think acreage allotments can be made on potatoes, but there are many, many perishables that grow in the State of Florida where it is not practical to put an acreage allotment into effect. The second answer is that under the committee bill, the payment, if any, made, will be the average difference; that is to say, the difference between the support level and the average market price. That would require the producer to get the best price he could in order to get the support price.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISHER to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GORE: Page 3, line 22, strike out the period and add the following, and by adding a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 4. Mohair shall be supported at not in excess of 90 percent of the parity prices taking into account the price level at which wool is being supported."

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I hope no one will object to this amendment. The committee wrote a provision similar to this in the measure that is now before us. I have shown this amendment to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and also to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], also to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and none of them objects to it. This was adopted in the Committee on Agriculture, or a provision comparable to it. This amendment simply undertakes to clarify the Wool Act of 1947, which by interpretation, on account of its peculiar wording, has not been held to include mohair. This will require the Secretary of Agriculture to treat mohair on a basis comparable to the treatment accorded wool.

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. May I say to the gentleman that mohair is included in the committee bill. It is included in the committee substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], and I know of no reason why it should not be included in the other amendment.

Mr. FISHER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Ohio to the Gore substitute: On page 2, line 23, after "until," strike out "January 1, 1951" and insert "June 30, 1951."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is apparent because certain products grown especially in the South, namely, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, along with wheat and corn, are protected under the Gore amendment until June 30, 1951. The products, like milk and milk byproducts, eggs, chickens, and hogs, produced largely in the northern section of the country, and, in my opinion, tremendously more important to the national economy than tobacco, for instance, are supported only until January 1. All I am trying to do by this amendment is to equalize the thing so that if the Gore amendment stands it will not be weighted in favor of southern agriculture. I would also like to say, Mr. Chairman, that this Gore amendment is only a stopgap measure, and certainly it seems to me that the country at large will not stand for an economy of scarcity caused by the Government buying up products and destroying them. I have maintained repeatedly on the floor of this House that the farmer's income should be kept at its present level in order to have a sound national economy, but I cannot subscribe, as a farmer, to maintaining that economy by taking food from the mouths of hungry children and by destroying the products of the farmer's labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] desire recognition to offer an amendment?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, Mr. Chairman; but I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

(Mr. COOLEY, Mr. HOPE, Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. HORAN, Mr. GROSS, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. ALBERT also asked and were given permission to yield their time to Mr. WHITTEN.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the courtesy extended to me by the Members who have yielded me this time. I hope I may be able to make a contribution which will be worth a little something in the consideration of this bill. I assure the Members of the House that it shall be my purpose to discuss the workings of this production payment plan. I hope fairly and factually.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to serve on the subcommittee handling agricultural appropriations for 6 or 7 years now. During the last year it has been my privilege to serve as chairman of that committee. That is the committee before which each year come the present support programs from A to Z. It has been our privilege to check with the Department and to hear witnesses on all the programs each year, and to recommend to Congress the amount of money to be provided for the operation of the programs.

I mention that to show you we had some experience in dealing with this problem. Charlie Brannan is a splendid gentleman. He is a good American. All this talk about socialism and all these other things really has no place here. His recommendations are no different from many things that have been recommended and from many things that we have had heretofore. But, my discussion is not directed to that. He never discussed his recommendations with our committee. If he had, I believe we could have shown him he was going at the matter backward and proved it by the testimony of the Department before our committee as well as by the record.

According to the testimony and the records before our committees through the years, his recommended program is directly contrary to our whole concept of price supports for agricultural products. This is the reason I say that. Under our farm-support program we are seeking to stabilize farm prices, to have a floor under them. It is true we have lost on a number of these perishable support programs, notably potatoes. Why? Because there has been no controls, no marketing quotas. The Secretary of Agriculture repeatedly has asked Democratic Congresses to give him controls. He has asked Republican Congresses to give him controls. No controls have been given to him, and that is why we have all these potato losses. That is the reason you have had all these losses. Of course it is ridiculous to continue such lack of quotas. But if you had controls, we would not had such tremendous

losses, which is proven by the experience of the Department with commodities where they have controls. If you control the supply and announce a support program, you stabilize prices at that level. The farmer will not sell unless he gets that price. The buyer cannot get the commodity unless he pays the price. If you have control, and the Department has the money to buy all the supply we have proved by years of experience that Federal Government does not have to pay out a dollar. You can check the record of our hearings. You can read the testimony of Mr. Dodd who ran this program for years. He shows you that time after time after time the Government has not paid out any money when they had controls and when they announced the program and had the money to buy the commodity. The price is stabilized and it frequently does not cost the Government any money and little when there are costs.

In 1948 Mr. Dodd testified he did that in 17 cases and the Department had to buy very little. Here is the other fallacy in Secretary Brannan's approach. It is our purpose to stabilize prices. However, Mr. Brannan says let farm prices seek their own level. All a buyer has to do is hold back from buying, and he runs the price down. The price goes lower and lower and lower on agricultural products. The farmer does not lose financially. However low the general selling price, he gets the difference in a blue check from the Government. But Secretary Brannan says he wants the consumer to benefit. So do I. But the plan the Secretary offers will not do that. The buyers hold back and run the price of eggs to the farmer down to say 10 cents. There is nothing in the bill to keep the produce merchant from selling those eggs for 30 cents or 60 cents to the consumer. You know that they will sell all of these commodities for what the traffic will bear. Thus the man who gets the benefits under this bill is your middleman. The Government fixes it so that the farmer gets his from the Government, if we can get the appropriation. The consumer does not get the benefit because he pays the price demanded by the seller. The seller can sell at whatever he can get the buyer to pay. We do not have an OPA now to control the price charged the consumer.

Thus, under this bill the consumer does not get the benefits it has been represented it will bring him and what Charlie Brannan hopes he will get. You say it does not work that way. We had experience during the war with subsidy on meat when we had the OPA. We said that meat could not be retailed above a certain price. Every little butcher in every small town in the country was held down on what he could charge for meat. The Congress provided a subsidy to help the producer to produce. That subsidy was paid to the butcher or to the meat packer. Do you think that went out to the producer of agricultural products? No, it did not. In most of the area with which I am familiar, the butcher reduced the prices he paid to the farmer. The butcher kept the same margin of profit and the same profit. In addition he got a check from his Government which was over and above and in addition to the profits that he had always made. That made everybody in the town mad. I say to you, as good as his intentions are, and as able as he is, the Secretary is miguided when he thinks that under this bill the benefits of his reducing farm prices to the producer will flow to the consumer. The benefits would go to the middleman.

Let me tell you, the commodities which we purchase in order to support the price today, goes to the school-lunch program without charge. Do you know any better place to use our surpluses? But under the Secretary's trial-run proposals we would not have the surplus for distribution to the school-lunch program.

Surely, if we continue the present law, we can count on this fine committee to provide for controls or marketing quotas on potatoes and other perishables. From the debate they so well recognize the ridiculousness of burning potatoes and other foods that I know they will bring in provisions for such controls.

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

I just want to ask the gentleman if he has read the language at the bottom of page 7 and the top of page 8, which sets forth certain compliance provisions?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not have the bill before me so as to answer by book and page. From the debate attention has been called to the fact that section 32 funds will not accumulate but the unused funds will go back to the Treasury each year if the present law were extended. I have fought for years to save section 32 funds and finally made it this year. I believe these funds should accumulate. I am sure our Committee on Agriculture, believing that, too, would not refuse to act just because they lost the Brannan plan.

No. What Mr. Brannan asks the farmer is to take whatever low price the buyers, middlemen want to pay him and get the rest from the Federal Treasury. To ask the farmers to submit to such a program is the same as asking labor to let employers pay whatever low wages the employers want to pay, the difference to be made up by Federal payments. Such a plan would not be fair to labor. It is not fair to the farmer, not to mention the fact there is not enough money in the country to finance such a plan.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman know any way on earth we could tell which program would be satisfactory except by trying it out?

Mr. WHITTEN. I say that in our dealings with this bill throughout the years, with the testimony always on the part of the Department to the effect I have just recited, and with no one on his committee believing the plan will work, I think I can say that we can be sure it will not work. Certainly the experience of the Department as shown by their testimony before our committee shows it will not work. We have one of the finest Committees on Agriculture in the House of Representatives we have ever had in the history of this country. We have able men on that committee, the chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, and many others. We have men who have served on that committee for years and who have studied this problem for 4 years trying to improve on the law that we now have, and they never were able to figure out one that was better, not even the Aiken bill, because the Republicans on the House side never did want the Aiken bill.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. We also tried to pass a law to study this movement of goods from the farmer to the consumer, the Research Marketing Act. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] was going into some of these problems before his committee. We also have had an 80-percent freight-rate raise since the end of the war, which has raised the margin between the farmer and the consumer, and which our committee has tried to correct by providing extra funds to oppose freight-rate increases on agricultural commodities.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct. Now, all that our good friends on the Committee on Agriculture have offered—and they are all splendid fellows—the only argument which they have offered is, "Let us give it a trial run." We have not heard one of them say they believed it would work. I have not found a man on the committee, which has studied this matter for years, who believes it will work. They could not figure anything better than the present law. The new Secretary brought in his new program. He wanted to try it out on all commodities. The committee did a good job to hold him down to a trial run on three, but I have not heard any argument that they thought it would work. The Secretary was active in politics last year. He found the people wanted no part of the Aiken bill. He mistakenly, I think, took it they wanted a new bill. I think they wanted the old law with controls for potatoes.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman does not mean that there was any trade on this matter? Nobody made any agreement with Mr. Brannan or anybody else.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sure that is true. The committee being afraid of this program under its bill holds him to a trial run on three commodities.

It was a good day's work to hold his program to three commodities, but I believe his program would not work on those. His program would run down farm prices instead of stabilizing them. We should not criticize the Secretary. Our Agriculture Committee could not write a better law than we have.

The Republicans in the Senate set out to write a better farm program. They came up with the Aiken bill. The Republicans in the House wanted to extend the present law. The Senate insisted on passing a bill over the wishes of the folks on our side who had studied for 2 years trying to improve it and who wanted to extend the present law. The

Senate had its way at 6:30 one Sunday morning and thereby lost an election.

The Aiken law has never been in operation. No one wants it today. The farmers—most of them—did not know what was in the Aiken bill last fall, by and large. Perhaps some of the leaders did, but the Republicans lost much of this country not because of the Aiken bill, but because the Congress had repealed the present program in which the farmers believed.

Now, the folks on our side are falling into the same trap. We are writing a new bill to improve on that which they have come to accept and to know and to understand. We should amend it—but why destroy 16 years' experience. Those of you who represent farm areas know it is hard to get farmers to take regulation and regimentation. In 16 years they have gradually come to accept the present program. Do you want to start off with another program? Do you want to require them to go all through this again? It is true the situation is going to be rather tough in the years ahead. Do you want to take the blame for following a course which the Republicans fell for, of interfering with a law that the farmers have come to know and to understand and to believe in? Let the fine Committee on Agriculture amend the present law, provide controls or marketing quotas for potatoes and the troublesome commodities, and do those things which should have been done years ago. You will not have to write the Brannan plan into law to do that.

It will not help Secretary Brannan to pass his plan if it will not work, but runs farm prices down. Sometimes you help your friends by holding them back from making a mistake.

It will not help the Democratic Party to pass a bill on the basis it will help the consumer when it will not.

The Democratic law I would continue has worked for 16 years. It has been good enough to elect thousands of Democrats. The Republicans were defeated when their leaders repealed it even though they postponed the effective date. Do not you make the same mistake.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, the consideration before the committee today is obviously in two parts: one, that part dealing with the over-all security and income of our farm producers and, two, an inferred promise of cheaper farm products to the consumer in America.

Like the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], who has just addressed the House, I serve on agriculture appropriations. I would like at this time to express in terms of the program which we considered in the over-all administration in the Department of Agriculture the difficulty, short of the restoration of OPA or other farm controls of individuals from the farmers to the consumer's table, of promising cheap foods. We cannot, with any certainty, promise any great reduction in the price.

And, so we arrive at consideration of what method shall we use, first, to make sure of the security of our American farmer, and second, the difficulties which now obtain in trying to move agricultural commodities with more speed, better quality, and lesser price to the consumer's table.

That this question has never been properly answered was recognized by this House 3 years ago when it passed a long-range program entitled "The Research and Marketing Act" under which we are spending millions of dollars every year (the total now being in excess of thirty millions which has been spent on this program) trying to find out what the "bugs" are in our marketing problem of farm products in America.

Another factor that makes an inferred cheaper price of farm commodities lies in the fact that since the war we have had no less than six general freight rate charge raises and freight rates have increased in the neighborhood of 80 percent since the war. This, of course, is a hidden cost in the high cost of living.

In addition to this, there are many other factors that should be considered as we so glibly debate such a fundamental matter as that now before us. We must recognize, I think, that the whole program of marketing services, including the Market News Service, is a factor designed to assist in ironing out the difficulties of the marketing of farm products.

In the first place, by keeping the producer advised as to general market conditions from day to day and for myself, and the record here is clear, I have tried to promote the general idea of a market basket market news service which would apprise in some way the housewife as to what she should expect to pay for certain agricultural commodities. This suggestion has been experimentally tried out by the Department on at least two occasions at my insistence and small sums have been included in the budget under "research and marketing" for this purpose. I might say, however, that my suggestion has never been received in the Department of Agriculture with any great enthusiasm.

Since it is presumed that the full force of competition would be allowed to play upon the farmer's productions after the Government has paid him his income-support standard payment or his support prices as the case might be, I feel that it is essential that we consider the work in another bureau down in the Department of Agriculture. I refer to the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations which is a sort of intelligence service carried on by the Department to advise us of what is happening in foreign countries in the general field of agriculture. Certainly if we have to continue and even increase the importation of foreign agricultural competitive commodities, we should know these things.

And so I conclude that the legislation today or the promises that have been included in the Brannan plan proposal do not remove the basic difficulties and despite the action that we may take here this afternoon, those basic difficulties will remain and only by research and continued efforts in the direction which we are now, I believe, constructively moving will we achieve the reductions in the cost of living at the consumer level which does certainly mean security to the American farmer. For if the people do not eat what our farmer produces, there is no security in it for him.

Therefore at all times, the prices of farm commodities should be kept within the reasonable means of the people to pay.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the Brannan believe-it-or-not plan is a snare and a delusion. Its prospective cost the Secretary of Agriculture has refused even to estimate. His last refusal occurred on Monday of this week, when I pressed him for an answer in the hearings now under way by the Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power of the Committee on the Judiciary. Probably with good reasons, he prefers to veil the cost and effectiveness of the program in obscurity.

If he can shed no light on the important factor of cost, are we to legislate in the dark and authorize him to involve the pay envelopes of our taxpayers for uncomputed billions? If we guarantee the incomes of farmers, are we to do the same for the factory worker, the dentist, and the fellow that runs the corner grocery store?

From the point of view of the consumer, certainly a sidewalk Congressman, looking out for his constituents' interests, cannot support this bill when the report of this committee shows that it is proposed by the measure to up the price of hogs $3 a hundred; beef, $4.90 a hundred; lambs, $5.40 a hundred; milk, nearly a cent-and-a-half a quart wholesale; butter, 9 cents a pound; chickens, 4 cents a pound; turkeys, 5 cents a pound; cotton, 5 cents a pound; wool, 9 cents a pound, and so on.

No more can a dirt-farmer Congressman support a bill which can nationalize every farm in the land, by giving to Washington the absolute power to control the kind of crops and produce, and the amount of them, that can be raised, to dictate how large a farm may be, and to decide whether the land shall be used for farming, for grazing, or remain idle. That is a controlled economy beyond anything yet contemplated in America. The control of the farm means the control of the farmer.

Those great farm organizations, the National Grange and American Farm Bureau, recognizing the inherent unsoundness of the Pace bill and the surrender of every freedom of the farmer

which its passage entails, want no part of such a booby trap. They are right.

Now that this undigested measure has been brought before us, it should be roundly defeated and the present law continued until such a time as we can know clearly where we are heading, and be presented with a long-range legislative proposal which has been thoroughly canvassed and is deserving of support.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the present bill offered by the administration which we are considering would be a trial run of the Brannan bill. Secretary Brannan, who proposed this cockeyed plan, which is really a political effort to join the farmers and laboring men in one group at the expense of all of the taxpayers, has been properly understood by the thinking people for just what it is, and they are almost unanimously against it.

Secretary Brannan, in the face of this opposition, abandoned putting practically all agricultural production in his proposed bill and now says to the Congress, "If you will try it out on only three or four small items of agriculture and just let my camel get his nose under the tent, we will be satisfied for the present."

Mr. Chairman, I have confidence that there are enough Members in this House who know this legislation is so destructive to the farmers of the Nation, and is such a deception attempted to be perpetrated on the consumers of the Nation, that a big majority of the representatives of the people in this House will stand with the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange and defeat this ignominious political measure, with such a majority that it will never again be proposed to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, the Brannan plan is the most alluring political bait that any group of high-paid bureaucrats has yet brought to the American people in an attempt to buy, at the expense of the United States Treasury and the taxpayers, the combined vote of the farmers and the labor organizations. Think of it, they promise to give the farmers higher prices for production and to give the consumers more food for less cost. The most daring magician would not attempt to pull such a trick on an audience and expect the people to believe it could possibly happen.

This bill will regiment the farmers so tight, and restrict production to the point where food will cost the consumer more than he is paying now, or it will bankrupt the Federal Treasury to make up the difference, if strict regimentation and production controls are not placed on the farmers.

The Brannan plan, if put in operation, may cost the Government over $7,000,000,000 a year. It would regiment the farmer, set the prices here in Washington by the Secretary of Agriculture on every pound of meat, every dozen eggs, and every bushel of grain produced. The Secretary of Agriculture would have the dictatorial power to do just that. In setting these prices the Congress would then be called upon to pay the farmer the difference between the price he got for a dozen eggs, and the price the Secretary of Agriculture thought he should have. This would go for everything else the farmer produced.

The farmer would then have to depend on the appropriation committees of the House and Senate to appropriate the billions of dollars to make up the difference. The people would be taxed—consumers, farmers, and producers—to get this money into the Treasury so that after thousands of bureaucrats had been paid out of these taxes to administer this bill, the balance would go back to the farmer.

If we run out of money in Washington or if the Appropriations Committee and the Congress would not appropriate the money, the farmer would not be paid the subsidy the Secretary of Agriculture figures out as due him under the Brannan plan.

I do not think the American farmer wants to be regimented and that he wants to depend on the United States Treasury for a major part of his income through subsidies, when we already have a debt of $252,000,000,000 hanging over the United States Treasury at the present time. He only wants a fair price in the market.

The farmers understand the present 90-percent parity. They pretty well understand the Hope-Aiken bill that would run on a sliding scale from 90-percent parity down to 60-percent parity. They probably do not know that parity cannot drop more than 5 percent a year under the Hope-Aiken bill.

Mr. Chairman, now what we propose to do in the Gore bill is to extend the old tried and tested extension of parity for another 12 months which will prevent the Hope-Aiken bill from becoming operative for over 1 year so that in the session of Congress beginning next January we will have a better picture of the agricultural situation, will have the time and opportunity to study the parity formula further, and enact farm legislation that will be satisfactory to the farmers, to all the people, to the Congress and in the best interest of the entire economy of the Nation.

Let us defeat this trial run of the Brannan plan proposed in the Pace bill, and support the Gore substitute which is preferred by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the Illinois Agricultural Association, and 90 percent of the farmers of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and yield my time to the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to the defense of my home town. My home town is Norfolk. It is not the Norfolk of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia; it is my Norfolk; Norfolk, in Nebraska.

It is, indeed, true that the outlying possessions and Territories of this Republic are—and by right out to be—dear to all of us. Wherever American armed forces are stationed, even temporarily, becomes part of our new frontier. During the late war it was correctly considered that the Rhine and Bataan were the first lines of this Nation's defense. Wherever an American fighting man fell, wherever he was buried—in Italy, in Africa, in France, at Iwo Jima or Okinawa—that 6 feet of soil is forever consecrated to the United States of America.

Yes, these truths cannot be disputed. I do not dispute them. My purpose, Mr. Chairman, is to give proper space to another great truth—one, which is second to none of these here mentioned—so that this continuing contributor to the welfare of our people shall not wither and be forgotten.

Since Bataan and the Rhine were only a few short years ago our first lines of defense, it was then and it ever shall be that your community—and my home town, Norfolk, Nebr.—must be considered to be the very citadel of American life.

My Norfolk is a citadel in the original meaning of that word. Webster defines a citadel as a stronghold. In the Middle Ages the citadel was a tower of strength for townsfolk and farmers alike. When we of today refer to fighting to the last ditch we recognize the power of the citadel, for about it was the last ditch which defended the community from conquest.

A century ago there was only a barren prairie where Norfolk is today. Within the memory of men and women who still live within its limits Norfolk evolved into what it now is. They cannot forget—nor can I—that, from the very first, it was a citadel. English and Scotch-Irish stock came to Norfolk from Virginia and from New England. Germans, in search of liberty, settled there. Sturdy Swedes made Norfolk their home. People of many nations, many religions, many backgrounds found Norfolk good—and stayed there.

Why did they stay? Their earliest reason was for sheer self-protection. The prairies of the pioneer had hardships which demanded human companionship. One family—alone—could not expect to cope with prairie fire, with the plague of grasshoppers, with blinding blizzards, any more than they could hope to stand off a raid of Sioux on the warpath. These Norfolk pioneers stopped over at Norfolk because they had to have any human aid the region afforded. They stayed on because they valued the particular kind of warm, human friendship which Norfolk so freely gave.

Norfolk pioneers could have gone on to other settlements. They deliberately chose to stay. They stayed, because their crops were good, because their businesses were prospering, because they could send their children to schools, because their especial church gave them the word of God in a way they respected and revered. All of these reasons were in back of their staying on in Norfolk. There were other reasons, too—reasons of which they seldom spoke—but which, nonetheless, held them in Norfolk or near Norfolk. Here was where a first baby

was born. Here was where a beloved father and mother were laid to rest in the cemetery. Here was where a German boy from Wisconsin had met a Swedish immigrant girl, where they had married, where their common toil and sacrifice had brought forth a rich, producing farm from what had once been trackless prairie. Here were ties which could not easily be broken. Friends lived in and around Norfolk. Norfolk held neighbors.

Norfolk grew with the dreams, the hopes, the aspirations of the people who tied their lives to their community. It was no longer an actual citadel or the American adaptation of the citadel, the stockade. The wild battle cries of Sioux on the warpath had been forever stilled. Today's Norfolk farmer has no need to whip his yoke of oxen over rutted trails to a distant market. Hard-surfaced roads fan out from Norfolk in all directions, the product of the thrift, the skill, the progressive thinking of farm and town dweller alike of the Norfolk community. The electricity, the modern inventions of this age, have erased the necessity but never the enduring picture of the Norfolk women of only a few years ago who clung to clotheslines, guiding them to the woodshed and back, through blinding blizzards, with their precious loads of wood so that their families might live.

Today's Norfolk, outwardly, seems to be a far cry from the rude settlement of its pioneers. Wide paved streets instead of narrow wagon tracks. Churches and schools of brick and stone in place of the old frame structures. Cars, not Conestoga wagons. Tractors pull the plows once pulled by oxen. Up-to-date business establishments rather than makeshift shacks house our merchants.

The outward change in Norfolk, wrought by years of American thinking and doing, has been great.

Thank God, this has only been an outward change.

The spirit of pioneer Norfolk moves, breathes, acts today as powerfully, as understandingly, as it did more than fourscore years ago.

The children of the wealthiest citizens of Norfolk attend the same school with the children of Norfolk's poorest citizen. They learn from the same books, the same teachers.

Norfolk citizens go to their different churches on Sunday. But—and this is one of the chief reasons I am so proud of my home town, Mr. Chairman—they drive to their different churches in the same cars, or they walk down Norfolk's streets together.

The meetings which the Grand Army of the Republic once held are now gallant memories. The thinning ranks of Norfolk's veterans of the Spanish-American War could now assemble in a single room of any Norfolk home. Yet the efforts of the veterans—the patriots of peace—have not been slowed down by years. The American fighting men of World War I and World War II swell the rosters of Norfolk's American Legion and Norfolk's Veterans of Foreign Wars. Even as their fathers and grandfathers before them—veterans all—these men build for their community in peace, as they fought for their country in war.

Norfolk's merchants, businessmen, professional men, and farmers gather around tables for noon meals as service club members in exhibitions of friendliness, neighborliness, and cooperation just like their earlier prototypes did in the old general store around the cracker barrel and pot-bellied stove.

Norfolk women borrow butter and eggs—and pay them back—even as their parents and grandparents did. Nor does the amount of income taxes paid by their fathers enter into Norfolk boys' sharing in the benefits of the Boy Scout program or in swimming in Spring Branch.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be able to say that the ability to work together, worship together and live together—which the pioneers brought forth in Norfolk—has been preserved and expanded by the people of Norfolk, 1949.

If there should be any doubt of that ability, that sincere determination, of the citizens of Norfolk community to "get along together," that doubt would be dispelled on seeing the farm-town festival which is held yearly in my home town. The townspeople of Norfolk invite the farmers around Norfolk to dinner. This means a thousand-plate meal. Norfolk churches of all creeds and denominations open wide their doors to their guests from Norfolk's farms. The quilting bee, the cabin raising, the cornshucking party—the singleness and sincerity of feeling which characterized the ancestors of these people—finds fulfillment in meeting together in this farm-town fellowship.

Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed my stay in Washington. The friends I have made here, the associations which will remain with me as long as I live, are matters of deep and abiding joy. It has been a great and moving experience to have served the people of the Third District of Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

In spite of the joy of being able to serve, in spite of friends and associations always remembered with gratitude, Mrs. Stefan and I have only "stayed" in Washington. In spite of all of these great and good gifts—when this session of Congress is ended—we want to go back to Norfolk. We want to go home.

We want to gain strength by being where our children were born and raised.

We want to go back to the house we made into a home.

We want to go back to the neighbors in Norfolk whom we love and who love us.

We want to go back to our citadel of Americanism, that stronghold of memories, of inspiration, and of realization.

We want to go back to Norfolk—our hometown, United States of America.

UNFORTUNATE REMARKS ON THE BRANNAN PLAN

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it is with some degree of regret that I feel compelled to call the attention of the House to some remarks made by the gentleman from the Second Congressional District in Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] when he spoke on the Brannan plan yesterday. His remarks appear on pages 10064 to 100066 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 20.

The gentleman, in my opinion, violates the rules of the House when he adroitly and by a rhetorical trick refers to "Nebraska's junior Senator as being cross- or cock-eyed," and having "a disturbed nervous system which creates a monstrosity"; and "there are mental conditions where one may actually see elephants and even monstrosities, that are not, and never were there," and then urges, "that if I ever begin to see monstrosities where they do not exist, I want my friends to take me pronto to a sanitarium and get the right kind of a doctor for me quickly," and "I would want to be locked up and be given treatment." If he is not referring to the distinguished minority leader in the other body, to whom does he refer?

I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that these remarks are by inference a reflection not only upon the distinguished minority leader, but upon the other body. He certainly is devoid of any mental breakdown to which the gentleman from the Second Congressional District of Nebraska so adroitly and cleverly seems to infer. I trust that the gentleman will confer with the proper party officials on his side of the aisle and then move to have these unfortunate references stricken from the permanent RECORD.

The gentleman from the Second Congressional District also refers to the Brannan plan poll that he had taken. This must be a mysterious and unusual poll, because he said that his poll showed that farmers in his district were 5 to 1 for the Brannan plan, and that I, who represent the Fourth Nebraska District, was mistaken in how the farmers of Nebraska felt about the Brannan plan.

The poll taken by the Omaha World Herald in my district showed 32 for the Brannan plan with 1,321 opposed. This was about the same percentage received by the other four Members of the Nebraska delegation. I challenge the gentleman from the Second District to make public the actual vote he received from the farmers in his district on the Brannan plan.

Now as to the bill before us. I am going to support the Gore amendment. It is the same bill as I introduced and is known as H. R. 5464, with the exception that my bill made the present law permanent and repeals outright the Aiken amendment which would otherwise go into effect January 1, 1950. The Gore amendment merely puts this off for 1 year.

I cannot support the Pace bill. It is similar to the Aiken bill. It has been shown without question that the Aiken bill came up from the Department of Agriculture in the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress. It was never passed on by the House, but was an agreement from the conference. The Aiken, the Pace, and the Brannan bills are rotten apples from the same tree. They would regiment the American farmer and the cost is unknown. Either of these bills would make it necessary for the farmer to depend upon appropriations from Congress. It is not a farm plan, but a scheme to snare votes. It is a sort of Pandora's

box, and a political Christmas tree, trying to give something to everyone.

In my opinion the farmers merely want a fair income—a fair profit. They prefer the program they now have. They understand it. I think it would be a mistake in these troubled times to take on some new and untried experiment such as suggested by the Pace bill. It is really a part of the Brannan plan. Let the camel get its nose under the tent and there is no telling just how far food subsidies to the consumer would go. It would not be satisfactory to the farmer or the consumer. I shall support the Gore amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the farmers of the country are afraid of these trial run proposals and they are afraid for the reason that they see in this an effort to take the power and the money of the Federal Treasury to beat them out of their normal market price; then when the Treasury runs out of funds, leave them holding the sack, with the normal market price taken up by the spread of charges to middlemen.

That is the short and simple fact.

This is the first time it has ever been proposed that funds of the Federal Treasury be used to bribe the farmer to give up his normal price in the market, then take the chance that what he will be left with is no appropriations available to make the payments when they become burdensome and taxes ever higher.

Milk today averages about 20 or 21 cents a quart over the country to the consumer but the farmer gets only 6 or 7 cents an average out of that. When it was first proposed to bring milk down to 15 cents a quart by use of production payments it was clear this would leave the farmer getting only 2 or 3 cents a quart in the market. If the Government then ever quit paying him production payments, where would he be? If milk should come down let the cut be all along the line.

Of course milk is out of the bill—out of this trial run, now, and so are hogs out of it because the other meat producers knew what would happen if money for hogs were used to beat down the price of all meats.

The proposals in the committee bill are in the direction of the Brannan plan. The people do not want to risk them. They prefer to deal with the ills we now have and deal with them directly than to fly to ills they know not of. The Gore substitute should be adopted to let us work this thing out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM to the amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 8, beginning on line 10, renumber sections 6 and 7 as 7 and 8 and insert a new section 6 reading as follows:

"SEC. 6. Section 32, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 612c), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The sums appropriated under this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for the purposes of this section until expended; but any excess of the amount remaining unexpended at the end of any fiscal year over $300,000,000 shall, in the same manner as though it had been appropriated for the service of such fiscal year, be subject to the provisions of section 3690 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 712), and section 5 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes' (31 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 713)."

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

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

Mr. GORE. The amendment which the gentleman from Oklahoma has offered is not in the present bill but it is in title II of the Aiken bill. It is also verbatim in the committee bill. I have advised with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] who has done more, I suppose, than any man in Congress with respect to section 32 funds, and he finds no objection to the amendment, nor does any member of the committee. However, it would probably be meaningless, since practically all of the money is committed.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

(Mr. WORLEY, Mr. SUTTON, Mr. WHITE of California, Mr. POAGE, Mr. PACE, and Mr. GRANGER asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].)

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am almost ready to say that I fear I am speaking to minds that are closed. But, I did not want to let this opportunity pass without saying just a word. Heretofore I have heard all of these fears expressed on the floor of the House with reference to something that was new, something that had not been tried, and criticizing a trial run. I have not known any legislation of far-reaching consequence in all the years that I have been a Member of this House that was not a trial run. I remember when the farmers of the country were in darkness, and many of them are still in darkness, and if they had depended upon their friends, the public utilities, to build lines out to their little homes in the country, they would still be in darkness. When I was carrying through the House of Representatives many years ago rural electrification, authorizing the appropriation of $450,000,000 over a term of years, the same men usually, sound men usually, said, "This is a venture that will lose the Government of the United States $450,000,000, because the farmers will take these lights, and when the bill comes around, they will have them taken out." Well, if farm prices had remained what they were then, and if no planning, no program for farm improvement had been put into effect by people who had the courage to make a venture and try something new, they would have taken them out, because they would not have had the money to pay the bills in the first place, and they would not have had the money to wire their houses. We have loaned millions upon millions of dollars for those things.

I have listened to this debate and I have listened to the members of this committee, and let me say to you, my Democratic friends, that I found out a long time ago that in this House the people get along the best who go along the most. When 17 of my Democratic colleagues unanimously, after 6 months of laborious and hard study, bring into this House a measure, I would hesitate long and prayerfully before I would fly in the face of those gentlemen. This is something new but, in my opinion, after reading and listening, this is a better thought out program than we have on the books today, this is a sounder program than we have on the books today and, in my opinion, in the long run it will cost a great deal less money than the program we have in operation now.

It seems to me we should have this trial run, so that we may see what this thing does. If we get a mix-up here, if we pass nothing except this extension, and then the Senate does not take it up, the farmers of the country are going to have the Aiken bill hanging over them the first day of January. If we do something about it here today more than simply extend what we have, which has been proven to be tremendously costly, in my opinion the cost of it is going to be such that one day it is going to injure the farmer and injure farm legislation.

Let me call your attention to this one thing, too. The city folks for all these years have gone along with us farming sections of the country and have voted unanimously for our programs, out of which they got little or nothing except a greater buying power on the part of the farmers to employ their people and buy their things. But some of these days, unless we pay a little more attention to the consumers of this country, they may rise up themselves and make it hard for us to continue a farm program that will be in the interest of the people. It is vital to every industry in America that the thirty-odd million people on the farms have buying power. When those thirty-odd million people have buying power, it puts people in town to work, and when people in town are at work at good wages, with high buying power, then they can buy what we produce on the dirt and out of the dirt.

I ask my Democratic friends to stand by these 17 men and let us have a trial run on this thing that, in my humble judgment, is much better than what is upon the statute books today and which you may extend today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, this is a long time to wait to get this short time to talk. Let me tell the House that there is another way to equalize prices and stabilize our national economy which may seem novel at this late day, but the plan is as fundamental as these hills and as basic as the soil. First let our Government give this country a sound, adequate, workable money system that will provide the necessary cash with which to transact the business of our country, and with this let us pass the necessary laws to strengthen the Federal Trade Commission to protect both small and new enterprises from the unfair competition and unfair trade practices of big business and organized industry.

If we will do these simple things to unfetter competition and give free play to the law of supply and demand, the thrift, industry, and enterprise of the people of this country will soon make the necessary adjustment in our price structure by competition that will equalize prices automatically, which we seek to do by this bill, adjust prices by spending money in carrying out an artificial program.

Mr. Chairman, as we have neither a stable, adequate, workable money system or any plan to strengthen the Federal Trade Commission or to preserve and protect competition and new enterprise in this country from destructive price manipulation and unfair trade practice, then I shall vote for this price support program for the following reason:

In considering our present commodity price level and ways and means to maintain the stability of our national economy by keeping the price structure in balance, I am sure you appreciate the necessity of maintaining the equilibrium between the price of the products of the manufacturer which the farmer must buy and the price of the products of agriculture which the farmer must sell. In other words, maintaining the balance or parity in the price level that will provide purchasing power in the hands of the farmer—purchasing power that is indispensable to the support of the market for the products of the manufacturing industry, together with the services of distribution and the transportation system, industries that are the big employers of labor.

If high prices are to prevail on one side of our price structure, it is vitally important, if we are to have a stable economy, that prices are in balance on the other side. If farm prices are permitted to drop out of line with the prices of manufactured products to a level where those engaged in agriculture lose their purchasing power and their ability to support the manufacturers' and distributors' price structure, then our national economy will be upset, just as it was after the First World War, when credit was contracted and currency retired—a condition which is within your and my personal recollection.

It may be of interest to review some of the causes of the farm depression of that time.

In the first place, with a war on, business organizations and manufacturing companies found a long-sought opportunity to raise prices of their particular products. War conditions precluded any new competitors from entering the field which the big manufacturers found they had practically all to themselves in the war period, when you and I saw everything that the farmers must buy double in price. Barbed wire, theretofore selling at $1.50 per spool of 80 rods, went to $6; nails from 5 cents per pound to 8 and 9 cents per pound; a 5-foot McCormick binder from $175 to $350; baling wire from $2.50 to $6.50 a bundle, and so on, through the entire list of every manufactured thing the farmer must have; and then what did we see? We saw the profits and cash reserves of these manufacturers and distributors piled up in huge cash surpluses, and we saw an inflated stock market get out of bounds, and we saw the manufacturers and distributors with their swollen profits, drained from those engaged in farming, and the other basic industries keep these cash reserves—these winnings—from their stockholders, and avoiding income taxes by issuing stock dividends, and everybody was prosperous in an inflated market except the farmers and those engaged in the other basic industries. Then we saw the banks attempt to arrest this dangerous financial trend by curtailing loans and shutting off money to the speculators, only to have the industrial concerns, attracted by high interest rates, step in and support the inflated securities market, by lending their cash surpluses to the speculators—money that had been drained away from the farming and basic industries until the farmer, having lost his purchasing power, could no longer support his part of the national economy. The result was that the whole price structure tumbled into a depression that has cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars in an effort to restore a balanced economy. So we have come to hear much about price parity and are devoting much time and money to devising schemes to support farm prices.

In considering our economic problems today, in order to demonstrate the necessity for support prices, for farm products, we need to take just one manufactured commodity for an example, barbed wire. Back in the days when the law of supply and demand and unfettered competition gave us price parity, the farmer bought an 80-rod spool of galvanized barbed wire for $1.50 to $2 per roll. Now he must pay from $8.50 to $10 per roll, and so on through the list of farm necessities.

Now if the prices of farm products are permitted to drop, and the manufacturers and distributors are successful in holding up the prices of the things the farmer must buy as they did back in the 1920's, our national economy will be upset, our price structure will be wrecked, and our financial pump will lose its prime—that is, bank loans will be contracted and currency—money—retired. When value is gone, the bankers have no basis on which to extend credit, and without credit there is no basis on which to create and issue currency—money—making it necessary to adopt many expedients and take heroic measures to stabilize prices and again prime the financial pump.

When the farmer has lost his purchasing power and is unable to support his part of the national economy, the manufacturing, distributing, and transportation industries will suffer irreparable losses, along with the farmer, the miner, the lumberman, and the fisherman, representing our four great basic industries.

Let us preserve and protect the prosperity we now enjoy by maintaining a balanced price structure, with purchasing power in the hands of industry's best customer—the farmer. If we are to have permanent prosperity, we must maintain a stable national economy by establishing price parity, which can best be achieved by a constructive farm price support program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

[Mr. O'SULLIVAN addressed the Committee.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order now which should have been made when the gentleman spoke on yesterday. I make the point of order that he is violating the rules of the House in making such comment upon a Member of another body.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his words be stricken from the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, in summarizing the debate on this important bill H. R. 5345 and the various amendments that have been proposed to it which proposes to improve the production and sustain the price on farm products. It would seem in order that something should be said about improving the farmer himself. The almost complete regimentation of the farmer and the products of his farm is so evident in this bill that I believe we should fully realize the dangerous trend toward a planned economy and toward eventual socialism that the passage of this bill H. R. 5345 would lead to. Let me read the following from a recent issue of Economic Trend Line Studies which is significant of the regimentation this bill will bring about:

Within recent weeks the United States Department of Agriculture, through Secretary Brannan, has submitted to Congress a plan with a new and entirely different approach to the problem of maintaining farm prosperity. Modesty apparently prevented Mr. Brannan from revealing the ultimate possibilities of this program. Economic Trend Line Studies, therefore, deems it a public service to point out how some of these possibilities might be realized in future years. In brief, Mr. Brannan proposes to:

1. Let prices of farm products seek a level determined by supply and demand;

2. Pay farmers the difference between the market prices they would receive for their products and prices that will guarantee the farmers a high fixed share of the total national income. This is designed to give consumers low prices and farmers high prices—in short, to substitute income parity support for price parity support;

3. Exercise such controls over farmers in their planting, production and marketing of farm crops as to prevent them from producing unneeded surpluses.

This program thus far seems to have failed to impress Congress, the farmers or the public. Perhaps it is because they do not grasp its profoundly conceived objectives. The Department of Agriculture certainly has proved its ability to increase the productivity of everything on the farm with a fence around it. Why not let the Department put a fence around the farmhouses and improve the farmers, too?

As a matter of fact, in the eight and one-half decades of its existence the United States Department of Agriculture has devoted so much of its time to the improvement of farm crops and animals that little time was left for the improvement of the farmers themselves. Now, when the Department is ready to proceed in this direction, this great and venerable bureau has made a horrifying discovery. The farmers obstinately resist the bold new plans of the Department to make livestock, poultry, pigs, ducks, geese, rabbits, farmers, and the Department of Agriculture one big, happy, indistinguishable organization.

The central problem in the improvement of the farmer is the curbing of his tendency to produce the crops that will make him the most money, irrespective of the existing needs or demands of consumers or the instructions issued by the Department of Agriculture. This tendency results in politically embarrassing and costly surpluses of certain crops and rankling criticism of the Department's staff, which would invariably be right if the farmers would do as they are told. The Department then faces the necessity of disposing of these surpluses even though it requires their destruction, a useless and wholly unnecessary waste of soil resources and of the Department's time.

The Department of Agriculture, therefore, should develop a breed of farmers so responsive to its directives that production of all the principal crops could be controlled within extremely close limits. The Department would then be able to direct farm production with respect to the proper conservation of soil resources and the observance of those practices that restore and increase soil fertility, and still provide an abundance of food, at the same time keeping farm population within bounds, or did we say fence? Perhaps the Department ultimately could produce farmers that would be both blind and deaf to all communications except Department publications and press releases.

It should be obvious, of course, that the development of the proper kind of farmer by the Department is essentially a biological problem. One of the most difficult obstacles to be faced by the Department inthis connection would be the necessity of providing each farmer unit (male, female, and progeny) with sufficient land resources to provide for its full and adequate development. The development of farm animals has proved this. A dairy cow must have a minimum of good pasture if it is to reach full production.

The Department could provide this land room for farmer units by limiting the production of the largest units so that expanded opportunities could be made available to the smaller units. There would doubtless be much opposition from the larger units to this equalizing of opportunity and, of course, there would be a temporary reduction of over-all farm production. The advantage the larger farmer units now possess, however, would gradually be overcome by natural competition as the quality and breeding of the smaller farmer units were improved.

A problem for which no immediate solution is available is presented by the presently uncontrolled intermarriage of the farmer units without regard to selection for improvement. The successful development of animal husbandry has shown that the science of genetics can sufficiently control inherited characteristics. The Department could apply this knowledge to the improvement of farmer units. Once the characteristics and traits to be developed in the new type of farmer unit by the Department are agreed upon and established, the Department personnel should experience little difficulty in working out satisfactory social procedures. Research by properly trained scientists into the personal attractions the female exerts that result in mating should make it possible for the Department of Agriculture to endow the most suitable females with sufficiently superior attractions to give them the necessary advantages over females classed as inferior. In this way the Department could control satisfactorily the element of natural selection. As this approach was developed fully the less desirable male and female stock would be forced to mate and, being unable to compete successfully with the more vigorous and able selected farmer strains, would ultimately succumb and disappear.

It should be perfectly evident that this plan as outlined would eliminate what could otherwise become a chronic farm problem and a threat to national prosperity, not to mention its threat to the prestige of the Department of Agriculture. The Department, therefore, should readily obtain the cooperation of Congress and the various important social agencies in the accomplishment of its objectives.

Under the American free enterprise system, incentive must be employed to gain the voluntary cooperation of any section of our people and, in this respect, the farmer must not be made an exception. He must not and cannot be made by force to accept any plan or program, however beneficial to him as an individual or to the Nation as a whole.

It is for this reason that the Department of Agriculture has proposed that the farmers as a group be guaranteed a fixed proportion of the national income. Thus assured of continued and uninterrupted well-being the farmer should be willing to cooperate voluntarily and vigorously in the Agriculture Department's program and submit himself to a vigorous plan of self-improvement.

The Department, of course, should plan to provide the necessary safeguards to make sure that the farmer units fulfills their obligations. Sufficiently painful penalties should be provided for those farmers who take time off during the planting and harvesting seasons for such pastimes as fishing or hunting. Furthermore, farmers should not be permitted to go to town during the busy seasons except for machinery repairs, certified as bona fide by the community commissar, responsible only to the Department of Agriculture. Intoxication at any time should be subject to drastic penalties as it is not only damaging to the farmer units well-being but tends to breed undesirable characteristics in farmer stock. Male farmers who might mate with females classed as inferior by the Department would be automatically excluded from the plan's benefits.

A complete agricultural education, including college, should be required of selected farmer stock. During this period farmer units in training, both male and female, would be carefully conditioned and intensively indoctrinated with a view to inculcating into them an unquestioning acceptance of the improved ideas, viewpoints and bold new plans fostered by the Department's program. This would protect the social investment the Nation is being called upon to make and should guarantee the success of the agricultural program.

The adoption of the program would proceed more swiftly no doubt were it not for the present futile attempt to assure farm prosperity by farm price supports. Proponents of this plan must be made to realize that price supports are doomed to failure because the present body of unregenerate farmers takes advantage of every price that is fixed too high in ways that the Department finds it impossible to anticipate. Then, too, in the fixing of prices there are sometimes political considerations which unfortunately cannot now be kept out of these calculations. Farmers voting under Department dispensation could not be tempted to vote for unearned handouts. They would know instinctively how to cast their ballots. It is evident that many, if not most of our existing farmers are now inspired solely by the profit motive, and are interested only in taking full advantage of the unavoidable errors of the present price support plan to their own selfish individual benefit.

No place for such a spirit would exist in the proposed new Department program. Such selfishness succeeds only in exploiting our rapidly dwindling soil resources and gives the farmer money he does not need if he stays within the fence the Department puts around the farmhouse. What we want is farmer units that make conservation and restoration of soil resources their primary goal and let their individual profit and pleasure be determined by the Department of Agriculture, which is in a much better position than the individual farmer to determine what pleasures and what proportion each should have of the total available agriculture income. These objectives the proposed department program is designed to achieve.

Mr. Chairman, unless the Gore amendment is adopted, I urge the defeat of this bill H. R. 5345 because of the danger of the loss of liberty and freedom of the farmer and the planned economy which this bill would bring about, which has been such a dismal failure in socialistic Great Britain. The Gore amendment is a complete substitute for the Pace bill H. R. 5345 and will leave the present parity program as it is and should be approved.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of Maine's and the country's greatest white potato producing county I would like to call to the attention of the House the tremendous contribution to the war effort made by Maine farmers and the patriotic endeavor of our growers to carry out the wishes of those who asked that acreage be increased and production upped to the highest possible point to insure food for our citizens and our allies during the war and immediately following cessation of hostilities.

Tolerant of seemingly inconsistent statements and actions on the part of Government authorities, the farmers of my State continued to exert every faculty and facility to perform their part in the programs mapped out in Washington. It was not always easy to understand the conflicting demands to say nothing of carrying them out. To people producing certified seed, for instance, it was difficult to explain why this Government would permit Canada to ship

in seed when our own citizens were growing more than sufficient to plant our entire commercial acreage, and three-quarters of a million noncommercial acres.

While the Government and the press complained bitterly at the high cost of supporting the price of white potatoes, the same Government allowed importation to the point where it was obvious that the expense of the program was increased by practices that to all intents and purposes had this Government supporting the price of Canadian potatoes as well. No justification for this confusion and lack of coordination in the plans of the various departments of our country could be found. And keen resentment was felt at the unpleasant and undeserved publicity directed at the potato farmers of the country for the cost of a program made exorbitant through no fault of the farmers themselves.

In the last 5 years potato farmers have voluntarily reduced their acreage some 36 percent. In fact, the acreage planted in each of the last 5 years has not been as great as the Department of Agriculture itself recommended. To those who have damned the potato industry I would point out that the voluntary decrease in acreage was in face of an existing support price of 90 percent of parity.

Maine farmers by improved methods and hard work, with other sections of the country, were able to produce a surplus even though planting greatly decreased acreage. As has become customary in late years, criticism and calumny were heaped upon the heads of our farmers for their very success. To be successful is to be criticized and unpopular.

Potato men, recognizing the situation themselves, recommended that the support price be reduced from 90 to 60 percent of parity.

We all recognize—farmers, labor, industry, and the consuming public—that if the farmers suffer disastrous losses the whole economy suffers. And in any year when potatoes have been below 60 percent of parity the condition has been reflected throughout the land.

The farmers of this country—the little men and the big growers—are the producers of food and of clear American thought. They are themselves one of the greatest crops we raise, and we could never produce a surplus to fill the need for such thinking as they do. They do not ask to be guaranteed a profit, they want to be insured against disaster.

I bespeak consideration of their situation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened patiently to the debate on these various proposals dealing with agriculture and some of it would be most amusing were it not for the fact that here we are dealing with the economic fate of this Nation, for agriculture is its basic industry.

In formulating a program, designed to provide economic stability for the Nation's basic industry, no one in the cities and towns is making a concession—no one is making a gift to the farmer. Unless farm income is kept at a high level from year to year those in the cities and towns can look for greater unemployment and in the end—a back-breaking depression.

There are several reasons why I find it impossible to support the Brannan plan as contained in the Pace bill. Time permits stating only briefly my viewpoint. For years there has been tinkering and experimentation, changing the rules every few months, so that the farmers of Iowa and the rest of the country scarcely know from one 6-month period to another what they were supposed to do or how.

The Brannan proposition is entirely new in many respects and wholly untried. No one knows its cost, estimated or otherwise. It does give a Secretary of Agriculture tremendous and arbitrary power. One of the great difficulties of the past has been the maladministration of measures, enacted by Congress in good faith, for the purpose of aiding both farmers and consumers. It is time to stop delegating enormous and arbitrary powers to appointive officials. Long ago, Congress should have enacted into law a farm program which based prices upon cost of production plus a reasonable profit for those products used in domestic consumption. That is the basis of price used by industry and business—by all those with whom the farmer transacts business. If there is a sincere desire to provide the farmer with the year-to-year security to which he is entitled that is the formula and program to which Congress should have centered its attention.

Much has been said during this debate concerning farm surpluses. Members of Congress may just as well recognize now that there is little or no foreign market left for American farm products. And we will only hasten the day of national bankruptcy by continuing the insane policy of permitting foreign food products, already in surplus supply here, to be imported by the boatloads into this country.

I shall support the Gore amendment for the reason that I believe the program which it provides can well be continued for another year and I have grave doubts concerning some provisions of the Brannan plan. In the meantime, let us formulate a permanent program for agriculture based upon cost of production and not 60 or 90 percent of parity. Let us put the farmer on a basis of equality with every other industry.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the essential purpose of the committee bill, reflecting, as it does, the intention of Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, is to strengthen the agriculture price-support program and to give to the Secretary power to prevent the occurrence—involving many other commodities and much larger sums of money—of cases similar to that involving potato surpluses last year. Some of the gentlemen who have spoken earlier in the debate on this bill have expressed the opinion that only those Members of the House who have been here for years are informed on this problem, and have suggested that everyone without experience should blindly follow their lead. This is not only an insulting suggestion, but one which disregards the fact, that having been free from the distractions of congressional activity, Members who have not been here for so long have probably had more time to study these problems. I will say to the gentlemen that I have heard more unsound economic arguments from the opponents of the Pace bill in the last 2 days than one would hear in a month of conversation with less informed people.

Who pays the bill for price support under the provisions of the Gore bill? It will be paid by the consumer—forced to pay a high price in the artificially sustained market—and it will be paid by the taxpayer by appropriation out of the general revenue. Who will pay under the Pace bill? The consumer will contribute to the support of basic nonperishable commodities; the taxpayer will continue to make up the deficit, but farm producers will also make a contribution—making some slight concession, to the end of stabilizing the farm-market prices and farm income.

The opponents of the Pace bill are setting the stage for the destruction of foods. This is waste in its worst form; this is waste today approved by men who were loudest in their denunciation of the program of destroying feeder pigs in the depression of the nineteen thirties.

The Pace bill proposes to give the Secretary of Agriculture powers to meet a problem. The opponents refuse to give him this necessary strength. The agricultural price-support program is dangerous. Members on both sides of the House admit to this. It is dangerous. Under any law the Secretary of Agriculture will have a bear by the tail. We propose to give the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration the right to hold on with two hands; the Republicans, aided by the dissidents and some special-interest Democrats, would allow him the use of but one hand.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I have received the following telegram from Mr. W. E. Anderson, commissioner, Louisiana Department of Agriculture:

> Re letter July 16, have studied enclosures carefully. Feel it would be better to let legislation stand as is by passage of Gore substitute. Do not believe Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as proposed to be amended by Pace bill H. R. 5345 or the Aiken bill will produce the desired objective of stabilizing agriculture to meet domestic requirements at parity without seriously stymieing individual farmer initiative and freedom in farm manipulation which is most desirable. Such desirable legislation can and should be developed.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the paternity of the Brannan plan. It has been said that Henry Wallace, Rexford Tugwell and Alger Hiss are the joint parents of this proposed farm measure. Its origin is shrouded in the obscurity that characterizes illicit associations.

It is a matter of regret that an effort has been made in the debate on this measure to inject into its consideration partisan politics. No good can come to agriculture by driving a wedge between the Republican friends and the Democratic friends of the farmers of this country.

I am supporting the Gore amendment. My able and aggressive colleague from Tennessee made a courageous, constructive and convincing speech in favor of his amendment. He ripped the Brannan plan up the back and split it down the middle. He exposed its fallacies and its utter unsoundness.

The Brannan plan as a whole has been abandoned by its sponsors.

Mr. Brannan, Truman's Secretary of Agriculture, in the early spring of this year, came up with this new plan for the farmers and consumers of this country.

He advocates that farmers produce all the food and all the farm products that it is possible to produce, and that they sell them for whatever price they can obtain, regardless of how low that price is. By thus cheapening the products of the farm he proposes to enable all of us to buy our food and anything that is produced on the farm for less than it is worth. In other words, he proposes by this scheme promptly to reduce the cost of living for the consumer and then he proposes for the Government to pay the farmer the difference between what he sells his products for and what would be a good price for such products, so that under this plan, the farmer will be more prosperous than ever and we will all buy our food for less than we have ever paid for it heretofore. Let us see what the catch is in Mr. Brannan's plan. Where will the Government get the money with which to pay the farmer this high price for his wheat, corn, oats, beef, pork, poultry, milk, butter, vegetables, wool, cotton and other products produced upon his farm? Will this money come from some benevolent foreign government interested in the welfare of our people? No, because there is no such country in the world. This money with which Mr. Brannan proposes to pay the farmer will come from the farmers themselves in the form of taxes. It will come from the people who buy the farmers' products for less than their market value. It will come from the taxpayers of the United States. In other words, although the American people are today the most heavily taxed people in the world, Mr. Brannan proposes to levy an additional tax burden upon the American taxpayers of ultimately not less than $10,000,000,000 per year. And if you have eyes and will look, you will see following these bureaucrats who come with a bribe in the one hand and a strait-jacket in the other, a shadowy host of uncounted numbers who will be the army of Federal employees who administer this new form of Government subsidy. Mr. Brannan is proposing to give the American people something for nothing. He is flying in the face of the truth that sooner or later we must pay for all that we get. It is my belief that the level-headed, sound-thinking farmers of this country, along with all the other people of this country who believe in the American way of life have not fallen for Mr. Brannan's farm program.

FARMERS ARE HARD TO FOOL

The farmers of this country have always been our most conservative, thoughtful, and careful citizens. They are not easily led astray by fakers and by demagogues who offer them something for nothing. Our farmers are rugged, level-headed individualists. Under the Brannan plan they are offered a mess of pottage for their birthright. For the surrender of their independence and their control over their own farms, they are offered a well-heeled form of servitude.

The Brannan plan offers the farmers a Government-guaranteed farm income. This offer is made to the farmers who operate our smaller and medium-sized farms.

Coupled with this farm plan as originally made is the old drive to limit all incomes to $25,000 a year. This is in keeping with the policy of the Soviets when they took over Russia. They shot all the kulaks, that is, farmers who owned their own farms. The Brannan plan directly discriminates against these large producers, and it discriminates against the small farmers. It is true that farmers who produce as much as $25,000 per year on their farms are probably not more than 2 percent of the farmers. These large producers would be forced to either go out of business or to split up their farms. The destruction of these large farmers and the splitting up of their farms would be detrimental to the consumers of this country. The owners and operators of these large American farms, by the use of farm machinery, produce large quantities of food—wheat, corn, cattle, dairy products, hogs, sheep, and poultry.

The Brannan plan is designed to get votes for the administration. All that the farmers who benefit by this plan would lose is their freedom. And when they lose their freedom, they lose everything worth having.

THE FARM BUREAU FEDERATION OF TENNESSEE IS OPPOSED TO THIS MEASURE

I was gratified to learn in a letter from my friend, Tom J. Hitch, formerly of Maryville and now of Columbia, Tenn., president of the Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation, that this great organization does not favor the farm program proposed by Charles Brannan, the Truman Secretary of Agriculture. On the contrary, the Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation, favors the Gore amendment. The Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation places its opposition to the dangerous Brannan plan on the ground, first, that it proposes to discard the parity concept and the present farm program based on it which the farmers of this country through their organization have spent 25 years in developing. Second, the Brannan plan proposes to substitute for this tried program, a new and untried program with no farmer background of thinking or experience. Our sensible farmers do not favor giving up a tried and tested plan which has worked for a ready made, socialistic plan written by bureaucrats in Washington. Third, the Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation proposes to stand by the safeguards to farm prosperity and fair prices for farm products as set out in the present law and continued by the Gore amendment. And it rejects the high income and price support standards covering all farm commodities and the rigid regulation and controls on production and administration, which the Brannan plan originally proposed to rivet on the farmers of this country.

This part of the Brannan program is socialistic and impossible of attainment.

The Farm Bureau also places its finger upon the deadly feature of the Brannan plan, that is, the stripping of the farmer of the right to run his own farm and his own business, and the placing of the regulation and control of the farms and the farmers of this country in the hands of a bureaucrat in Washington.

If the power-hungry bureaucrats of Washington are permitted to take this step, they will have taken the long, last, fatal step toward centralization of all power and control in Washington over the farmers of this country.

On June 11 of this year, Mr. Truman sent his Vice President, Mr. BARKLEY, and his Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, and a host of other New Deal bigwigs out to Des Moines, Iowa, where on Sunday and Monday they undertook to convince the farmers of Iowa and the great adjoining agricultural States of the Middle West, that the Brannan plan is the panacea for all the ills with which the farmer and the working people of this country are afflicted. Mr. Brannan made a speech in which he denounced the so-called Hope-Aiken bill passed by the Eightieth Congress.

The hard-headed Midwest farmers listened to Mr. Brannan and then said to him, "We want to keep our parity prices under the law as it now is, and you can keep this Brannan plan for your New Deal candidates to run on in the November election in 1950."

Mr. Brannan in his speech seemed to be a reincarnation of Harry Hopkins who was the author of the New Deal slogan—"Tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect."

What have we here today? We find that the sponsors of the Brannan plan have eliminated hogs from their program. Frightened in the overwhelming opposition of this House, they come to us with a potato in the one hand and an egg in the other, and say they are willing to compromise if we will give them a trial run on potatoes, eggs, and shorn wool.

The most enthusiastic sponsors of this program are from the South. They overlook the fact that the Brannan plan is aimed at the agricultural South and all other agricultural sections of this country. These gentlemen from the Southland are inviting disaster to the agriculture products that are protected by the Gore amendment. They are inviting disaster to the prosperity of farmers everywhere in this country. They overlook the fact that you cannot go halfway over Niagara. Once the farmer surrenders the control of his farm, he gives up his liberty. And when he loses his liberty, he loses all.

It is liberty alone that gives the flower of life its fragrance and perfume, and we are weeds without it.

The fact that the Brannan plan is supported by the radical labor leaders of the country is in itself a warning to the farmers. The Brannan plan is the opening wedge in a drive to bring American agriculture and American industry down to

the level of the socialism and controls in which Great Britain finds herself today.

On July 18 Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin told Commons that one of the problems behind the dollar crisis of Britain and the sterling area lies in the fact that the United States is "a welfare state."

Citing the United States system of high unemployment insurance, sick pay, and the possibility of "a great medical service," Bevin said:

> The United States is as much a welfare state as we are, only it is in a different form. One of our difficulties in the balance of payments today is the fact that the United States, in carrying out its welfare policy, has given basic prices to agriculture.

The farmers of this country are colaborers together with God. They keep step with the procession of the seasons. Theirs is a life of toil, but it is a life of freedom, self-reliance, and happiness. Their friends and they themselves do not propose that they shall be stripped of their dignity and self-respect.

The men and women on the farms of this country have made their voice heard in this House, and it is my belief that when the roll is called there will be an overwhelming majority in favor of the Gore substitute for the Brannan plan.

This is no time to adopt an untried, paternalistic, drastic, stifling control over the production of farm products without which our people cannot live and our country cannot prosper.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the patent defects in the proposal of Secretary Brannan, as contained in the bill now before us, have been demonstrated beyond the possibility of any refutation.

It is unnecessary to refer further to the argument which has been advanced that the enactment of this bill would be advantageous to the consumers of this country. It is true that it has a surface appeal in the sense that it could result in somewhat lower prices. But I am convinced that the great majority of the American people realize full well that this is both a deceptive and an untenable argument. No such economic legerdemain would deceive the American people for any length of time if the plan were put into operation, even on a trial-run basis. More than that, I am convinced that the American people thoroughly understand that this involves the economic fallacy of being able to eat our cake and to have it.

The argument that we can afford to experiment in any such field falls of its own weight. If any experimentation would be of any value, in passing upon this legislation, we definitely have before us the actual experience in England. As has been pointed out repeatedly, the government there has recently been forced to admit that the only source from which such experimentation can be financed is from taxes imposed upon the people. That they should have been confronted with a completely unexpected cost of their experimentation should be sufficient warning to those who defend similar experimentation here.

In my judgment, the clear-thinking and constructive action which has been taken by the great farm organizations of this country constitutes advice which we should all weigh very heavily. They should be commended for their patriotic and statesmanlike approach to what might have seemed to be an alluring proposal.

Within the last few days in Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation undertook a poll throughout the State in an effort to develop the opinions of farmers in Massachusetts. I am glad to report that I was advised this morning that on the question of the adoption of the Brannan plan, in whole or in part, and with reference to any trial run, 90.3 percent voted against such proposals.

On the whole, I think it has been a good thing that this proposal has been brought before us at this time. It has afforded an excellent opportunity to members of this body to become fully acquainted with the nature of this proposal so that we may have an opportunity to pass collective judgment upon it. I do not have the slightest doubt as to the verdict. With the atmosphere then cleared and with the vast amount of information now developed, it should be possible to devise, with the assistance of representatives of those engaged in agriculture in this country, a sound, long-range program which will truly be beneficial to agriculture and to the Nation as a whole. As I understand it, that is the recommendation of these great farm organizations. They believe it to be possible. We certainly should welcome their assistance in this effort.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Gore substitute as an amendment to the Pace bill. At this time, more than at any time in the history of our great Nation, we need to develop markets for our agricultural products. In a few short years we have seen a period in which the demand for farm commodities has gone from the surpluses of the late twenty's and early thirty's to a period in which the market absorbed all of our products during the war years. Now again, we are facing a loss of markets for agricultural commodities.

My farmer neighbors are concerned with this problem. They want to farm with an assurance that their products will bring a fair return and full consumption. I feel that farmers want and have a right to expect income protection. I think consumers have a right to buy their food in a market as free as possible from speculation, middleman interference, and Government interference. Farmers will supply the food we need if they are given an opportunity to do so. They have proven this time and time again in cooperation with agricultural programs.

The Department of Agriculture has made a thorough study of farm production and prices and has pointed out the dangers threatening our rural economy. Members of the distinguished Committee on Agriculture have given full and complete study to these programs. We need only to consider some of the dangers ahead unless a realistic, equitable farm program is enacted. Take, for example, the corn-hog problem.

We are now expecting a huge 1949 corn crop—perhaps the second largest in our history. And it is coming right on the heels of a bumper crop in 1948. By October 1 we can expect a total supply of corn, including carry-over of 4,200,000,000 bushels as compared with 3,800,000,000 bushels last year.

Nothing is more certain than that this corn situation is going to have a tremendous effect on hog production. Last month a 9 percent increase in fall pigs was predicted. This month our experts say, it looks more like a 12 or 13 percent increase.

Iowa can furnish us with a perfect example of the problem we will be facing next fall. The June pig crop report issued at Des Moines shows a 16 percent increase in sows farrowed over the same period in 1948. This is 8 percent higher than the previous record year of 1943 for Iowa. Since it has been demonstrated that the fall pig crop bears nearly the same percentage increase as sows farrowed, we can expect an increase of 16 percent in fall pigs in Iowa. When hog prices start tumbling and our present program is unable to effectively insure support prices, what are the Iowa farmers going to say?

We are clearly facing an increase in the fall pig crop. Add to that the expected abnormal increase in spring pigs next year and we will face real trouble in supporting the price of hogs.

No one knows exactly what the surplus in hog production will be. One estimate is that it will be between one and two billion pounds live weight. The Government is definitely committed to support hog prices. Secretary Brannan has estimated that the support of 1,000,000,000 pounds of hogs by the purchase method, the only method now authorized by law, would cost approximately $230,000,000. And that would be merely the cost of acquiring and storing the surplus.

Then what? The export possibilities for hogs next year are expected to drop far below the 180,000,000 pounds of dressed pork sold last year. Exports of pork are expected to drop to 100,000,000 pounds because of the declining foreign market due to dollar shortages. What is to be done with the rest of the surplus? It cannot be dumped on the domestic market without further depressing prices. That will call for more support purchases and larger unusable surpluses. Moreover, we are dealing with a highly perishable commodity. Hogs cannot be stored for more than 6 months under ideal conditions in refrigerated warehouses. Where are these warehouses?

Gentlemen, the continuation of the purchase system of hog support in the face of increased hog production may lead us straight to a kill-the-pigs program. Do any of us want that when workers need meat?

I do not mean to give the impression that the production payment method of supporting hog prices will be cheap. Nor do I know exactly what it will cost. But no one knows exactly how much it will cost under the present program. But it certainly seems more reasonable to suppose that the production-payment method, simply by eliminating transportation and disposal charges, will be a great deal cheaper. At the same time, it would increase the consumption of pork

at home and give meat to the people who need it at prices they can pay for it.

It is very important, I think, not to make the mistake of applying a 1942 program to 1949 needs. The whole idea of the Steagall amendment in 1942 was to provide incentives for increased wartime production. The Steagall amendment served its purpose well, and farmers everywhere responded magnificently.

But in 1949 and 1950 we are faced with very different problems. Everything points to agricultural surpluses and declining demand at home and abroad.

A modern farm problem demands a modern farm program. And that program must provide the fullest measure of protection for farm income. Generally speaking the last 8 years have been good years for the farmer. But let no one suppose that the farmer is rolling in wealth, or that he can live on his accumulated fat. As a matter of fact, although he worked heroically during the war years to prove that food could win the war, he was far less well paid for his efforts than nonfarm workers were. And even in 1946, one of the peak years of the postwar boom, more than half of the farm families of the United States had net cash incomes of less than $1,250. In the South, the farm income picture was, and is, even worse. There, at the peak of boom, more than 70 percent of the farm families had less than $1,250 net cash income. I submit that any farm program which does not take account of these facts would be an inadequate program.

We must maintain farm income at levels at least equal to, and if possible above, those of the past few years.

But we cannot do that merely by curtailing production—though I do believe that farmers will most enthusiastically support any sane program of controlling wasteful production. We have long since repudiated, I hope for all time, the the economics of scarcity.

The production-payment method of income support seems to me to provide the best means of providing for the free flow of goods from farm to market, with the least possible interference with our free enterprise system, and with the best prospect for the absorption of surpluses by an increase in domestic consumption. It largely solves the problem of costly surplus disposal in the most advantageous and economic way possible. It gives every promise of avoiding the scandalous destruction of food wealth in order to maintain prices artificially.

Farmers lost markets because the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act discriminated against them. Let us not lose markets because our own price-support programs discriminate against us. This would be disastrous to our national economy. We live in a world that is in dire need of agricultural products. Our farmers and workers need that market if we are to build a healthy America.

We cannot lose sight of the need of maintaining farm production. Good, sound conservation of our soil is an essential of a wise farm program. We need grass, legumes, and green manure crops. We need erosion control. We need to build up and restore the soil resources which suffered because of the need for large war crops. National prosperity depends upon natural resources, and the greatest of these is our soil. These are the things a sound farm program needs and it is a program that I will continue to work for.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, not in a long time have I seen or heard as much confusion, misapprehension, and misunderstanding as to just what a bill does as I have heard against the pending farm measure.

In the first place the Pace bill is not the so-called Brannan bill. It does contain two parts of the proposal made by Mr. Brannan; namely, a modernized parity formula and authorization for a trial run on three commodities. I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture for the past 5 years and have done my best to help work out a satisfactory long-range program for a stable agricultural economy. I was one of those members of the committee who traveled over much of the country by bus, plane, train, and car to hear the testimony of the farmers and ranchers in their own back yards. We heard little farmers and big farmers, sharecroppers, tenants, and everyone else actively engaged in the production of food and fiber which feeds and clothes this country and a good part of the world. In my opinion, at least 90 percent of the witnesses to appear before that committee endorsed without reservation two propositions; namely, an adequate soil conservation program and support prices based on 100 percent of parity.

The first proposition, soil conservation, is not in issue here. However, the second proposition, the 100 percent support price for basic agricultural commodities is in issue here. The Pace bill contains the modernized parity formula which means not 50 or 60 or 90, but 100 percent of parity. The average farmer cannot understand why the minimum wage for labor is based on a 100 percent dollar when his support price is 90 percent of a 100 percent dollar. Neither can he understand why postal subsidies, shipbuilding and ship-operating subsidies, airline subsidies and tariff protection, which is of course a blood brother to a subsidy, and other governmental subsidies are based on 100 percent when his own prices have been based on only 90 percent.

This bill is designed to meet the changes in our economy. The first farm legislation was enacted back in the thirties when times were hard. Changes were made immediately before the war and during the war. During the war we needed unprecedented production of nearly all agricultural commodities but today, with the diminishing demand from our foreign markets and the slackening purchases at home, we must necessarily change legislation to meet changing economic conditions. Instead of today urging all out production, we must resort to less production or greater consumption if we are to avoid a repetition of collapsing farm prices. During the war days we had a sellers' market. Today it is fast becoming a buyers' market.

In the opinion of the 17 Democrats on the House Committee on Agriculture, this bill represents the best legislation we can offer. It is not perfect of course but it can and will be changed as time and practice bring out any defects it might contain.

For one of the few times in history, for the past several years the farmers of this Nation have been eating at the first table. We believe this legislation will continue to give them an even break with other economic groups of this country.

A good many Members seem to think the Pace measure involves more regimentation and control that does the Aiken bill. The truth is that section 202 (A) of the Aiken Act provides as follows:

> The Secretary, through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him, is authorized to support prices of agricultural commodities to producers through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations.

Now if that does not mean that the sky is the limit so far as trial runs are concerned, then I do not know what the language means. The Pace bill offers a far more conservative approach in delineating the trial run phase.

For the information of the House, I include as a part of my remarks a statement of the Commodity Credit Corporation's operations as of May 31, 1949, which should be of intense interest to those who really have the welfare of agricultural interests at heart.

Commodity Credit Corporation, as of May 31, 1949

	Loans outstanding	Loans of banks acting as lending agencies	Total
Upland cotton	$413,150,624	$214,906,539	$628,057,163
American Egyptian cotton	157,215	----------	157,215
Flaxseed	2,722,642	250,349	2,972,991
Peanuts	8,873,132	1,454,500	10,327,632
Soybeans	7,120,354	644,058	7,764,412
Irish potatoes	2,863,262	1,597,977	4,461,239
Barley	17,937,863	720,244	18,658,107
Dry edible beans	4,889,100	165,901	5,055,001
Corn	112,845,266	236,848,155	349,693,420
Grain sorghums	4,364,740	148,026	4,512,766
Oats	6,808,190	508,044	7,316,234
Dry edible peas	2,338	473	2,811
Rice	8,578	----------	8,578
Rye	537,196	27,478	564,673
Wheat	96,501,559	6,005,420	102,506,979
Tobacco	138,993,416	----------	138,993,416
Naval stores (rosin and turpentine)	123,634	----------	123,634
Total	817,899,109	463,277,162	1,281,176,272

Commodity inventories

American Egyptian cotton	$7,087
Upland cotton	140,250
Flax fiber	144,758
Butter	1,452,529
Dried milk	2,467,891
Flaxseed	126,027,295
Linseed oil	59,903,920
Peanuts	24,152,549
Soybeans	9,073,780
Prunes	683,501
Raisins	195,445
Potato starch	517,389
Irish potatoes	4,214,725
Barley	15,415,948
Dry edible beans	27,473,164
Corn	729,195
Grain sorghums	49,509,826
Oats	1,579,753
Rice	15,362
Rye	336,803
Hay and pasture seeds	162,995
Wheat	392,201,389

Wool:	
Appraised	$68,338,740
Unappraised	8,103,353
Dried eggs	72,092,789
Eggs, liquid or frozen	58
Naval stores	18,889,932
Tobacco	1,744,318
Total price-support inventories	885,574,745
Supply program	
Dried milk	$8,543,014
Cottonseed oil	624,132
Soybean oil	978,912
Soybeans	2,588,322
Potato flour	1,407,881
Barley	1,102,456
Corn	8,324,332
Flour	587,956
Grain sorghums	92,548
Oats	54,128
Dry edible peas	263,041
Rye	1,559,948
Wheat	62,151,031
Mexican meat	34,311,534
Salted pork	48,892
Total	122,638,127

All inventories, supply and price support, $1,008,212,872.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the parliamentary situation to be that the vote first will be upon the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], which is the committee bill with some modifications, in substitution for the bill which I have offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated that the question now is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PACE and Mr. GORE.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 152, noes 222.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JULY 25, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the majority leader about the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it is very fitting that the gentleman do so at this time when such a large number of Members are present.

On Monday we will take up the poll-tax bill, H. R. 3199, under the operation of the 21-day rule.

For Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, I have bracketed only two bills out with rules: H. R. 3829, to provide assistance to schools on account of war-incurred enrollments; and H. R. 29, rather interesting at this time, to provide parity for tung nuts and honey.

If rules are reported out on the following bills they will be called up for consideration: H. R. 1758, to amend the Natural Gas Act; and H. R. 5472, the rivers and harbors public works bill.

Conference reports, of course, will be in order at any time. If there is any further program it will be announced in due time next week.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

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, pursuant to House Resolution 283 he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. The vote now is on the Gore amendment as amended by the Sutton amendment and other amendments?

The SPEAKER. On the amendment as reported to the House by the Committee of the Whole.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 239, nays 170, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—239

Abbitt	Case, N. J.	Gavin
Abernethy	Case, S. Dak.	Gillette
Allen, Calif.	Chelf	Golden
Allen, Ill.	Chiperfield	Goodwin
Allen, La.	Church	Gore
Andersen, H. Carl	Cole, Kans.	Gossett
Anderson, Calif.	Cole, N. Y.	Graham
Andresen, August H.	Colmer	Grant
Andrews	Cooper	Gregory
Angell	Corbett	Gross
Arends	Cotton	Gwinn
Auchincloss	Coudert	Hale
Barden	Cox	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Barrett, Wyo.	Crawford	Hall, Leonard W.
Bates, Ky.	Cunningham	Halleck
Bates, Mass.	Curtis	Hand
Battle	Dague	Harden
Beall	Davis, Ga.	Hardy
Bennett, Fla.	Davis, Tenn.	Hare
Bennett, Mich.	Davis, Wis.	Harrison
Bishop	DeGraffenried	Harvey
Blackney	D'Ewart	Hébert
Bland	Dolliver	Herlong
Boggs, Del.	Dondero	Herter
Bolton, Md.	Donohue	Heselton
Bolton, Ohio	Doughton	Hill
Bonner	Durham	Hinshaw
Boykin	Elliott	Hobbs
Bramblett	Ellsworth	Hoeven
Brehm	Elston	Hoffman, Ill.
Brown, Ga.	Engel, Mich.	Hoffman, Mich.
Brown, Ohio	Engle, Calif.	Holmes
Bryson	Evins	Hope
Burleson	Fellows	Horan
Burton	Fenton	Hull
Byrnes, Wis.	Ford	Jackson, Calif.
Camp	Frazier	James
Canfield	Fugate	Jenison
Carlyle	Fulton	Jenkins
Cavalcante	Gamble	Jennings
Celler	Gary	Jensen
Chesney	Miller, Nebr.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Christopher	Monroney	Scrivner
Chudoff	Morton	Scudder
Clemente	Murray, Tenn.	Secrest
Combs	Murray, Wis.	Shafer
Cooley	Nelson	Short
Crook	Nicholson	Simpson, Ill.
Crosser	Nixon	Simpson, Pa.
Davenport	Norblad	Smith, Kans.
Davies, N. Y.	Norrell	Smith, Va.
Dawson	O'Hara, Minn.	Smith, Wis
Deane	O'Konski	Stefan
Delaney	Passman	Stockman
Denton	Patterson	Taber
Douglas	Pfeiffer, William L.	Talle
Doyle	Philbin	Taylor
Eberharter	Phillips, Calif.	Tollefson
Fallon	Phillips, Tenn.	Underwood
Feighan	Pickett	Van Zandt
Fernandez	Plumley	Velde
Fisher	Potter	Vinson
Flood	Poulson	Vorys
Fogarty	Preston	Vursell
Forand	Rains	Wadsworth
Furcolo	Rankin	Weichel
Garmatz	Reed, Ill.	Wheeler
Gathings	Reed, N. Y.	Whitaker
Gordon	Rees	Whitten
Gorski, Ill.	Regan	Whittington
Gorski, N. Y.	Rich	Wigglesworth
Granahan	Richards	Williams
	Riehlman	Wilson, Ind.
	Rivers	Wilson, Tex.
	Rogers, Fla.	Winstead
	Rogers, Mass.	Withrow
	Sadlak	Wolcott
	St. George	Wolverton
	Sanborn	Wood
	Sasscer	Woodruff
	Scott, Hardie	

NAYS—170

Addonizio	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Albert	Green	O'Hara, Ill.
Aspinall	Hagen	O'Neill
Bailey	Harris	O'Sullivan
Baring	Hart	O'Toole
Barrett, Pa.	Havenner	Pace
Beckworth	Hays, Ohio	Patman
Bentsen	Hedrick	Patten
Biemiller	Heller	Perkins
Blatnik	Holifield	Peterson
Boggs, La.	Howell	Poage
Bolling	Huber	Polk
Bosone	Irving	Price
Breen	Jackson, Wash.	Priest
Brooks	Jacobs	Quinn
Buchanan	Javits	Rabaut
Buckley, Ill.	Jones, Mo.	Ramsay
Burdick	Karst	Redden
Burke	Karsten	Rhodes
Burnside	Kee	Ribicoff
Byrne, N. Y.	Kelley	Rodino
Cannon	Keogh	Rooney
Carnahan	King	Sabath
Carroll	Kirwan	Sadowski
Celler	Klein	Sheppard
Chesney	Kruse	Sikes
Christopher	Lane	Sims
Chudoff	Lanham	Smathers
Clemente	Lesinski	Spence
Combs	Lind	Steed
Cooley	Linehan	Stigler
Crook	Lyle	Sullivan
Crosser	Lynch	Sutton
Davenport	McCarthy	Tackett
Davies, N. Y.	McCormack	Tauriello
Dawson	McGrath	Teague
Deane	McGuire	Thomas, Tex.
Delaney	McKinnon	Thompson
Denton	McSweeney	Thornberry
Douglas	Madden	Trimble
Doyle	Magee	Wagner
Eberharter	Mahon	Walsh
Fallon	Mansfield	Walter
Feighan	Marcantonio	Welch, Calif.
Fernandez	Marsalis	Welch, Mo.
Fisher	Marshall	White, Calif.
Flood	Miller, Calif.	White, Idaho
Fogarty	Mills	Wickersham
Forand	Mitchell	Wier
Furcolo	Morgan	Willis
Garmatz	Morris	Wilson, Okla.
Gathings	Moulder	Woodhouse
Gordon	Multer	Worley
Gorski, Ill.	Murdock	Yates
Gorski, N. Y.	Noland	Young
Granahan	Norton	Zablocki
	O'Brien, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—23

Buckley, N. Y.	Clevenger	Eaton
Bulwinkle	Dingell	Gilmer
Chatham	Dollinger	Hays, Ark.

Heffernan	Pfeifer,	Staggers
Kennedy	Joseph L.	Stanley
McGregor	Powell	Thomas, N. J.
Morrison	Roosevelt	Towe
Murphy	Smith, Ohio	Werdel

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Hayes of Arkansas against.

Mr. Werdel for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Stanley for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Staggers against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Clevenger.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FULTON. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FULTON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture for further study.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. On that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 384, nays 25, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—384

Abbitt	Bland	Chesney
Abernethy	Boggs, Del.	Chiperfield
Addonizio	Boggs, La.	Christopher
Albert	Bolling	Chudoff
Allen, Calif.	Bolton, Md.	Clemente
Allen, Ill.	Bolton, Ohio	Cole, Kans.
Allen, La.	Bonner	Colmer
Andersen,	Bosone	Combs
H. Carl	Boykin	Cooley
Anderson, Calif.	Bramblett	Cooper
Andresen,	Breen	Cotton
August H.	Brehm	Cox
Andrews	Brooks	Crawford
Angell	Brown, Ga.	Crook
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Crosser
Aspinall	Bryson	Cunningham
Auchincloss	Buchanan	Curtis
Bailey	Buckley, Ill.	Dague
Barden	Burdick	Davenport
Baring	Burleson	Davis, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Burnside	Davis, Tenn.
Barrett, Wyo.	Burton	Davis, Wis.
Bates, Ky.	Byrne, N. Y.	Dawson
Bates, Mass.	Byrnes, Wis.	Deane
Battle	Camp	DeGraffenried
Beall	Cannon	Delaney
Beckworth	Carlyle	Denton
Bennett, Fla.	Carnahan	D'Ewart
Bennett, Mich.	Carroll	Dolliver
Bentsen	Case, S. Dak.	Dondero
Biemiller	Cavalcante	Donohue
Bishop	Celler	Doughton
Blackney	Chelf	Douglas
Doyle	Kee	Potter
Durham	Keefe	Poulson
Eberharter	Kelley	Preston
Elliott	Keogh	Price
Ellsworth	Kerr	Priest
Elston	Kilburn	Quinn
Engel, Mich.	Kilday	Rabaut
Engle, Calif.	King	Rains
Evins	Kirwan	Ramsay
Fallon	Klein	Rankin
Feighan	Kruse	Redden
Fellows	Kunkel	Reed, Ill
Fenton	Lane	Reed, N. Y.
Fernandez	Lanham	Rees
Fisher	Larcade	Regan
Flood	Latham	Rhodes
Fogarty	LeCompte	Richards
Forand	LeFevre	Riehlman
Ford	Lemke	Rivers
Frazier	Lesinski	Rodino
Fugate	Lichtenwalter	Rogers, Fla.
Furcolo	Lind	Rogers, Mass.
Gamble	Linehan	Sadlak
Garmatz	Lodge	Sadowski
Gary	Lovre	St. George
Gathings	Lucas	Sanborn
Gavin	Lyle	Sasscer
Gillette	Lynch	Scott, Hardie
Golden	McConnell	Scott,
Gordon	McCormack	Hugh D., Jr.
Gore	McCulloch	Scrivner
Gorski, Ill.	McDonough	Scudder
Gorski, N. Y.	McGrath	Secrest
Gossett	McGuire	Shafer
Graham	McKinnon	Sheppard
Granahan	McMillan, S. C.	Short
Granger	McMillen, Ill.	Sikes
Grant	McSweeney	Simpson, Ill.
Green	Mack, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Gregory	Mack, Wash.	Sims
Gross	Macy	Smathers
Gwinn	Madden	Smith, Kans.
Hagen	Magee	Smith, Va.
Hale	Mahon	Smith, Wis.
Hall,	Mansfield	Spence
Edwin Arthur	Marcantonio	Steed
Hall,	Marsalis	Stefan
Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa	Stigler
Halleck	Martin, Mass.	Stockman
Hand	Merrow	Sullivan
Harden	Meyer	Sutton
Hardy	Michener	Taber
Hare	Miles	Tackett
Harris	Miller, Calif.	Talle
Harrison	Miller, Md.	Taylor
Hart	Miller, Nebr.	Teague
Harvey	Mills	Thomas, Tex.
Havenner	Mitchell	Thompson
Hays, Ohio	Monroney	Thornberry
Hébert	Morgan	Tollefson
Hedrick	Morris	Trimble
Heller	Morton	Underwood
Herlong	Moulder	Van Zandt
Herter	Multer	Velde
Heselton	Murdock	Vinson
Hill	Murray, Tenn.	Vorys
Hinshaw	Murray, Wis.	Vursell
Hobbs	Nelson	Wadsworth
Hoeven	Nicholson	Wagner
Hoffman, Ill.	Nixon	Walsh
Hoffman, Mich.	Noland	Walter
Holifield	Norblad	Weichel
Holmes	Norrell	Welch, Mo.
Hope	O'Brien, Ill.	Wheeler
Horan	O'Brien, Mich.	Whitaker
Howell	O'Hara, Ill.	White, Calif.
Huber	O'Hara, Minn.	White, Idaho
Hull	O'Konski	Whitten
Irving	O'Neill	Whittington
Jackson, Calif.	O'Sullivan	Wickersham
Jackson, Wash.	O'Toole	Wier
Jacobs	Pace	Wigglesworth
James	Passman	Williams
Jenison	Patman	Willis
Jenkins	Patten	Wilson, Ind.
Jennings	Patterson	Wilson, Okla.
Jensen	Perkins	Wilson, Tex.
Johnson	Peterson	Winstead
Jonas	Pfeiffer,	Withrow
Jones, Ala.	William L.	Wolcott
Jones, Mo.	Philbin	Wolverton
Jones, N. C.	Phillips, Calif.	Wood
Karst	Phillips, Tenn.	Woodhouse
Karsten	Pickett	Woodruff
Kearney	Plumley	Worley
Kearns	Poage	Young
Keating	Polk	Zablocki

NAYS—25

Blatnik	Corbett	Judd
Burke	Coudert	Kean
Canfield	Davies, N. Y.	McCarthy
Case, N. J.	Fulton	Marshall
Church	Goodwin	Mason
Cole, N. Y.	Javits	Norton
Ribicoff	Sabath	Tauriello
Rich	Smith, Ohio	Yates
Rooney		

NOT VOTING—23

Buckley, N. Y.	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Roosevelt
Chatham	Kennedy	Staggers
Clevenger	McGregor	Stanley
Dingell	Morrison	Thomas, N. J.
Dollinger	Murphy	Towe
Eaton	Pfeifer,	Welch, Calif.
Gilmer	Joseph L.	Werdel

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Stanley with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Welch of California.

Mr. McCARTHY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BLATNIK changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISCRIMINATION IN USE OF TAX-SUPPORTED RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Many people believe that, if preferences, likes and dislikes, differences of opinion, growing out of physical or mental racial characteristics, can be eliminated, people as a whole will be much happier, make greater progress in every field of human endeavor.

At the Tower of Babel, about 2247 B. C., an effort was made to establish one language for all the people. Now, apparently some are making an effort to establish on earth one race, brought about by the intermingling and interbreeding of all races.

If the Lord wanted but one race, humans of but one color, perhaps he would have seen to it that the children of Adam and Eve, when they came out of the Garden, bred true to type and color.

He had another opportunity when Noah and his family came out of the Ark.

Little is to be gained by ignoring the fact, for it is a fact, that ever since Moses led the children of Israel out of Egypt—yes, and before that time—there have been conflicts between races—yes, and even between tribes or subdivisions of the same race.

Individuals and groups of one race from the beginning of time have had preferences for those who were members of the same race. They have, if you prefer, discriminated against members of other races.

We all, as individuals, exercise a preference when we select our social and business associates. It is absurd to deny this obvious fact; to attempt by legislation to eradicate this preference or, again if you prefer, this discrimination.

Perhaps the simplest form of preference or discrimination is that which moves every mother, whether human or animal, to have a preference for and to protect her young; always, in the case of

some animals—sometimes, although infrequently in the case of humans—from the father.

Families usually stick together, discriminate against nonmembers of the family.

Towns, cities, and States, since the beginning of our history, have exercised a preference for their inhabitants; discriminated against nonresidents.

Yes, even today, if I want to fish in Maryland or Virginia, I must pay a fee over and above that charged the residents of those States. True, that fee is not imposed upon me because I am a member or a nonmember of a particular race, but it is imposed because I am a resident of another State, either the State of my origin or the State of my adoption.

It must be admitted that some Negroes—and where I grew up, they were known as colored people—prefer to associate with members of their own race. A similar feeling exists among some members of the white race.

As immigrants continued to come to this country, they settled, if possible, near people of their own race or nationality who had preceded them. The Hollanders and the Germans settled in communities where they found individuals from their own land. The Swedes, the Norwegians, the Italians, the Irish, the Jews—in fact, those of every nation, every nationality, followed a like course of preference or discrimination.

After thousands of years of experience it would seem as though it might be assumed that individuals and members of a race will always have a preference for other individuals of their own race or creed or individuals who have similar habits or follow similar practices.

And so we get to the point where we must acknowledge that each and every one of us, either as individuals or as members of a race or group, has a preference, and so, as some would put it, discriminate against others.

Preference or discrimination being an existing characteristic of most of our people, it seems to be our duty to, insofar as we can, through education and legislation, attempt to minimize the unpleasantness, the strife, and the harmful results, caused not only by any unjust discrimination, but by the bitter feeling created by self-serving or even sincere but misguided advocates who, on so many occasions, take advantage of isolated instances of harmful discrimination.

Christians have long sought to minimize, to render less harmful, any evil growing out of such an apparent preference, with its resulting so-called discrimination.

Advocates and trouble makers, who are never happy unless creating discord, disunity, and lack of harmony, have always sometimes for their own advancement, financial or political; at other times, because the spirit of the devil seemed to be in them, capitalized on this inherent racial or religious feeling.

It is long past the time when we here in the Nation's Capital should attempt to do something practical to minimize, insofar as is possible, all discrimination in employment and in social intercourse, remembering, however, at all times that we cannot, by legislation nor by force, obliterate inherent human characteristics.

Whether we should, by legislation or by education, seek a common ground on which can be established an intermingling and interbreeding of all races on this earth and the establishment of a new universal race of men is not the issue I am proposing to consider. Nor do I assent in any way to Hitler's theory of a race of supermen, to be created through selective human breeding to attain a special purpose.

Accepting facts as they exist and as they are known to all, I am seeking a way so that everyone, no matter what his color or origin, may have equal opportunity; to, here in the District of Columbia, the seat of the National Government, create a situation which may act as a proving ground where we can test some of the theories, some of the plans, which look toward the end of discrimination which creates injustices.

Here in the District, where perhaps 35 percent of the population is colored—although what proportion of the District or Federal tax the 35 percent pays I do not know—there is continual although undercover strife because of the policy of segregation in the utilization of public recreational facilities.

Ignoring the situation, permitting troublemakers to have their way, may, in the end, bring us not only to local civil strife, but perhaps in a large section of the country and in some of our cities to civil war.

I am appealing to all those who believe that the District of Columbia, being the seat of the National Government, is an ideal place to try out some of the legislation which has for its purpose the end of unjust discrimination because of race or color.

Colored folks are entitled to an equal opportunity in the employment of tax-supported recreational facilities. They are entitled, if they prefer, to associate with, and only with, members of their own race and color. Whites are entitled to the same privilege.

There is no more discrimination in denying to a colored man the right to swim with his white brother than there is in forcing the white brother to swim with the colored man.

If the colored man is to be given the legal right to go where he wishes when he wishes, associate with whom he will, then the white man should be given the equal right.

If it be said that the white man has the right to associate with the colored man, is it not equally true that the colored man has the right not to associate with the white man? Has one a preference, the other none?

If I have the right to go into the park and sit on one end of a bench on which sits a colored man, has he not the right to get up and walk away, find a seat alone or with other colored men?

Should not the banning of segregation also carry with it a declaration that the members of each race shall have the right, if they wish, to associate only with the members of their own race?

In my boyhood days, near the end of the underground railway in Michigan I associated with colored boys and girls. They attended the same day and Sunday school that I attended. Some of them were members of my school and Sunday-school classes. My first business partner was a colored boy, and there was in that community no question of race, color, or creed.

Here in Washington, the situation is entirely different. The question of discrimination, the question of segregation, is one which concerns the welfare of the District, it may be of the Nation.

Believing as I do that everyone, white as well as colored, should be able, insofar as is possible, to exercise his own natural preference as to association; believing as I do that there should be no discrimination in the enjoyment of tax-supported recreational facilities; believing as I do that you cannot, by legislation, successfully, while retaining individual freedom and liberty, force individuals to disregard their preferences, their inherent likes and dislikes and without strife join in one mass group where everyone will be happy, I am introducing a bill which should, in my opinion, aid, at least here in this community, in solving the question of segregation.

The bill is very simple in its provisions. The present issue here in the District seems primarily to center around the question of the use of swimming pools. The District has six.

The bill suggests that two be turned over for the exclusive use of the colored folks; a like number for the use of the whites, and that two be set aside for the joint use of all those who wish an intermingling of the races.

It seems to me that, if each group, that is, the colored, the white, and the colored and the white, is given equal opportunity to follow its own desires, none should complain.

The solution of the other questions which may arise over the use of other recreational facilities, such as baseball diamonds, tennis courts and so on, is not quite so simple, but there is no reason to believe that competent, understanding administrators, familiar with the conditions here in the District, cannot, if they so desire, solve all controversies which may arise, without undue appeal to either the police force or the courts.

SUBSTITUTION OF CONFEREES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the appointment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] as a conferee on the bill H. R. 5632, on account of illness in his family, which takes him out of the city, and to substitute in his place the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is relieved as conferee, and the Chair appoints the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] in his stead, and the Clerk will notify the Senate accordingly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Credit Union bill, and in parallel columns to state the present law and what is proposed.

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

There was no objection.

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

ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL SCHOOL AGENCIES

Mr. McSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 292) on the bill (H. R. 3829) to provide assistance for local school agencies, for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3829) to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MR. A. F. WHITNEY

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, America lost a great man and an outstanding leader of labor last Saturday with the death of Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Mr. Whitney was a labor statesman of the highest order who devoted his entire life to the cause of labor and American democracy. As a champion of human rights, Al Whitney fought ably and consistently in behalf of the people to realize the promises of the good life for all Americans. As a leader of labor, his was a life of devotion to labor progress and better working conditions for the workers. For this he has earned the gratitude of every American.

His record of public service will serve as a shining example to all of us, and he will long be remembered with affection by everyone who had the privilege of knowing and associating with him. His untimely death leaves a great gap in the ranks of labor, and it will be difficult to find a man of his stature to succeed him.

I know that the House will be interested to learn that the executive board of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen has chosen Mr. Parker Kennedy, general secretary and treasurer of that worthy organization, to succeed Mr. Whitney as president until the union's next national convention. It is my belief that the selection of Mr. Kennedy, who comes from my home State of Minnesota and whom I know personally, was a wise choice, and I know that he will carry on the fight for labor's rights in the spirit of A. F. Whitney. In this great undertaking I wish him well.

PROGRAM FOR FRIDAY, JULY 22, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inform the Members that there will be no business tomorrow. We must meet tomorrow to receive a message that must be submitted while the House is in session, but there will be no business transacted. The Members can proceed with that distinct understanding.

PENSIONS FOR MEMBERS OF THE POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, presented a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2021) to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McSWEENEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News and a letter from the Council of Churches of Buffalo, N. Y.

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

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $260.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the United States Naval Institute proceedings, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $380.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on Federal aid to education.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a translation of the constitution of the Communist Party of China, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $380.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a survey recently made by the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., in respect to certain bills introduced in the House.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. GATHINGS) for an indefinite period on account of illness in family.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administraiton, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution to provide for on-the-spot audits by the General Accounting Office of the fiscal records of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the

President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3901. An act to increase the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 22, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

JULY 14, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXVII, I, Hon. JOHN R. WALSH, move to discharge the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4495) entitled "A bill to provide additional benefits for certain postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service with respect to annual and sick leave, longevity pay, and promotion, and for other purposes" which was referred to said committee May 3, 1949, in support of which motion the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives affix their signatures, to wit:

1. John R. Walsh.
2. Earl T. Wagner.
3. Thomas J. Lane.
4. Edward H. Kruse, Jr.
5. Jack Z. Anderson.
6. Ray J. Madden.
7. Harold C. Hagen.
8. Vito Marcantonio.
9. Roy W. Wier.
10. J. W. Trimble.
11. George D. O'Brien.
12. George H. Christopher.
13. Wayne L. Hays.
14. Fred Marshall.
15. Winfield K. Denton.
16. A. A. Ribicoff.
17. Richard Bolling.
18. Andrew Jacobs.
19. Usher L. Burdick.
20. Clyde Doyle.
21. Thurman C. Crook.
22. James E. Noland.
23. Donald W. Nicholson.
24. Frank Buchanan.
25. Eugene J. Keogh.
26. Foster Furcolo.
27. Mike Mansfield.
28. Abraham J. Multer.
29. Alvin E. O'Konski.
30. Joseph R. Bryson.
31. Franck R. Havenner.
32. Harold A. Patten.
33. Charles R. Howell.
34. Richard J. Welch
35. Frank L. Chelf.
36. Helen Gahagan Douglas.
37. Thomas H. Burke.
38. Tom B. Fugate.
39. Chester A. Chesney.
40. Barratt O'Hara.
41. E. H. Hedrick.
42. Gerald R. Ford, Jr.
43. John A. Blatnik.
44. Andrew J. Biemiller.
45. Gordon L. McDonough.
46. William T. Byrne.
47. John Lesinski.
48. Gardner R. W'throw.
49. John J. Rooney.
50. Wm. Lemke.
51. Robert T. Secrest.
52. James G. Polk.
53. A. L. Miller.
54. Cecil R. King.
55. Albert M. Cole.
56. Mary T. Norton.
57. Chet Holifield.
58. Neil J. Linehan.
59. Laurie C. Battle.
60. Walter S. Baring.
61. Merlin Hull.
62. Reva Beck Bosone.
63. Herbert A. Meyer.
64. Chester E. Merrow.
65. Daniel J. Flood.
66. Toby Morris.
67. Harry J. Davenport.
68. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
69. Hugh J. Addonizio
70. J. Hardin Peterson.
71. Eugene D. O'Sullivan.
72. A. J. Sabath.
73. James F. Lind.
74. Hamilton C. Jones.
75. Cecil F. White.
76. Paul W. Shafer.
77. Frank B. Keefe.
78. Edith Nourse Rogers.
79. Ben F. Jensen.
80. James E. Van Zandt.
81. Clare Magee.
82. L. Gary Clemente.
83. Dayton E. Phillips.
84. C. W. Bishop.
85. Louis B. Heller.
86. Walter A. Lynch.
87. Sidney R. Yates.
88. Robert L. Ramsay.
89. Homer D. Angell.
90. Thor C. Tollefson.
91. Carl Hinshaw.
92. Norris Poulson.
93. Donald L. Jackson.
94. Edward J. Hart.
95. Donald L. O'Toole.
96. R. W. Hoffman.
97. John A. McGuire.
98. Earl Wilson.
99. Boyd Tackett.
100. Edward A. Garmatz.
101. Walter E. Brehm.
102. Melvin Price.
103. John E. Fogarty.
104. Herman P. Eberharter.
105. Henry M. Jackson.
106. Wright Patman.
107. Clark W. Thompson.
108. Dwight L. Rogers.
109. Edgar A. Jonas.
110. George M. Rhodes.
111. Thomas S. Gordon.
112. Arthur G. Klein.
113. Carroll D. Kearns.
114. Clement J. Zablocki.
115. Anthony Cavalcante.
116. B. W. Kearney.
117. James J. Murphy.
118. Harry P. O'Neill.
119. James C. Auchincloss.
120. Augustine B. Kelley.
121. Walter B. Huber.
122. Frank A. Barrett.
123. Wesley A. D'Ewart.
124. Jacob K. Javits.
125. Harold D. Donohue.
126. Jos. P. O'Hara.
127. John E. Miles.
128. Chas. A. Wolverton.
129. Ivor D. Fenton.
130. J. Glenn Beall.
131. L. H. Gavin.
132. Overton Brooks.
133. Hugh B. Mitchell.
134. Christopher C. McGrath.
135. Clifford Davis.
136. Henry D. Larcade, Jr.
137. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.
138. Carl D. Perkins.
139. Carl Elliott.
140. Carl Vinson.
141. Dean P. Taylor.
142. Martin Gorski.
143. A. S. J. Carnahan.
144. Walter Norblad.
145. Clinton D. McKinnon.
146. T. H. Werdel.
147. Cleveland M. Bailey.
148. Peter F. Mack, Jr.
149. Chase Going Woodhouse.
150. Lindley Beckworth.
151. James G. Fulton.
152. Clair Engle.
153. T. Vincent Quinn.
154. Lawrence H. Smith.
155. Hardie Scott.
156. Victor Wickersham.
157. Earl Chudoff.
158. Gordon Canfield.
159. John Phillips.
160. Thomas E. Morgan.
161. Harley O. Staggers.
162. Philip J. Philbin.
163. William L. Dawson.
164. Monroe M. Redden.
165. Otto E. Passman.
166. John A. Carroll.
167. William T. Granahan.
168. H. R. Gross.
169. Anthony F. Tauriello.
170. W. K. Granger.
171. Robert Crosser.
172. George G. Sadowski.
173. John B. Sullivan.
174. Henry J. Latham.
175. Compton I. White.
176. Karl Stefan.
177. John C. Kunkel.
178. Leonard Irving.
179. Cecil M. Harden.
180. James B. Hare.
181. W. L. Pfeiffer.
182. Paul Cunningham.
183. John Sanborn.
184. Jesse P. Wolcott.
185. Morgan M. Moulder.
186. Charles E. Potter.
187. Charles P. Nelson.
188. R. B. Chiperfield.
189. Richard Nixon.
190. Norris Cotton.
191. Oren Harris.
192. Leroy Johnson.
193. H. Carl Andersen.
194. Wayne N. Aspinall.
195. Edward Breen.
196. Ralph E. Church.
197. Thomas J. O'Brien.
198. John H. Kerr.
199. James T. Patterson.
200. John Davis Lodge.
201. Michael J. Kirwan.
202. Chester C. Gorski.
203. Wint Smith.
204. Leo E. Allen.
205. M. G. Burnside.
206. Hale Boggs.
207. J. B. Frazier, Jr.
208. E. C. Gathings.

209. Francis E. Walter.
210. Edwin Arthur Hall.
211. Ernest K. Bramblett.
212. Hubert B. Scudder.
213. John Kennedy.
214. Hugo S. Simms.
215. Franklin Lichtenwalter.
216. Edward T. Miller.
217. W. A. Barrett.
218. Stephen M. Young.

This motion was entered upon the Journal, entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with signatures thereto, and referred to the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees, July 21, 1949.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

783. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $98,500 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 266); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

784. A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting a report showing a list of contracts executed, by negotiation, for experimental, development, or research work, for the period January 1 to June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

785. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the survey of the accounting system of internal control of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1947 and 1948 (H. Doc. No. 267); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

786. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize temporary aid to and repatriation of needy nationals of the United States in foreign countries, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

787. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to evaluate and to waive collection of certain financial assistance loans, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

788. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report showing claims paid under part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), for the fiscal year July 1, 1948, to June 30, 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. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 289. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 29, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide parity for tung nuts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1086). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4569. A bill authorizing the transfer of Fort Des Moines, Iowa, to the State of Iowa; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1095). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REGAN: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2733. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Canadian River reclamation project, Texas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1096). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Committee. S. 1285. An act to authorize progressive partial payments to sponsors under the Federal Airport Act program; without amendment (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4239. A bill to amend section 6 of the Federal Airport Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Second Intermediate Report. Inquiry into certain operations of Institute of Inter-American Affairs Group of Corporations based on General Accounting Office Audit Reports; without amendment (Rept. No. 1105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 292. Resolution for consideration of 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 1106). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee of Conference. H. R. 2021. A bill to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1107). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 584. A bill for the relief of Mike Clipper; without amendment (Rept. No. 1087). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1020. A bill for the relief of Moody L. Smitherman, Jr., a minor, and Moody L. Smitherman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1088). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1600. A bill for the relief of Gustav Schilbred; without amendment (Rept. No. 1089). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3536. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1090). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4414. A bill for the relief of Dora M. Barton; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1091). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5019. A bill for the relief of Fella H. Holbrook; without amendment (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5148. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5525. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1871. A bill for the relief of Hilde Flint; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1097). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4042. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Yannopoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5276. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia (Iole) M. Stefani Lencioni; without amendment (Rept. No. 1099). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 219. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due to and render judgment upon the claims of the employees of The Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2457. A bill for the relief of Helen Morren; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3252. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zelma Inez Cheek; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1104). 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. PRIEST:

H. R. 5716. A bill to authorize the Public Health Service to admit to its hospitals persons committed by State courts who are beneficiaries of the Service or narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 5717. A bill to authorize the construction of levees, flood walls, and appurtenant works at Barbourville, Ky., for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 5718. A bill to authorize grants to the States for surveying their need for elementary and secondary school facilities and for planning State-wide programs of school construction; and to authorize grants for school construction, for advance planning of school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 5719. A bill extending for a period of 1 year the provisions of certain naturalization laws, insofar as they relate to veterans of the war with Spain, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 5720. A bill to provide for the operation of a general surgical and medical hospital at the Veterans' Adminstration domiciliary facility, Clinton, Iowa; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 5721. A bill declaring the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power and setting forth ways and means of achieving these objectives; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'SULLIVAN:

H. R. 5722. A bill to amend section 602 (v) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the payment of disability benefits to certain totally disabled veterans who had insurance on August 1, 1946; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 5723. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of Fort Vancouver; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 5724. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to limit importations of petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 5725. A bill to stimulate the exploration for strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution to provide for equality of opportunity in the enjoyment of public recreational facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. Res. 290. Resolution relating to the presence of a quorum in committees and subcommittees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 291. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Bulletin No. 940 of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, entitled "Occupational Outlook Handbook"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. QUINN:

H. R. 5726. A bill for the relief of Margaret Frankell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 5727. A bill for the relief of Greta Struch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5728. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Santina D'Augustino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 5729. A bill for the relief of Frank W. Cox and the estate of W. N. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 22, 1949

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 2, 1949)

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

Rev. James H. Elder, pastor, First Methodist Church, Gallatin, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, Thou hast given to us the highest privilege of creation by making us the sons of God. Cause us to do the duty of sons that we may never lose our title to an inheritance so glorious.

Thou knowest, Father, how often in these days of confusion and chaos we tremble with fear. Yet Thou knowest that we tremble with fear only because we often drift too far from the side of the Good Shepherd. So draw us so close to Thyself that whatever happens to us personally, to the Nation, or to the world, we may move forward, fearing God and nothing else.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 21, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 21, 1949, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 863. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; and

S. 1359. An act to repeal the provisions of the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and sections 91 to 107 of the Canal Zone Code and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such provisions are applicable.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. BATES of Massachusetts had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5632) to reorganize fiscal management in the National Military Establishment to promote economy and efficiency, and for other purposes, vice Mr. COLE of New York, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5345) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 298) to provide for on-the-spot audits by the General Accounting Office of the fiscal records of the office of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Chavez	Ferguson
Anderson	Connally	Flanders
Brewster	Cordon	Frear
Bricker	Donnell	Fulbright
Butler	Douglas	George
Byrd	Downey	Gillette
Cain	Dulles	Graham
Capehart	Eastland	Green
Chapman	Ecton	Gurney
Hayden	McCarran	Robertson
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Russell
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Saltonstall
Hill	McFarland	Schoeppel
Hoey	McKellar	Smith, Maine
Holland	McMahon	Smith, N. J.
Humphrey	Magnuson	Sparkman
Hunt	Malone	Stennis
Ives	Martin	Taft
Jenner	Maybank	Taylor
Johnson, Colo.	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Johnson, Tex.	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Thye
Kefauver	Mundt	Tydings
Kem	Murray	Vandenberg
Kerr	Myers	Watkins
Knowland	Neely	Wherry
Langer	O'Conor	Wiley
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Williams
Long	Pepper	Withers
Lucas	Reed	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed an adviser to the delegation of the United States of America to the Second World Health Organization Assembly, meeting at Rome, Italy.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] is absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4830) making appropriations for foreign aid for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I make inquiry of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and of the majority leader? If we proceed with the consideration of the foreign aid appropriation bill is it their intention that the Senate vote on committee amendments today, if we should come to the point where the Senate is ready to vote?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I understand there will be objection to voting on some of the committee amendments today.

Mr. WHERRY. May I inquire of the distinguished majority leader if it is the intention to proceed with the consideration of the foreign aid appropriation bill now? In view of the fact that there are so many controversial amendments to the bill, there might possibly be an inclination to take up the independent offices appropriation bill rather than proceed with the foreign aid appropriation bill. I am not suggesting that the Senate do so. I wish to say that in the event the Senate comes to the point where it is ready to vote on the committee amendments, it is all right with me to do so. There will be plenty of speeches