

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6942. A bill for the relief of Hisako Nakane; without amendment (Rept. No. 1682). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6793. A bill for the relief of Fujiko Fukuda; without amendment (Rept. No. 1683). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7094. A bill for the relief of Kazuyo Dohi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1684). 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. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7396. A bill to enable the States to make more adequate provision for special services required for the education of physically handicapped children of school age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7397. A bill to provide for the promotion of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service in recognition of longevity of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 7398. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7399. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 104, subsections (a) and (b), to create a Greenville division in the northern district of Mississippi, with terms of court to be held at Greenville; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 7400. A bill to enable the States to make more adequate provision for special services required for the education of physically handicapped children of school age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 7401. A bill to allow to a retail dealer in gasoline a refund of the Federal tax paid on gasoline which is lost by the retailer through evaporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 7402. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 7403. A bill to amend the Social Security Act in order to prohibit the requirement of support from relatives as a condition of granting old-age assistance or aid to the needy blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 7404. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to make permanently effective the provisions of title I of such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 7405. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site for, and the construction of, a Federal building in Scranton, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 7406. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in west Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 7407. A bill to provide for issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the opening of the Erie Canal in New York State; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. Res. 485. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 7058, a bill to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 486. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 5074, a bill to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 487. Resolution to take off all taxes on bread and butter; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 7408. A bill for the relief of Christos Haralamos Marasaglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNOS-ISERN:

H. R. 7409. A bill for the relief of Maria Rozas Espiñeira de Colchero Arrubarrena, Fernando Colchero Rozas, and Fernando Colchero Rozas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 7410. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kiyoko Tanaka Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 7411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Ruth Sattler McLaughlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 7412. A bill for the relief of Roberto Nicolas Nassor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCSWEENEY:

H. R. 7413. A bill for the relief of James T. M. Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 7414. A bill for the relief of Teresa Gentile and Galliano Gentile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 7415. A bill for the relief of Clifford D. Smitherman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7416. A bill for the relief of Miss Suzuko Takanashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1895. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to securing additional financial aid for the Waltham Watch Co. from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1896. Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to remove existing taxes on admissions to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by

charitable and nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1897. By Mr. MACK of Washington: Resolution of the South Bend, Wash., Chamber of Commerce, asking immediate action by Congress to stabilize our national economy; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1898. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lewis E. Park, chairman, Industrial Arts Club, Kansas City, Mo., endorsing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1899. Also, petition of Philipp N. Poulleys, president, Pan-Messenian Federation of America, Boston, Mass., relative to the treatment being given Greek children from the Province of Messenia, Greece, by the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1900. Also, petition of Dr. Louis Kreshtool, secretary, Delaware State Dental Society, Wilmington, Del., requesting that compulsory health insurance be not imposed upon the citizens of this Nation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1901. Also, petition of Mercedes Mennecke, president, American Legion Auxiliary, Summit, Ill., opposing the Hoover reports pertaining to proposed changes in the Veterans' Administration and in the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1902. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Resolution of Queen Annes County Petroleum Industries Committee, Centreville, Md., requesting repeal of the Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1950)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D. offered the following prayer:

God our Father, we thank Thee for the unquenchable impulse toward Thee which Thou hast planted within us. Open our eyes to see Thee and our hearts to feel Thee, not just out on the rim of the universe, in some distant star, but in human love which hallows our own lives, which at its best bears witness to Thee and alone can heal the hurt of the world. Conscious of Thy overshadowing presence, we pray for fidelity as we face the issues of these momentous days. Committing our souls unto Thee, who knowest the way we take, bring us forth as gold tried in the fire. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 22, 1950, was dispensed with.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

#### 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:

Alken	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Benton	Hickenlooper	Malone
Brewster	Hill	Martin
Bricker	Hoey	Maybank
Butler	Holland	Millikin
Byrd	Humphrey	Morse
Cain	Hunt	Mundt
Capehart	Ives	Murray
Chapman	Jenner	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Darby	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Knowland	Sparkman
Ecton	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Leahy	Taylor
Ferguson	Lehman	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Frear	Long	Thye
Fulbright	Lucas	Tobey
George	McCarran	Tydings
Gillette	McCarthy	Watkins
Graham	McClellan	Wherry
Green	McFarland	Wiley
Gurney	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	McMahon	Withers

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD and for printing in the Appendix, without debate and without speeches.

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

#### CLEAR RADIO CHANNEL—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER CO-OPERATIVES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, in Chicago, Ill., on January 12, 1950, relating to clear channels for rural radio service.

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

CLEAR CHANNEL RESOLUTION, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER CO-OPERATIVES, ADOPTED JANUARY 12, 1950, CHICAGO

#### RURAL RADIO SERVICE

Knowing that radio service is vital to our rural population, the National Council of

Farmer Cooperatives hereby expresses its opposition to any legislation which would impair or prevent the improvement of rural radio service, which at best is quite inadequate.

Many of the rural people depend to a large extent upon clear-channel stations for their radio service and such service should be protected and improved. This is even more true now because we realize that television, now available to large metropolitan areas, will not be available to many rural areas for an indefinite period.

Therefore, the council requests that no action be taken by the Congress or the Federal Communications Commission which would allow the breaking down of clear channels serving rural areas. On the contrary the council urgently recommends that such clear-channel stations be granted sufficient facilities to serve farm communities and rural areas not presently enjoying the superior radio service available to all metropolitan areas.

In recent months the United States has been a party to an international radio frequency allocation conference with other North American nations. During that conference the council vigorously protested the demands of the Cuban Government for broadcasting rights on channels which are so essential to the people of the United States. The council again requests that the United States Department of State maintain a firm stand against the attempted inroads of foreign nations on radio channels utilized by stations in the United States.

#### FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID TO LOCAL SCHOOLS—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the extent to which public opposition has developed on the principle of Federal financial aid in support of local schools is forcefully pointed up by a resolution adopted February 8 by the Nebraska State School Boards Association, in convention at Grand Island, Nebr.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and that it be appropriately referred for the consideration of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

#### NEBRASKA STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION ADOPTED IN CONVENTION FEBRUARY 8, 1950, AT GRAND ISLAND, NEBR.

#### FEDERAL AID

Whereas it is recognized by the convention delegates here gathered that taxes are mushrooming under all kinds of subterfuges, and that the greatest percentage of total taxes are exacted by the Federal Government; and that the present trend will lead to an impossible burden on farmers, laborers, businessmen and all other citizens; and

Whereas it is further recognized that however vital the need may be, in individual cases, further Federal aid for any purpose to any special interest will be only an entering wedge, and that more and more grants will be demanded and allowed. It is recognized that there is already alarming dissipation of funds between Federal-tax collections and net productive expenditures for specific projects, with the result that Federal aid to schools will require far more tax collections than will finally arrive at the local classroom; and

Whereas we recognize that further tapping of the Federal Treasury for any form of Federal aid to education must necessarily be financed from some form of additional

taxes on all American citizens, including those of Nebraska; and

Whereas it is felt that the Nebraska State Legislature had not made full and exhaustive use of our own resources to meet the educational crisis within our own boundaries: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Nebraska State School Boards Association take a strong stand opposing all new forms of additional Federal aid to education, except in areas disturbed by military installations, and that all human forces of our State be mobilized in a concentrated effort to focus the attention and action of our State legislature on the financial needs of Nebraska schools, in an effort to keep the Federal Government from forcing its way into the schoolrooms of Nebraska to solve our problems for us; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be mailed to every Member of the United States Congress and the Nebraska State Legislature; and be it finally

*Resolved*, That this association make every possible effort to recruit the coordinated assistance of all educational, community, farm, labor and business associations and social clubs of Nebraska to obtain adequate State financing for our own Nebraska educational program.

#### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1151. A bill to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1279).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4502. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain easement near Fort Belvoir, Va., in exchange for another easement elsewhere on the same property; without amendment (Rept. No. 1280); and

H. R. 5503. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to release and quitclaim a portion of a right-of-way easement to Langley Air Force Base, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1281).

By Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 5921. A bill to terminate lump-sum benefits provided by law to certain Reserve officers of the Navy and Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 1282).

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 23, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 204. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche;

S. 229. An act for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.;

S. 309. An act for the relief of Gabe Budwee;

S. 321. An act for the relief of Lloyd D. Lyles;

S. 481. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Clarence Herbert Hartman, a minor;

S. 563. An act for the relief of the P. S. Cook Co.;

S. 914. An act for the relief of Gladys Inez Greenwood;

S. 1449. An act for the relief of Robert B. Workman;

S. 1916. An act for the relief of Edna A. Bauser;

S. 1933. An act for the relief of C. L. Leflingwell and others;

S. 1990. An act to amend section 429, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the act of August 5, 1882, as amended, so as to substitute for the requirement that detailed an-



nual reports be made to the Congress concerning the proceeds of all sales of condemned naval material a requirement that information as to such proceeds be filed with the Committee on Armed Services in the Congress; and

S. 2520. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted devised land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Oscar M. Jonas, of Milwaukee, Wis., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Wisconsin;

Craig Pottinger, of Nogales, Ariz., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz.;

Louis T. Rocheleau, of Woonsocket, R. I., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R. I.; and

Ellis Campbell, Jr., of Dallas, Tex., to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas, vice John B. Dunlap, resigned.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3104. A bill to protect the National Security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. ROBERTSON introduced Senate bill 3105, to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3106. A bill to authorize appropriations for the eradication and control of halogeton on public lands; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Virginia will be printed in the Record. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3105) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

#### EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF BILL BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

In 1947 the Board of Governors brought to the attention of the Congress the need for more adequate building facilities at branches of the Federal Reserve banks, pointing out that this need could not be met because of a provision in the law placing a limit of \$250,000 upon the cost of any such building (ex-

clusive of the cost of vaults, permanent equipment, furnishings, and fixtures). At that time, in order to take care of the most urgent needs for additional construction, Congress provided that this limit should not apply as long as the aggregate of such costs thereafter incurred for all branch bank buildings, with the approval of the Board of Governors, was not in excess of \$10,000,000.

Under that authority, with the approval of the Board, a building has been purchased in Cincinnati, Ohio; construction has been undertaken at Portland, Oreg., Seattle, Wash., and Detroit, Mich.; and funds have been earmarked for construction at Jacksonville, Fla. However, major additions are badly needed at Los Angeles, Calif., Pittsburgh, Pa., and Omaha, Nebr., to provide satisfactory working conditions, and, on the basis of present estimates, it would not be possible to complete these programs within the existing limitation.

Most of the buildings occupied by branches of the Federal Reserve banks were acquired or constructed more than 20 years ago, and, in view of expanded activities since that time, additional space is needed at a number of other branches. For that reason, additional construction is contemplated at Buffalo, N. Y., Louisville, Ky., San Antonio, Tex., Baltimore, Md., Charlotte, N. C., Birmingham, Ala., Nashville, Tenn., Denver, Colo., Oklahoma City, Okla., El Paso, Tex., Houston, Tex., and Salt Lake City, Utah. It is clear that this additional construction cannot be undertaken within the limitation in the existing law, and for that reason the amendment which I am proposing will increase the limitation to \$25,000,000.

It should be borne in mind that all expenses in connection with the construction and enlargement of Federal Reserve branch bank buildings are met by the Federal Reserve banks out of their own funds. No appropriation of Government funds is involved. Moreover, the Board of Governors, as an agency of the Government, is vested with the general supervision of the Federal Reserve banks, and in the exercise of its supervision all construction projects with respect to branch bank buildings come before the Board of Governors for its approval. In each case the Board considers the proposal in the light of the needs of the branch, the type of building to be constructed, the reasonableness of the cost, the availability of materials, whether the construction at the time is generally in keeping with the prevailing economic situation, and other pertinent considerations.

#### COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MALONE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCARRAN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of the committee to House Joint Resolution 398, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WHERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of the committee to House Joint Resolution 398, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### LINCOLN REPUBLICANISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR IVES

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the Lincoln Day ad-

dress entitled "Lincoln Republicanism," delivered by him at a meeting held under the auspices of the Republicans of Schenectady County, at Schenectady, N. Y., on February 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### AMERICA, WORLD LEADER AGAINST IMPERIALISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GILLETTE

[Mr. HUNT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on the subject America, World Leader Against Imperialism, delivered by Senator GILLETTE, at the Arlington Jewish Center, February 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### MANKIND AT THE CROSSROADS—AD- DRESS BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

[Mr. GRAHAM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by Senator KEFAUVER at the young Democrats' rally in Greensboro, N. C., February 11, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### WHAT THE REPUBLICAN POLICY STATE- MENT REALLY SAYS ABOUT A BIPARTI- SAN FOREIGN POLICY

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "GOP Policy on Bipartisanship," published in the Daily Plainsman of Huron, S. Dak., together with a statement by himself, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED?—ADDRESS BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on the subject What Have You Learned? delivered by David Lawrence, at the commencement exercises of Temple University, February 15, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NYLONS AND LIPSTICKS RUIN MARSHALL PLAN—ARTICLE FROM KANSAS CITY STAR

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Nylons and Lipsticks Ruin Marshall Plan," published in the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of February 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE DANGER TO AMERICA—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "With the World on Fire," published in the Arizona Republic, the Indianapolis News, and the Muncie (Ind.) Press, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE OF POLICE OFFICERS

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a communication and statement of Howard J. Devaney, president of the New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Inc., relative to the opposition of the association to H. R. 6000, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### RESCUE OF GREEK CHILDREN—PLEA BY ARCHBISHOP MICHAEL

[Mr. GRAHAM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a plea by Archbishop Michael that Greek children be rescued, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### HOW MUCH OF THE WORLD?—ARTICLE BY LIVINGSTON HARTLEY

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "How Much of the World?" written by Livingston Hartley and published in Freedom and Union for January 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

# WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME— AMERICAN DAY CONTEST ADDRESS BY ANNE PINKNEY

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a prize-winning address by Anne Pinkney, of Trinidad, Colo., in the 1950 I Am An American Day contest, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE COAL SITUATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Miners' Rebellion," from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 21, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

## PRAYER FOR PEACE—POEM BY JAMES PATRICK MCGOVERN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Prayer for Peace," composed by James Patrick McGovern, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THESE DAYS—ARTICLE BY GEORGE SOKOLSKY

[Mr. CHAPMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "These Days," by George Sokolsky, published in the Washington Times-Herald of February 23, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

## DISPLACED PERSONS — EDITORIALS, NEWSPAPER COMMENT, AND LETTERS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD editorials, newspaper articles, and letters from responsible persons in the United States bearing on the subject of displaced persons.

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

[From the Washington Star of February 20, 1950]

## DP'S ARE APT TO LEAVE SUDDENLY, FARMERS IN NEARBY STATES FIND

(By William A. Millen)

An up-to-date version of How You Gonna Keep 'Em Down on the Farm? is plaguing Maryland and Virginia farmers who have employed displaced persons.

A tendency of the recently arrived Europeans to move out without warning was cited by area farmers as probably their greatest fault.

L. M. Walker, Jr., Virginia commissioner of agriculture and State DP committee chairman, put it this way:

"The biggest all-around objection is that the DP's leave suddenly, and the farmers are left high and dry. The farmer provides a house and some furniture. But he still is worried whether the DP will be there next week or will move to the big cities—Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore, or Washington."

He blamed the screening of DP applicants in Europe—an apparent failure to select farm people for farm work.

Virginia has about 120 DP families now. About 40 percent of these originally employed on farms have switched to other occupations. More than half the Virginia DP's are Ukrainians, with Lithuanians and Poles making up most of the others.

Dr. T. B. Symons, dean of the School of Agriculture at the University of Maryland, figures Maryland has between 400 and 500 DP's.

In addition to a need for screening, Dr. Symons believes the DP program would be improved by a follow-up check on performances, a requirement that DP farmers remain

on farms for a reasonable time, and that they be registered for a reasonable period.

Anne Arundel County's members resigned recently from the Governor's Committees for the Resettlement of Displaced Persons. They charged the DP program has been haphazard.

Anne Arundel County Agent Stanley E. Day said that often farmers turn out to be tailors, beekeepers or florists.

To illustrate, he told how one DP family, given a chicken by a farmer, had to ask him to kill it for them.

Other difficulties arise from the difference in languages. Some farmers, believing they were more than generous in wages and living quarters, were amazed to find DP's walking out on them at a minute's notice, Mr. Day said.

At Joyce Lane, Md., Dr. Charles E. Iliff, a Baltimore eye specialist, invited a young Ukrainian family to work on his farm last May. The DP's were given a third-floor apartment in the large farmhouse, with their own bath, radio, and a large fan to keep cool in the summer.

The Ukrainian woman did not know how to cook, so Mrs. Iliff patiently coached her. The immigrant often talked about how nice things were back home and said that someday, when the Russians left, they would move back. Almost without warning last month, the Ukrainians left the Iliff farm.

On the Arnold, Md., Angus cattle farm of Charles B. Lynch, there's an empty house. It was prepared for another Ukrainian family last April. Last month the tenants shoved off for parts unknown.

In Montgomery County, where some of the first DP's landed, there has not been a request for a DP farm family in 10 months.

S. Gilbert Brown, manager of the Silver Spring office of the Maryland Employment Security Department, said, "they went sour on us and the word spread like wildfire."

Now, instead of the 14 DP families in the county, there are four such groups, all Lithuanians, he said.

Montgomery County Agent O. W. Anderson said the DP's "showed they were interested only in getting into this country and then going their own way."

Dissatisfaction also was expressed by Agent P. E. Clark of Prince Georges County, where 30 foreign families still reside on farms.

"They should be called in many cases misplaced persons instead of DP's," he said, "They are chosen like picking a pig out of a bag. They land in Baltimore and the farmer is told to meet them there. The DP's have pictured to them that this is a land of milk and honey, and somebody will take care of them."

But not all the criticism of DP farm families is derogatory. Many hard-working groups have proved satisfactory, as tomorrow's concluding article will describe.

## PHILADELPHIA, February 7, 1950.

Senator McCARRAN:

Please note editorial herewith from the Philadelphia, Pa., Bulletin of February 4, 1950. Then eye front-page story of today (Feb. 7) Philadelphia, Pa., Inquirer on subject DP's. In the light of almost 4,500,000 unemployed in the United States of America, why admit DP's.

Also, I think our over-all population in the United States of America is 150,000,000 and there is no need of any folk from Europe or Asia.

With this four million and a half unemployed, many of whom are GI's, let's try to help them. I'm looking at it from a purely American angle. Do not listen to pressure groups—let's help our own American born. We owe it to them as do our Congressmen and Senators. I hope you agree.

Yours truly,

J. P. DEVIR.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of February 4, 1950]

## A NEW BLOW AT DP'S

When Senator PAT McCARRAN assented to release of the DP bill from the Judiciary Committee, where it had so long been kept in pickle, it was assumed that he was ready to see the measure passed in the form that the committee had given it. But he has now shown his invincible opposition to relief for these unfortunate people by proposing a strangling amendment.

He would prohibit further admissions under the act if the country's unemployment total should exceed 4,000,000, or if the number of married couples doubled up with others in dwelling units should be above 2,000,000. Unemployment in December was estimated at 3,500,000. The number of doubled-up persons was reported to be 2,040,000 in April last.

Now that the bill is before the Senate the mischief which the Nevada Senator can do would be limited to the number he can muster in support of the amendment. A bill for removal of discriminating features of the present act has passed the House, and is expected to be approved in some form by the upper branch of Congress.

Relief of the displaced persons is backed by the administration, and has been supported by national leaders of both parties. It is now the responsibility of the Senate to see that a measure is passed that fulfills all reasonable requirements. The measure approved by the Judiciary Committee still retains restrictions that limit the effectiveness of the relief sought. The Senate committee bill is some improvement on the present law, but it would be better to bring it more into line with the House measure.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 7, 1950]

## FOUR MILLION FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHTY THOUSAND IDLE IN UNITED STATES; HIGHEST TOTAL SINCE WAR

WASHINGTON, February 6.—The Census Bureau reported today that unemployment rose to a postwar high of 4,480,000 in mid-January. Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer said it was due largely to seasonal lay-offs.

The estimated number of jobless on January 14 was 991,000 greater than on December 10, and 1,816,000 greater than January 1949.

Sawyer stressed the fact that industrial employment did not appear to be materially affected.

## INCREASE EXPECTED

He said an increase in joblessness was expected between December and January because of curtailment in seasonal industries, and bad weather in many parts of the country which caused lay-offs of construction and farm workers.

Total employment was estimated at 56,947,000 persons, down 1,609,000 from December. (The drop in employment was greater than the rise in unemployment because some part-time workers left the labor market.)

Employment last year at this time was 57,414,000 persons.

## INDUSTRIAL LAY-OFFS

Sawyer pointed out that unemployment figures rose similarly between December 1943 and January 1949. That rise was more serious than the present one, he indicated, because industrial lay-offs were an important factor.

Unemployment, fed by continuing industrial lay-offs, rose steadily throughout the winter and spring of 1949 to reach a peak of just over 4,000,000 in last summer's recession.

## PREDICTED PROSPERITY

The jobless total dropped last fall to about 2,700,000 and most economists began the new year with optimistic statements that



the country had snapped back from the recession and was due for a relatively prosperous 1950.

The Census Bureau broke down its total employment figures into 50,749,000 in non-agricultural work and 6,198,000 agricultural jobs. The comparable figures for December 10 were 51,783,000 and 6,773,000.

SWANTON, VT., January 25, 1950.

Senator PATRICK MCCARRAN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Recently received your "Displaced Persons: Facts Versus Fiction" and am very glad to know that there are some people in Washington, D. C., that are not afraid to call a spade a spade.

I am a member of the Memorial Methodist Church of Swanton, Vermont, holding the position of Charge Lay Leader, a member of Memphremagog Lodge, No. 65, F. & A. M., Newport, Vermont, a member of the Franklin County Farm Bureau, Franklin County Vermont, a member of the Vermont Society of Mayflower Descendants, member of the Vermont Society, Sons of the American Revolution, member of the Swanton Board of Trade.

With the unemployment situation as bad as it is I believe that it is the height of folly to admit so many displaced persons.

I am very well acquainted with the unemployment situation—Robert W. Shaw was graduated from the Swanton High School last June. The only work that he could find was working for the State of Vermont painting bridges and cutting grass for 75 cents per hour. Wonder what Robert thinks of the American Way of Life. However, Robert is taking a course of study with the Franklin Institute of Rochester, New York, and hopes eventually to land a job working for the Government.

Very sincerely,

ALDEN K. SHAW.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,

Kansas City, Mo., January 11, 1950.

Mrs. C. WALTERS,

Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MRS. WALTERS: This will acknowledge your letter of January 7, 1950, to the commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars, regarding the displaced persons' situation.

This organization has consistently fought against displaced persons being brought into the country and have testified in Congress on the present bill which would allow 200,000 more of Europe's displaced persons to enter the United States over and above the regular immigration quota.

Very truly yours,

JAMES K. FRY, Assistant,  
(For George L. MacElcay, Chief,  
Division of Employment.)

NEW YORK CITY COLONY,

NATIONAL SOCIETY NEW

ENGLAND WOMEN,

Douglas Manor, N. Y., January 21, 1950.

HON. PAT MCCARRAN,

United States Senator, Senate Office  
Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you so much for your statement before the Senate on January 6, 1950, on displaced persons, copy of which I received yesterday.

For a long time I have been in favor of a reduction in immigration quotas and a cessation of all immigration for at least 5 years, increased patrol of our Mexican border and the Gulf of Mexico shore line through which countless immigrants enter the United States.

I could make good use of 25 extra copies of your statement and hope I am not asking too many. Will you be good enough to have your secretary send them to me?

With appreciation of your effort to control the displaced persons matter, including immigration to the United States, which really means "conquest by immigration," I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPHINE W. OTTMAN,  
Chairman, National Defense,  
New York City Colony, NSNEW.

P. S.—Please keep up your good work. H. R. 4567 should be defeated.

CHICAGO, ILL., January 17, 1950.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,  
Chairman, Judiciary Committee,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Congratulations on your splendid opposition to the DP advocates who would deliberately or thoughtlessly intensify our domestic unemployment situation.

Personally I feel that our obligation to the 60,000,000 American children, rapidly growing up and entering the job market, is in itself an overwhelming argument not only to stop the DP movement but to halt all immigration indefinitely if not permanently.

You will note from the enclosed clipping that my views on this subject recently appeared in the Chicago Tribune.

May your good work continue.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. ROGERS.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 18, 1950]

#### DP'S AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES

CHICAGO, December 27.—Every few days we read that two or three thousand more DP's are arriving in this country. At the same time our unemployment problem is becoming more acute. Government and AFL figures show there are now more than 5,000,000 Americans seeking employment. Any suggestion that still more DP's or other immigrants be admitted is preposterous, if not an actual crime against American labor. It's time to wake up and stamp out this DP racket and also crack down on the thousands of aliens being smuggled into our country.

The unemployment situation alone justifies the complete stoppage of all immigration, but there is another reason vastly more important. I refer to our obligation to the 60,000,000 American children (50,000,000 under 16), most of whom will be in the job market during the next two decades. That's twice the number of adults who will die or retire during the same period and never before have we faced such an awesome challenge. The least we can do is preserve every job opportunity for our own progeny.

The Truman administration claims to be a friend of American labor and the American family. Now is their chance to prove it.

R. W. ROGERS.

LAFAYETTE COUNCIL, No. 59,

ORDER OF INDEPENDENT AMERICANS,

Hazleton, Pa., February 1, 1950.

HON. PAT MCCARRAN,

Senator from Nevada,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Have received one of your pamphlets of your talk on immigration and displaced persons and those who have unlawfully come into our country, which was a good article and very interesting.

We being considered a small country along side of some of the European countries, and with all of these people coming into our country unlawfully and otherwise, and when here we will have to care for them along with all the unemployed that we have to care for, it will be coming to a point where it will be creating chaos for us.

I have written to both Senator MARTIN and Senator MYERS, from Pennsylvania, ask-

ing them to use their support and influence against this bill H. R. 4567, and also asking them to use their influence toward appropriating enough money to deport all these aliens to the countries of their origin.

A copy of what was sent to the other Senators:

At a regular stated meeting of Lafayette Council, No. 59, Order of Independent Americans, held January 31, 1950, the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, We advocate that the Displaced Persons Act be strictly enforced. And that bill 4567 be defeated in its entirety: Be it further

"Resolved, That Congress appropriate sufficient money to deport the 3,000,000 or more people who have come into our country unlawfully back into the country of their own origin."

I trust that you can muster enough votes to hold the lines and defeat these people who are for everlastingly trying to force this issue for personal gains more than anything else.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE C. SCHATZ.

FREDERICK, MD., February 3, 1950.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: Please accept my thanks for your kindness and courtesy in sending me a copy of your remarks on displaced persons, which, I am happy to say, I heartily approve and concur in. As a matter of fact, I would go even a step further and stop all immigration for the next 50 years. If we ever have another recession in this country (which I hope and pray we will not, but I fear that we will) it will simply mean that we will just have so many more people to take care of. Sooner or later we are going to realize we just can't take care of the entire world, and we must stop somewhere along the line.

I am sending you a clipping from the local paper that I feel sure you will appreciate. What is our country coming to? I am just an old retired soldier, one who loves his country dearly, but it makes me wonder sometimes as to just where are we headed for?

It was especially pleasing to me to see on your folder (not printed at Government expense). Would that more and more of our leaders would do likewise. Again my thanks for your courtesy.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. HOLT,  
Colonel, United States Army, Retired.

[From the Frederick (Md.) News of February 1, 1950]

#### A SOCIALISTIC U. S. A.?

Would you like to live in a Socialist America? Most Americans wouldn't. But there's a real danger that we will—whether we want it or not.

One of the main roads to socialism is government ownership and control of important businesses. The electric light and power business is one—and this map shows how far the Government is in it already.

Every white dot—209 of them—on the map marks an electric power plant now operated or financed by our Federal Government. Every black dot shows where another Government power plant is being built, expanded, or proposed. In all, over 700 places in 44 States. And a long step toward a socialistic U. S. A.

Most of the people who speak for more Government control over American life don't want a socialistic nation. They have other reasons for Government control.

But when Government, moving step by step, controls enough things, we'll have a

Socialist government, whether we want it or not. And, instead of our freedom, we'll have Government control, not only over business but over churches, schools, homes—our whole lives.

THE POTOMAC EDISON CO.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of February 14, 1950]

# DP RACKET BARED TO ENTER UNITED STATES ON FALSIFIED RECORDS

(By Josephine Ripley)

Many displaced persons have been attempting to enter the United States illegally under fraudulent documents, and some have succeeded, Congress has been told.

This is reported to be part of a fairly widespread racket among the DP's who have been bribing German police officers to falsify residence documents in order to establish eligibility for United States emigration.

About 500 fraudulent registrations have been uncovered in the Munich area alone, Donald W. Main, senior officer for the Displaced Persons Commission in Munich, informed a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

Of these, probably 100 slipped into the United States before this illegal activity was disclosed, Mr. Main estimated.

## ELIGIBILITY DATE FRAUD

Purpose of this fraud, it was explained, was to establish record of a German residence prior to December 22, 1945. This is the date after which displaced persons seeking sanctuary are ineligible for emigration to the United States. It is a cut-off date which has barred many who are eligible in every other way.

Under the new displaced-persons bill just reported out by the Senate Judiciary Committee, the eligibility date is moved up to January 1, 1949.

The only bribe of which Mr. Main knew personally was one involving a suit of clothes which was promised to a German police officer in exchange for the false residence paper.

The Counter Intelligence Corps of the Army and the Displaced Persons Commission became suspicious of this racket with the sudden influx of some 300 applications giving Schneitsee, Germany, as the place of residence. Prosecutions by the military government in these cases are now in process, Mr. Main informed the committee.

Fraudulent registrations also have been reported by CIC in nine other towns, he stated.

Mr. Main indicated that the CIC had only scratched the surface of this practice. He said he had been told by the CIC in the Munich area that if it had the authority to check police registrations in every locality within its jurisdiction, which covers about half of Bavaria, it felt fraudulent records would be uncovered in 80 percent of these towns.

There was no evidence given before the subcommittee to indicate that these fraudulent records involved the efforts of Communists or other subversives to gain entry to the United States. When questioned as to how many Communists may have come in as displaced persons, Mr. Main said he had no knowledge or opinion. He did assert, however, that it would be possible for spies or Communists to enter under the displaced-persons law or as regular immigrants.

It is impossible, he said, to frame a law which will positively screen them out.

Mr. Main spoke somewhat critically of the policies of the Displaced Persons Commission, with which he frequently disagreed.

He reported that on cases which he recommended be turned down, he frequently was reversed by higher-ups in the Frankfurt headquarters. Mr. Main estimated that in about 10 percent of the cases which he had handled, his recommendation for nonadmission had been reversed by higher authorities.

He reported, however, that in 9 percent of these split-decision cases he had been upheld by the United States consulate, the office issuing the final visa under the regular immigration laws.

It was apparent from Mr. Main's testimony that the dispute arose over an interpretation of the law. The Commission took upon itself authority to pass on the eligibility of the applicant only with relation to the requirements of the displaced-persons law, and not with relation to immigration regulations which it left to immigration authorities. Mr. Main, an immigration officer on loan to the Displaced Persons Commission, construed it as his duty to consider the record of the applicant from both aspects.

## OFFENDERS TURNED DOWN

Most of those which he had questioned, he said, had records which he felt would make them inadmissible on the grounds of moral turpitude. He spoke of two cases of minor thefts, one involving six shoestrings, and another a can of spam. In both cases the offender had been convicted and so had a record. In both cases the displaced persons were turned down by the consulate.

Mr. Main testified that he was never overruled by the Displaced Persons Commission authorities on cases involving previous involvement of the applicant with Fascist or Communist organizations, although the Displaced Persons Commission had ruled that membership in the VVN—an organization of persecuted displaced persons—did not necessarily bar the applicant from emigration to the United States even though the organization of persecuted displaced persons was 40 percent Communist.

The purpose of the Senate subcommittee in investigating this situation is to find out whether subversives are entering the United States as displaced persons, and in what way the displaced-persons law or the regular immigration law may be tightened to prevent such infiltration.

## THE AMERICAN LEGION,

DEPARTMENT OF UTAH,

Salt Lake City, Utah, January 25, 1950.

Hon. PAT McCARRAN,

Senator from the State of Nevada,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We received your letter of January 19, setting forth the resolution that was passed at our national convention held in Philadelphia, in August last year.

Be assured that the department officers of the American Legion from Utah concur with this resolution.

The pamphlets you mailed to this office have been received and a thorough distribution of your statement will be made to all post commanders and adjutants in the department.

We commend you for the attitude you have taken relative to our immigration laws and we wish to encourage you in your official capacity as chairman of this committee for the stand you are taking. The American Legion is cognizant of the reactions that can come should our immigration laws be modified in favor of foreign emigration. The displaced persons coming to the United States are a positive liability; some adjust themselves immediately, but most of them never become adjusted. The group in the latter category can reasonably be referred to as undesirables and they are a fertile field for the alien propagandists to cultivate undercurrents of un-Americanism.

We are always happy to cooperate with you in promoting anything which will have a tendency to strengthen us as a nation, and we wish you continued success in your endeavors.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE E. LARSEN,

Department Adjutant.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,

February 10, 1950.

Senator PAT McCARRAN,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE McCARRAN: I have observed with interest various news items given by you, as well as your statement before the Senate on Friday, January 6, regarding displaced persons, Facts Versus Fiction, and I want to compliment you on your stand. I think it is way past the time that other Members of Congress should become familiar with the fact that various illegal entries of subversives and others are being made by way of Canada, Cuba, Mexico, etc., into our country. As a matter of fact many entries are being made by members of a sinister cult, the majority of whom are unassimilatory and a danger to our way of life and of a Socialist-Communist variety, regardless of the screening through which some of them go but many of whom avoid. Some are slipped into our country for a mere thousand dollars.

I would like to call your attention, although you may have seen it, to the item in the October 6 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representatives YATES, of Illinois, Subversive Activities of Hate Groups.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT DONNER.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.,

February 16, 1950.

Senator PATRICK A. McCARRAN,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: Although not a constituent of yours, I am taking the liberty of sending you herewith a copy of a letter which is self-explanatory and which may be of interest to you.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the splendid fight you have made and are making to keep undesirable aliens out of our country? With all good wishes for your continued success, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

HOMER G. RICHEY.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.,

February 16, 1950.

EDITOR, RICHMOND TIMES DISPATCH,

Richmond, Va.

(Attention Voice of the People)

SIR: I should first like to acknowledge Mrs. Virginia Hurt's gracious and courageous remarks in her letter to the VOP of February 7. In view of a spate of letters in the VOP of February 16 concerning the DP problem, I should like to point to some ramifications of this problem which have received but little public attention.

It is often argued that present DP legislation discriminates against Jews and Catholics. I fail to see that it discriminates against Catholics at all. Nor does it discriminate against Jews as such, although it is intended to preclude, and properly so, the entry of large numbers of Polish Jews into this country who voluntarily left Poland for Germany in 1946—long after Hitler's forced deportation of DP's had come to an end.

A dispatch of February 13 from Munich in the Chicago Tribune tells some interesting things about the International Refugee Organization, the international group in charge of DP resettlement. A DP in Vienna from one of the Baltic countries insisted that "the Russians have some way of getting information from the IRO. Several times after someone has admitted his anti-Communist feelings . . . it would filter through some place and get into Russian hands."

The dispatch goes on to say, "Most displaced persons will tell you that, although it would be hard to prove that there are



Communist sympathizers among the IRO, it definitely was a disadvantage in getting cleared for United States immigration if one were known as an anti-Communist" (sic).

Instead of passing a liberalized DP bill, Congress ought to start an investigation of the IRO. This organization is supported principally by United States funds and the American taxpayer has a right to know whether he is subsidizing a group composed largely of fellow travelers whose chief mission is to get subversive aliens into the United States. If Congress is in an economizing mood, I can think of no better place to start than the IRO.

HOMER GILMER RICHEY.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,  
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,  
February 7, 1950.

Hon. PAT McCARRAN,  
Member of the United States Senate,  
Committee on the Judiciary,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: As a member and vice chairman of the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I was very much interested in your statement made in the Senate of the United States on Friday, January 6, 1950, copy of which I received recently in the mail.

As you know, our organization has consistently maintained the stand, which has been well expressed by you in this statement. The statement furnishes us with very valuable information which will be of assistance in the drafting of our legislative program.

The entire membership of the second district of the VFW, comprising representatives of all the VFW posts in the second district, city of Seattle, State of Washington, has requested that I write to you reaffirming our position on this matter of displaced persons.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. YOTHERS,  
Vice Chairman, National Legislative  
Committee, VFW.

TASKER L. ODDIE, OF NEVADA

MR. MALONE. Mr. President, former United States Senator Tasker L. Oddie, of Nevada, died on February 17. The story of his political and professional life is parallel to and an integral part of the history of our State of Nevada during the early part of this century.

He dedicated the greater part of his active life to public service.

Tasker L. Oddie served with great distinction one term as Governor of Nevada, from 1911 to 1914, and two terms as United States Senator, from 1921 to 1933.

He was closely associated with Jim Butler, who discovered the great silver mines of Tonopah, Nev., early in this century and continued his interest in mining to the end of his distinguished career.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada, was very close to Senator Oddie during the period from 1927 to 1932, including the period of the development of Boulder Dam, now Hoover Dam, and other public projects affecting the State of Nevada and the other Western States and understood his keen interest in the development of worthy projects.

Senator Oddie played an important part in perfecting the legislation providing for Federal aid to the States in the construction of public roads during the early part of his first term in the Senate. He was also closely connected

with and had a very active part in securing the naval ammunition depot at Hawthorne, Nev., together with Samuel S. Arentz, the Congressman from Nevada, Gov. Fred B. Balzar, and State Senator John H. Miller.

Throughout his long period of service his integrity and ability were unquestioned, and his long record in active public service demonstrated his loyalty and devotion to his State and his country.

Senator Oddie's loss will be deeply felt in our State of Nevada, and throughout the Western States, where he was active both professionally and politically for more than a third of a century.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a news item entitled "Death Takes Tasker Oddie," which appeared in the Reno Evening Gazette on February 18.

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

DEATH TAKES TASKER ODDIE, FORMER GOVERNOR, UNITED STATES SENATOR—RITES MONDAY

Tasker L. Oddie, whose political career in Nevada spanned the first third of the century, died at his San Francisco home late Friday afternoon at the age of 79.

He was Nevada's twelfth governor, the eleventh man to represent this State in the United States Senate, and he had also served in the State senate and as district attorney of Nye County. Playing an important part in Nevada mining development during the Tonopah boom days he also contributed to the progress of his adopted State in many other ways.

Senator Oddie was one of the men responsible for the Hoover Dam project. As a member of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads he succeeded in securing Federal highway money for Nevada. He was prominent in the fight to raise the price of silver to a basis profitable to Nevada mining enterprises. It was also largely through his efforts that Hawthorne was selected as the site for the naval ammunition depot in 1926.

#### SUCCESSFUL GOVERNOR

Regarded as one of Nevada's most successful governors, he took office January 1, 1911, the first Republican to occupy the chief executive's chair in 16 years, and with the aid of a split in the Democratic Party. Always an advocate of good government, he placed public duty above political considerations, insisted on strict economy, and administrative efficiency. He secured the provision of a State tax commission, and sought to abolish numerous boards and offices he thought were unnecessary. Oddie believed that public expenditures should be governed by the rule of whether or not the State would derive benefits therefrom in excess of cost. He was long an advocate of good roads and he also held the office of State engineer to be the most important in the State. Too, he thought the State should interest itself in reclamation projects.

Just before he took office an act prohibiting gambling had gone into effect and he insisted on its strict enforcement. During his term, too, the legislature in 1911 passed a workmen's compensation act. Legislation was also enacted for protection of miners from injury and death underground by requiring modern safety and fire-fighting appliances. During his term, too, the legislature ratified the sixteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, authorizing imposition of Federal income taxes. As Governor he directed a reform of the old methods of assessing property for taxation. In Feb-

ruary of 1912 he called the legislature into session to authorize the State to borrow from the State school fund a sufficient amount to enable the State to transact business on a cash basis.

#### BROOKLYN BORN

Tasker Lownes Oddie was born at Brooklyn, N. Y., October 20, 1870. He was educated at East Orange, N. J., and at the age of 16 came west to ride the range. Returning east he clerked in a wholesale grocery house and studied law, receiving his diploma from New York University in 1895.

He came to Nevada in the employ of Anson Phelps Stokes in 1898, intending to stay for a short time to inspect certain mining claims and railroad interests. He elected to remain and grow up with the country, making his headquarters at Austin. The decision led him on the trail of fortunes, which he made, lost, and made again, although at his death he was not regarded as a wealthy man.

From Austin he went to Tonopah with Jim Butler, who was that district's original discoverer. Oddie was Butler's close legal and financial adviser in the pioneering days when a large portion of the mining world flocked to Tonopah, and later swarmed to Goldfield, and the two were associated with Wilson Brougher. He was a conspicuous figure in the camps but a large part of the fortune he accumulated was expended in grub stakes and in subsequent developments which turned out to be unprofitable. He always believed in Nevada's mining possibilities, and after he left the United States Senate in 1933 he went to look for another fortune in the gold and silver districts, spurning a possible political comeback. He had faith, too, in the agricultural and livestock possibilities of the State.

Admitted to the State bar of Nevada in 1898 he did some law practice in Tonopah and served as Nye district attorney from 1900 to 1902. While serving in the State Senate from 1904 to 1908 he was a proponent of labor legislation and supported the 8-hour law for railroaders and the full crew law. Later as governor nearly all the acts on the statute books in the interests of railroad workers were passed and signed by him.

#### POLITICAL CAREER

He was elected governor in 1910 after a strenuous campaign, and was defeated for reelection by Emmet D. Boyle in 1914. He again opposed Boyle for the governorship in 1918. In 1920 he was elected to the United States Senate, serving two terms. Between 1921 and 1933 he served on numerous influential committees and was chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, was on the Committees on Mines and Mining, Naval Affairs, Reclamation, Public Lands and Appropriations.

After he went down during the Democratic landslide in 1932 he was appointed special advisor to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on mining loans. Then he came back to mining in Nevada. More recently he had lived in San Francisco, spending his summers at Lake Tahoe and still calling Nevada home.

His funeral will be private, and will be held at Gray's Parlor on Divisadero Street, Monday at 1:30 p. m. The request has been made that no flowers be sent.

Senator Oddie married Daisy Rendall, of Los Angeles, November 30, 1918. She survives him as does a brother, Clarence M. Oddie of San Francisco, and a sister, Mrs. Frederick Siebert of Palo Alto. He was a member of the Bohemian Club of San Francisco, was a Knight Templar Mason and Shriner and a member of Reno Lodge, No. 597, BPO Elks. He was a member of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers. During World War I he was chairman of the highways transportation committee in the

Nevada State Council of Defense and chairman of the Nevada District of War Resources Committee.

Senator Oddie was a direct descendant of men who wrote their names in large letters in the history of the Nation's capital in Washington, D. C. He was sixth in line from Christopher Lowndes, early day merchant and shipbuilder in whose ships grain and tobacco were sent to Europe. He was also a descendant of Governor Tasker, one of the early royal governors of Virginia, and of Thomas Bladen, for whom a village was named. Oddie himself gave his name to a mountain in Nevada. He was related to Gen. Tasker E. Bliss, and his great grandfather was Benjamin Stoddert, first Secretary of the Navy and one of the original owners of the land on which the National Capital is built.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask that there be printed at this point an editorial entitled "A Notable Nevada Leader," from the same newspaper, the Reno Evening Gazette of February 18.

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

#### A NOTABLE NEVADA LEADER

For more than 40 years, Tasker L. Oddie was a leading figure in two of Nevada's important fields—mining and politics. The death of the former governor and United States Senator in San Francisco Friday brought to a close a career that paralleled Nevada history in the first half of this century.

Coming to this State in 1898 to look after the mining interests of some New York clients, Oddie remained in Nevada to take part in the discovery of the rich Tonopah mines, and he took an active interest in mining that never left him. With a talent for political affairs, he became district attorney of Nye County, was a member of the State legislature, and then was elected governor when the Republican Party was able to break the power of the allied Democrats and Silver Party followers that had held control of the State for 16 years.

Oddie was elected to the United States Senate in 1920, and he achieved a notable record during his two terms in the upper House of Congress. A conservative Republican, he was an able legislator and his advice carried considerable weight in national affairs. He thoroughly understood the needs of the western States, and was responsible for much Federal legislation for the improvement of this section. He carried on the fight that finally brought about the Boulder Dam project, at that time the largest river and power development that the Federal Government had entered into. The Federal Highway Aid program, in which the Government shared the cost of building roads through the public lands States on a basis of Federal land ownership, was one of Senator Oddie's achievements. Senator Oddie and Nevada's Republican Representative Samuel S. Arentz were responsible for the location of the naval ammunition depot at Hawthorne.

Like many another able and experienced Congressman, Senator Oddie was swept out of office in 1932. Six years later, he was again a candidate, but he could not hope to win against the combined powers of the Federal and State office holders, the regimented relief vote and the millions of boondoggling dollars that were distributed just before election time.

Although he had been retired in recent years, Senator Oddie kept in close touch with political affairs as one of the elder statesmen of the Republican Party, and he retained extensive mining interests in the State.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a part of a column entitled "Nevada Politics," by the Observer, from the Nevada State Journal for February 19, 1950.

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

#### NEVADA POLITICS

(By the Observer)

When Senator Tasker L. Oddie, whose death occurred Friday in San Francisco, landed in Washington, D. C., as a United States Senator early in 1921 he and Mrs. Oddie were greeted with open arms by some Washington oldtimers because of the Senator's family background and Mrs. Oddie's former residence in the Capital. Here's an excerpt from a story in one of the Washington papers published at that time which gives information not generally known here:

"The new senatorial hostesses take rank with the Cabinet women in the social interest of Washington, and in many instances surpass them in the local sense. Senator Oddie, of Nevada, is, for instance, a direct descendant of men who have written their names in large letters in the history of the National Capital, and before its existence, in Virginia and Maryland. He is sixth in line from that veteran merchant and shipbuilder of Bladensburg, Christopher Lowndes, in whose yards were constructed those stout ships in which the planters of the entire section sent off their grain and tobacco to Europe and the east, and in this number must be counted the illustrious planter of Mount Vernon. Mr. Lowndes married Rebecca Tasker, daughter of one royal Governor of Maryland, and the sister of another, that Thomas Bladen, for whom the sleepy village of the eastern branch is named.

"One of Mrs. Lowndes' sisters married Councillor Robert Carter, of Nomini Creek, Va., and these two figured in history as the grandparents of Robert E. Lee. The new Senator from Nevada and Mrs. Oddie will be kept very busy for weeks to come meeting their kindred, who are numerous in and about Washington.

"There is Gen. Tasker E. Bliss, who is likewise descended from the royal Governor Tasker, now in command of the Soldiers' Home. Another illustrious great-grandfather of the Nevada statesman is Benjamin Stoddert, first secretary of the Navy and one of the original proprietors of the land on which the Capital City is built. Mr. Stoddert, a Revolutionary hero, besides his other claims to greatness, married Rebecca Lowndes and reared a large family in the fine old Stoddert mansion, Prospect Hill, in Georgetown. Mrs. Oddie is not a stranger to Washington, since she spent several years here in her girlhood as a student at the National Park Seminary in Forest Glen."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask that there be inserted an editorial entitled "Men of Integrity," from the same newspaper, the Nevada State Journal for February 19.

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

#### MEN OF INTEGRITY

Nevada's fortunes in mining were at a rather low ebb in May of 1900 when the great silver discovery was made in the rugged mountains of Nye County and Tonopah sprung up almost overnight. Into that district poured miners and prospectors, promoters, and businessmen by the thousands. Roads were almost nonexistent but the desert and mountain areas some distance from the south end of Smoky Valley

and the wastelands beyond the southern Nevada terminal of the old C. & C. Railroad at Rhodes were soon populated by men and women lured there by the Tonopah strike.

Prospectors had roamed those hills before but now they were out in force and it was not long before they found gold on the desert and the camp of Goldfield, 30 miles to the south, gave Nevada mining the greatest impetus since the days of the Comstock.

Tonopah and Goldfield, rivals, friendly, booming, and populated by men of vision, courage, and the spirit of give-and-take, exercised great influence on the affairs of Nevada and spurred on mining development elsewhere at a pace that spawned one of the most prosperous periods in the State's history.

Among the men of courage, vision, and ability who was on the ground when Jim Butler's burro (so the story goes) wandering away from camp kicked a silver laden rock loose from an outcropping was Tasker L. Oddie, young lawyer turned mining man. He had the rock assayed at Austin and then the excitement began.

Millions of dollars were produced by the Tonopah mines and Tasker Oddie, one of the original quartet to locate claims there, received a substantial share and spent it in the development of other mines, some of which were failures. But he found time, too, to devote to other things and became a leader of men in a community that needed sound leadership.

Honest, straightforward, and possessed of a real insight into human affairs, it was no accident that he was chosen by his fellow citizens to represent them in the State senate at Carson City and neither was it an accident that he was selected less than 10 years after the discovery of Tonopah as a candidate for Governor of Nevada on the Republican ticket.

As Governor Mr. Oddie helped to straighten out labor troubles that had beset the State and particularly the mining districts of southern Nevada. His was not a spectacular administration but it was a sane and safe one. Though defeated for reelection to the governorship he retained the affection and the confidence of the people of Nevada of all political faiths and as one of the outstanding leaders of the Republican Party won the party nomination and subsequent election to the United States Senate in 1920 and served two full terms.

Though he engaged in many spirited political contests not a single opponent ever once questioned his integrity.

He took victory and defeat in stride and always came up smiling, characteristic of the times and the fine caliber of citizens with whom he worked and enjoyed life.

Nevada is indebted to such men as Tasker Oddie for their contributions to the State's advancement. They in turn felt they owed to the State a debt of gratitude which they generously shouldered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Tasker L. Oddie was a great governor, a great United States Senator, and a great citizen.

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY RESPECTING CONFERENCE REPORT ON OLEO BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared with reference to the conference report on House bill 2023, relating to oleo-margarine, and I also ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "How Dairying Serves Mankind," by Milton Hult, president of the National Dairy Council, be printed in the RECORD.



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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

THE FINAL CONFERENCE REPORT ON OLEO BILL SHOULD BE DEFERRED; ITS GRAVE IMPLICATIONS SHOULD BE STUDIED

Mr. President, the Senate-House conference committee on H. R. 2023 has completed its actions. This committee was composed of some of the ablest Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, and I say that irrespective of the fact that their actions were, I believe, deeply harmful to the American dairy industry and to 150,000,000 American people as a whole.

I say that not in disrespect of these conferees, whom I admire as individual Senators and Representatives, but I say that on the firm conviction that the conference majority, which is going to report this bill back to the Senate and House of Representatives, has taken an action whose repercussions will be felt by our generation and future generations to come in adverse ways which we can barely estimate today.

In making these statements, I direct my principal objection to the omission by the conference committee of that provision which we adopted on the Senate floor, and which Senator FULBRIGHT accepted, which would have provided that oleomargarine as retailed be sold in triangular prisms.

The failure of the conference committee to include that one vital provision can spell a death knell to the American butter industry and a body blow to American dairying as a whole.

WHY TRIANGULAR PROVISION WAS NECESSARY

I have in my hand a copy of the bill, H. R. 2023, as it was rewritten by the committee. I will not discuss at this point its weakening of various phases of the bill, such as the definition of margarine, etc., because I do not believe that we should divert our attention from the one main issue, and that is, that oleo should be sold in triangular form if it is to be properly identified by American consumers. The conference report provides, to be sure, that oleo must be sold in 1 pound or less packages; that the word oleomargarine or margarine must be printed in type at least as large as the lettering elsewhere on the label; and that a full statement of the ingredients shall be included on the package. To be sure the conference report states that the lettering on each individual quarter-pound wrapper shall refer to oleomargarine or margarine in a type not smaller than 20-point size.

The big question, Mr. President, is: How many consumers will actually bother to read the type; to look at the wrapper; to closely study the over-all package? The answer is: Very few, indeed.

On the other hand, a triangular package would have been both feasible and desirable because it would have provided the one way by which the great mass of oleomargarine as purchased could have been easily identified by consumers.

The oleo trust professed no objection to the idea of proper identification of their product. However, we now see the proof of what we have contended all along, that the oleo trust wants to masquerade its product as butter in every way, shape, and form, and that is why it fought to eliminate Senator FREAR's amendment for triangular packaging.

Let me point out that several manufacturers have furnished the dairy industry word that machinery could fairly promptly be devised for triangular packaging of oleo. That certainly could not have been a legitimate objection, therefore, to the effect that machinery was not available.

RESTAURANT PROVISION IS INADEQUATE

Let me point out that the provisions of the conference report requiring that oleo shall

be sold in triangular pats in restaurants, while they may look good on paper, will not have very concrete results. Why? Because in the first place they will undoubtedly not be enforced unless we are to have an army of inspectors, tens of thousands strong, to invade every restaurant in the Nation.

Secondly, we note that the amount of oleo consumed in restaurants is comparatively very small in relation to the over-all total of oleo consumed in the Nation. No one has accurate estimates, but I have seen guesses ranging from 1 percent to 5 percent. In other words, the conference committee has taken care of 1 percent of the problem and has left 99 percent of the problem to shift for itself.

ARTICLE ON DAIRYING

I have in my hand an article written in the latest issue of Think magazine by the president of the National Dairy Council.

This article came out almost simultaneously with the unfortunate action of the conference committee. The article points out that some milk is produced on at least 75 percent of the Nation's farms; it points out that the dairy industry contributes \$10,000,000,000 to the Nation's retail commerce; it cites the fact that 118,000,000 pounds of milk were produced in 1948.

Where is the ocean of milk to go if the butter market is destroyed? Does the oleo trust want the milk to be poured into the gutters, or does it want the Government to buy up the surplus butter which cannot find a market?

This year it is predicted that the Government will have to buy 225,000,000 pounds of butter which will fall below the parity price.

What a ridiculous inconsistency for the Federal Government to buy up surplus butter on the one hand and to take an action which will cause more butter to be in surplus on the other hand.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senate should defer final action on the conference report on H. R. 2023 for a minimum of 1 month in order that the grave implications of the conference report may be thoroughly studied. The bill could still go into effect on July 1 if we acted, let us say, on the 1st of April one way or the other on the conference report.

We are not making any unreasonable demand in this respect. The oleo bill was enacted as the first item on the Senate calendar this year. There is ample precedent for delay of final action on a conference report. I refer particularly, for example, to the decision to hold over the final action on the basing-point bill from October 1949 to January 20, 1950.

I believe that the American consumers will come to see that it is not they who have won a victory in the conference report, but 30 large corporations seeking to destroy the butter market. The American consumers will see increasingly, as they have already begun to see, that they were sold a false bill of oleo goods.

Oleo, unidentified as such, will drive butter from the market, and when it does the implications will be grave to every housewife, every infant, every adult, every farmer, every workingman, every businessman in the United States. The implications to soil conservation, the implications to the supply and demand of other dairy products will be grave.

I urge my colleagues, therefore, to defer action on the Senate-House report until they have had an opportunity to analyze the grave repercussions of the omission of the triangular packaging amendment.

HOW DAIRYING SERVES MANKIND  
(By Milton Hult, president of the National Dairy Council)

Today dairy products comprise more than 25 percent of the food consumed by the Na-

tion's 150,000,000 people. These men, women, and children sit at dining tables three times a day 365 days of the year to consume more than 118,000,000,000 pounds of dairy foods at 164,000,000,000 meals.

Milk, known as nature's most nearly perfect food, is constantly in the limelight as 60,000,000 quarts of fresh milk and cream are distributed daily to consumers through doorstep deliveries and stores.

The health of the Nation, to a large degree, has improved as invention and science have stimulated progress in finding new food values in milk and its products for the human diet.

Milk was an important article of food long before 6000 B. C. when the oldest written records of the human race were recorded in Sanskrit and preserved in India. To the early peoples of central Asia the cow was so important that wealth was measured in numbers of cattle. In fact, the cow at times was made a sacred animal and is still so considered by a substantial portion of the population of India.

When the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth in 1621, they failed to bring with them a cow to provide children and adults alike with milk, butter, and cheese. The colonists became ill, and many died for lack of nourishing food. But conditions changed several years later when the ship *Charity* brought new settlers and cows from England. As the early Americans moved westward, their covered wagons were always followed by two or three cows.

Several hundred years slipped by before significant changes took place in methods of producing milk or manufacturing dairy products. One outstanding development that stimulated growth in the dairy industry in the United States and foreign countries was the invention of a test to measure the content of fat in milk. Discovered by Stephen Moulton Babcock in 1890 and known in the trade as the Babcock Test, it serves as a major instrument in handling and processing dairy foods.

To Louis Pasteur, the noted French scientist, goes the credit of adding another major link to the chain of progress in the dairy industry. His painstaking research led to the discovery of the pasteurization process which guarantees the purity and keeping qualities of milk and milk products.

Among other noteworthy inventions in handling milk and its products are the cream separator, pasteurizer, milking machine, churn, cooling systems, filling machines, ice cream freezers, evaporating and milk drying equipment and scores of other essential machinery, all playing an important role in speeding production and improving the quality of dairy products. Contributing to this trend toward modernization were the railroads, which began to build special refrigerated milk trains to ship milk from milk sheds to industrial centers for processing milk for delivery at the Nation's doorsteps and for manufacturing butter, cheese, ice cream, and a myriad of other products. Then came tank cars and huge tank trucks, all of which enable the dairy industry to haul milk and its products many hundreds of miles every day of the year. Back of these important mechanical developments which contributed immeasurably to the growth of the dairy industry was an ever-increasing fund of knowledge from the country's leading scientific laboratories where men toiled incessantly to discover the dietary values contained in dairy foods.

The flow of milk from the Nation's 22,935,000 cows in 1948 amounted to 118,337,000,000 pounds. Of this, 44,500,000,000 pounds was bottled in glass or paper containers and consumed as milk and cream in cities and villages, and 12,306,000,000 was utilized on the farms. The remaining milk supply, 61,531,000,000 pounds, was manufactured into a variety of dairy foods to satisfy the needs and

desires of the buyer on Main Street. These manufactured products, and the amount of milk required to produce them, were as follows: 1,214,000,000 pounds of creamery butter from 25,000,000,000 pounds of milk; 1,097,000,000 pounds of cheese, from 10,920,000,000 pounds of milk; 568,000,000 gallons of ice cream, from 7,900,000,000 pounds of milk; 3,434,000,000 pounds of evaporated milk, from 7,390,000,000 pounds of milk; 172,980,000 pounds of dry whole milk, from 1,310,000,000 pounds of milk; and 658,000,000 pounds of nonfat dry milk solids, from 5,663,000,000 pounds of defatted milk.

About 120,000,000,000 pounds of milk were produced or consumed in the United States in 1949. It is difficult to visualize that amount of milk, but if milk produced in this country in a single year were placed in tank cars, each of which would hold 56,000 pounds of milk, it would require 42,857 trains of 50 cars each. A single day's production would require 117 such trains.

Although milk and its products are generally considered as food for human consumption, they are also used in a wide variety of industrial products, such as plastics, textiles, paper coating, paint, flue, films, pharmaceuticals, insulation, fertilizer, insecticides, penicillin, plaster, dyes, animal feed, preservatives, explosives, and electroplates.

The magnitude of the dairy industry is apparent when it is considered that one out of every 15 families in the United States is dependent on milk for a livelihood. Actually, the dairy industry employs full time at least 1,500,000 people in the production, processing, and distribution of milk and dairy products.

Ten million persons depend upon the dairy industry for their livelihood. Nearly every segment of the country's manufacturing, technical, and professional skills are drawn into the industry at one point or another. Among them are veterinarians, building suppliers and construction men, fabricators of milk cans, milkers, filters, machinery of all types for processing and manufacturing, producers of raw materials from lumber through most of the metals, and transportation, including rail, truck, and ship.

Although dairying is national in scope, in 11 States it is the principal source of farm income. These States are: Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wisconsin. Some milk is produced on at least 75 percent of the Nation's farms, and about 10 percent of the farms, or 585,900, are specialized dairy farms.

Every American family is a part of an industry that employs millions of people and produces billions of pounds of dairy foods. Dollarwise, cash farm income from dairy products is around \$4,000,000,000 annually, but in addition the dairy farmer receives about \$2,000,000,000 for the sale of dairy cattle for beef and veal. Significantly this income to the farmer is on a daily or monthly basis while most of his other receipts from agricultural products are seasonal. On a retail basis the dairy industry contributes \$10,000,000,000 to the national commerce.

Dairying has always been a stable branch of agriculture. It has fluctuated less than the national income. A productive dairy herd proved the salvation of many a farm family during the last depression when net income from other livestock and grains was entirely wiped out. Today the average dairy cow will produce annually 5,036 pounds of milk compared with 2,360 pounds in 1850. In fact, improved herds will average around 8,835 pounds. This increased production is the result of improved feeding and breeding programs stimulated by leaders in the dairy industry, breed associations, and the colleges of agriculture in land-grant schools across the country.

The dairy industry has spent and is spending now millions of dollars in the interest of

finding new food values and new uses for its products. The dairy chemists are constantly engaged in converting what was formerly a waste into additional income for the farmer and into new, improved products for the consumer. To illustrate, defatted milk, totaling well over 10,000,000,000 pounds annually, is worth about 40 cents per hundred pounds today, while 20 years ago it was practically worthless. Both industrial research and nutrition research insure security for the future of farming as a sound business.

Research in nutrition makes clear the fundamental reason why milk is an essential part of the diet under conditions of modern civilization. Without milk the human diet would be so lacking in certain essential factors, particularly vitamins and minerals, that civilization as now developed could not exist. That's why health authorities across the Nation recommend a quart or more of milk for every child and as close to that amount as possible for adults, both young and old.

It was Dr. E. V. McCollum, a noted scientist at Johns Hopkins University, who singled out milk as the basic product in the dairy industry and showed how it served mankind so significantly in the diet from the cradle to the grave. Said Dr. McCollum: "The people who have achieved, who have become large, strong, vigorous people, who have reduced their infant mortality, who have the best trades in the world, who have an appreciation of art, literature, and music, who are progressive in science and every activity of the intellect, are the people who have used liberal amounts of milk and its products."

#### COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has before it House Joint Resolution 398, a complete substitute for which the committee has reported. The substance will be regarded as the text of the joint resolution for purposes of amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks about the pending joint resolution. The Senate was told a few days ago by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] what the joint resolution would do if enacted. I should like to give the Senate some reasons why a measure of this character is necessary at this time.

It will be recalled that during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress we enacted Public Law 272. In that law it was provided that the 1950 national cotton acreage quota shall be not less than 21,000,000 acres. When the time for the distribution of those acres was at hand, the county committees, which had the duty of distributing the acreage, were in considerable trouble. It will be recalled that the main reason was that since 1942 we had no cotton acreage allotments in the cotton-producing States. During the war a farmer could plant any amount of cotton he desired, without restriction. There was no necessity for the existence of county committees such as we now have. So it can be seen that no accurate record was kept of the amount of acreage planted during the years 1942-49, as had been kept before 1942.

The question soon arose as to how to distribute the 21,000,000 acres of cotton to be allocated under Public Law 272. The county committees were at a loss. The Department of Agriculture was consulted, and ways and means were devised by it as to how best to distribute the acreage. Questionnaires were sent to cotton growers throughout the country. From what I am told, unsatisfactory data were furnished, therefore the Department of Agriculture resorted to statistics compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in order to ascertain as nearly as possible the amount of cotton acreage planted during the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. The method pursued by the bureau to ascertain the acreage was to obtain from cotton gins throughout the Nation figures showing the amount of cotton ginned. Then the bureau, by dividing the number of pounds of cotton produced in a given area by the average number of pounds produced per acre, for that area, established a figure for the number of acres devoted to cotton throughout the cotton States during those 3 years.

I may say that, later, when this method did not prove satisfactory, a further attempt was made to have the farmers give their acreage figures during the 3 years 1946, 1947, and 1948. I should like to read into the Record some of the figures given by the farmers throughout the Cotton States for the purpose of establishing the number of acres planted, in contrast to the number of acres ascertained by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Here is what was found: For the year 1945, Alabama had in cultivation, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1,390,000 acres of cotton. According to the farmers who reported, however, the acreage was 2,029,707, or a difference of 46 percent more than the figures arrived at by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Let us take the case of Arizona: There the difference was only 6 percent. Now let us take the case of Arkansas: For 1945, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics figured the cotton acreage as 1,554,000 acres; but when the farmers of that State were questioned in regard to how many acres of cotton they planted during the same year, they reported 2,422,341 acres, or 55 percent more acreage than that reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

During the entire year, for all the Cotton States, the number of acres figured by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics aggregated 17,560,665, whereas reports from the farmers indicated 24,169,506 acres, or 37.6 percent more than the figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics had shown. The same thing occurred for 1946, proportionately; the same thing occurred for 1947; and the same thing occurred, likewise, for 1948.

It can readily be seen, then, that the job the committees had in allocating among the various cotton farmers of the States the 21,000,000 acres of land for cotton, was a huge task; it was most difficult for them properly, adequately, and equitably to apportion the cotton acreage. Especially is that true, Mr. President, inasmuch as in the previous year the cotton farmers of the Nation had



planted approximately 26,000,000 acres of land in cotton.

So the administrators of the new cotton law, Public Law 272, in each State, were at a great disadvantage. Many of the local committees had no experienced men. Many of them did not utilize to the fullest extent all the provisions of the law. There was no compulsion for the committees to use them, it is true; but it will be recalled that under the law the Congress provided for setting aside 10 percent of the acreage in a State, and further, that the committee for each county or parish had 15 percent of its allocation which could be set aside and used in order to remedy, as far as possible, inequities which might occur in the distribution of acreage.

Mr. President, in order to try to adjust this situation—and I may say it is very serious—the House passed House Joint Resolution 398.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

At this point I am reminded that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who has just requested that I yield to him, likewise proposed a measure to meet the situation. He was joined by several other distinguished Senators, including the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Incidentally, when the committee had this problem before it for consideration, it considered the measure introduced by the Senator from Mississippi, as well as the House joint resolution.

Now I gladly yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator spoke of the necessity for the enactment of this measure. Is not the real necessity for the enactment of the joint resolution the fact that in a great number of counties throughout the Cotton Belt there are hundreds of farmers in each county who planted 5 acres or less of cotton; and when the cotton allotment was set aside, the farmers who planted 5 acres or less were exempted, under the bill we passed last fall; they took no acreage reduction. When the county's allotment was set aside and the acreage of the farmers who were exempt was charged against the allotment for the county, that left nothing for the farmers with tenants who planted 40 or 50 or 60 acres of land in cotton. The allotment being gone, those farmers and their tenants were faced with bankruptcy and with losing their property unless a system could be devised to give them an equitable acreage.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, that was one of the main reasons for the Senate's action.

The Senator's measure, of course, will correct to some extent the inequities to which he refers, and I have no doubt that it will do a great deal of good.

However, it will not satisfy all of the farmers.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course it will not. Mr. ELLENDER. It will not satisfy many of the farmers who are in the position the Senator now describes.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield. Mr. EASTLAND. It will take care of every hardship case, as I have described them. It is true that it will not satisfy everyone. But I tell the Senator that it will take care of the hardship cases, the cases of farmers who will lose their property, and the cases of tenants who will have no land to work unless this measure is enacted. It is designed solely and exclusively to take care of that class.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that, Mr. President. As a matter of fact, the record shows that more than 90 percent of the cotton farmers of the Nation were unaffected by the passage of Public Law 272. The farmers the Senator now describes are the ones really affected; that is correct.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield. Mr. EASTLAND. In my judgment, 95 percent of the cotton farmers have a fair and equitable acreage allotment and are satisfied with it. They have what acreage they are entitled to.

But there are a few—I refer now to the larger operators in counties where there are hundreds of farmers who are exempt—who, because of the provision of the act which exempted the 5-acre and the 3-acre cotton farmers, have no acreage, and face bankruptcy. They are the only ones who are entitled to relief.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator refers to 95 percent of the farmers, I presume he refers to farmers within the State of Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. No. Mr. ELLENDER. I think evidence was produced to show that about 90 percent of the farmers throughout the Nation received a fair allotment; that is, what was to be expected under the act as passed by the Congress.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield. Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to say to the Senator that in one county in Tennessee we have had particularly numerous complaints about the working of the present act. The complaint is based upon the evidence adduced that the committee did not accept the PMA report. That is the farmers' own report, as I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that is what I was explaining a few moments ago.

Mr. KEFAUVER. They relied upon the report of the BAE.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But the farmers themselves, in trying to establish a higher production, actually went to the gins and obtained the figures of the ginnings for the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. They then computed, on the basis of those ginnings, that the PMA report was substantially correct, and very much higher

than the BAE report. If their acreage could be based upon the actual ginnings, where based upon the information they got from the ginner themselves on their production, they would be satisfied with the result of this amendment. I want to ask the Senator whether, under the amendment, the county committee or the State committee, or whoever has charge of which formula is to be used, can take the actual report from the ginner and figure the acreage on that basis?

Mr. ELLENDER. The national acreage allotments as now figured will stand. Under the pending joint resolution, no provision is made to change the method by which the present allotment has been made. What the resolution really provides is that an additional acreage shall be made available. The additional acreage is to be taken from the "frozen acreage," which I expect to discuss in a few moments. The facts produced by us show that, although a ceiling of 21,000,000 acres was put on cotton plantings throughout the cotton States, the Department of Agriculture did not expect that more than 19,000,000 acres would be planted. Therefore it was anticipated that there would be approximately 2,000,000 acres of cotton land which would not be planted. With respect to that acreage, that is, the cotton acreage which would not be planted and which is considered to be frozen, the pending measure provides that it shall be reallocated among the farmers of the State with preference being given to the needs of farmers within the same county in which it was released.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator will yield further, it would solve satisfactorily the problem we have in Macon County.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Mr. KEFAUVER. That is, provided the State committee allocated a sufficient amount to this particular county, and the county committee then tried to make up the deficits in hardship cases.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I may point out to the Senator, in the joint resolution as reported to the Senate, there is a provision whereby a farmer shall receive acreage equal to 60 percent of the average cotton planted by him in 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The difficulty about that is, taking the BAE reports, not sufficient acreage is allotted to some of our 15- or 20-acre farms to let them get along.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, may I answer that question, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. In answer to the Senator from Tennessee, let me say that the joint resolution provides that the acreage surrendered shall be reallocated by the State committee, preference being given to the county in which the acreage is located. It must be satisfactory to the farmers in that county before any acreage can be taken out. That would solve practically the problem in every county.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am afraid it would not be a full solution; it would be only a partial solution.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is impossible to satisfy everyone. In fact, we shall not get very far if we try to satisfy everyone.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate that, but some of the farmers have been cut down from 20 acres to 6 or 7, and it is going to be very hard for them to get along.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senator will read on page 6, I think the question will be found to be answered there:

Determination of the average acreage planted or regarded as planted on any farm in 1946, 1947, and 1948 shall be made by the county committee after consideration of such evidence as may be submitted by the owner or operator, and shall be subject to review by the State committee.

I think that will answer the Senator's question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That, I believe, is the present law.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The difficulty is that while they consider the statement of the owner or operator, they actually take the BAE figures, even though they may also consider and take a look at the owner's statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question that the allocation which has already been made will not be disturbed. But the excess cotton acreage will be used in order to adjust inequities which resulted in the past. I know of no better way of doing it. Of course, as I pointed out, there has been a great difference in the number of acres reported as having been planted, according to the BAE, in contrast to the self-serving declarations made by the farmers, and it will be a difficult matter to resolve. I fear that, notwithstanding the fact that we may pass the joint resolution, there will still remain inequities. However—

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

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have just indicated, the Senate version of the joint resolution provides for a minimum of 60 percent of the average acreage for 1946, 1947, and 1948, and there is a further provision which states, in effect, that no such allotment shall be increased by reason of this provision, to an acreage in excess of 40 percent of the acreage of the farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation as determined under the present law, excluding from such acreage the acreage devoted to other crops subject to acreage restrictions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may ask the Senator whether he does not feel, however, that the language on page 6, which has been read by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, will give the county committee the right to consider the statement of the farmer himself?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And evidence other than the report of the BAE?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. However, as I have previously stated, no authority exists or is given to change the allocations already made and which were accepted by the farmers when they voted for acreage controls a few months ago. BAE figures will have to stand, and I believe they will, in all counties.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, if there are cases wherein the county committees obtain evidence to show grave injustices, the committees would have the right to adjust those cases. But no effort is to be made by the Department of Agriculture to change the method which has been in effect since December with reference to the allocation of cotton acreage to the various States, as I have stated on several occasions.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator decline to yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in a case such as the one to which I have referred, in which the individual farmers have collected information to show that the BAE report is incorrect, or at least they have carried the burden of proof of showing that the BAE report is incorrect, then there is no prohibition on the county committee or the State committee to prevent it from considering the newly-discovered evidence. Is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no prohibition whatever.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then, how will the individual farmers obtain rectification of the allotment, after they have shown that the BAE report may be incorrect?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will depend on the amount of acreage which the county committee will have available for distribution. Under the law as it now stands, the county committees can reserve, out of the amount allocated to a county, 15 percent, and they can put that acreage wherever they deem proper, in order to assure equitable treatment for all farmers.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I understand that, but how about the State committees? Suppose the evidence shows that a particular county should have received a considerably increased allotment. Of course, the discrepancy cannot be made up by the committee of the particular county. There would have to be action by the State committee. How can the farmers in a given county get the State committee to do something about it?

Mr. ELLENDER. The additional cotton acreage provided by this measure is to be distributed by the State committee; preference, however, is to be given in those cases in which inequities are involved; the remainder can be distributed according to certain regulations which may be devised by the committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator has been very generous in explaining this matter so clearly. Suppose the State committee refuses to act in line with the plain evidence in the case in rectifying inequities: Is there any right of appeal to the Agricultural Department or to the Cotton Acreage Control Board, or is the decision of the State committee final?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is final, as I understand. I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is not this the system which will be used under the provisions of this joint resolution, that if a farmer claims he has an inadequate acreage, not in accordance with the standards established in the law, he files a written request with his county committee and can present any evidence he desires to present to the county committee to claim an acreage of 60 percent of the land which he had under cultivation in 1946, 1947, and 1948, provided it does not exceed 40 percent of his cultivable acreage?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. EASTLAND. There must be someone to pass on these matters and wring the water out if we are to have any acreage controls at all. Under joint resolution as passed by the House, the principal difference is that the farmer could plant 70 percent of what he planted in 1946, 1947, and 1948, but the county committee must take the word of the farmer. I submit that under that language we would have no effective control.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] says that the individual farmer, if he did not have adequate acreage, would have no right of appeal, no right to go beyond the State committee. Last fall, acreage allotments were made to farmers before an election was held. After each farmer received the acreage allotment he was to have in 1950 an election was called, a vote was had, and by a vote of 12 or 14 to 1, the action was ratified. If a farmer was not satisfied with his allotment at that time it was his duty to vote against acreage allotments for this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. It may be that the answer I made to a question a few moments ago left some confusion in the minds of a few Senators. What I had in mind was that the allocation of cotton acreage on a national basis had to stand, and that this measure contains no provision which would permit a change in that situation. Therefore, the administrators of this measure, if it be enacted into law, will have to use the facts as they find them, since there is no law nor any section of a law which would provide for a reallocation of cotton acreage on a national basis.

Mr. EASTLAND. That could not be done, because the farmer's acreage was assigned to him, and certainly we could not now take away from him acreage which has been assigned, because he has a vested right in it by agreement with the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I tried to clarify that a moment ago. Perhaps my answer was not completely clear.



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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The statement has been made on the floor that the so-called small cotton producer has been taken care of under the present law.

Mr. ELLENDER. The owner?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. That applies only to the owner; it does not apply to the small tenant who may be included along with many other tenants on a 50- or a 100-acre farm.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I should be glad if the Senator would explain that point more fully.

Mr. ELLENDER. The 5-acre allotment which was provided in the original act, in Public Law 272, of the Eighty-first Congress, and in this joint resolution does not change that situation. The 5-acre minimum is first allocated to all the cotton farmers who own their land in a particular county or parish.

Mr. President, I should like to state that if it had been possible for cotton acreage to have been allotted to the States and then to the counties on the basis of accurate records and if 10 percent of the State allotment had been set aside, and also if the 15 percent county allotment had been set aside, there is no doubt in my mind that Public Law 272, passed by the Eighty-first Congress, would have been adequate. That law provided means for adjusting most of the inequities. We provided that a certain percentage of the cotton acreage could be used by the administrators of the law for adjusting such inequities as have appeared since December 1949.

#### NEVADA COTTON ACREAGE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. The problem in the State of Nevada is one with reference to long-staple cotton. One hundred and ten acres have been allocated to the State of Nevada for 1950 as compared to 1,150 acres planted in 1949.

There are approximately 16 cotton States with about 21,000,000 acres. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The ceiling fixed is 21,000,000 acres, but I do not believe the allocation under the Department of Agriculture quite reached that figure.

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

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator's question pertain to this subject?

Mr. EASTLAND. It does.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall gladly yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to tell the distinguished Senator from Nevada that the allotment granted his State, as I recall, is several thousand acres. I think it is 3,000 or 5,000 acres. One of those figures is in my mind. I think it is 5,000 acres. But the point I desire to make is that at a meeting in the city of Memphis, Tenn., a year ago of the farmers and farm groups, in which the Senator's State was represented, his State was given the acreage allotment which

the farmers of his State requested, with no questions asked. It was written into the law. The State of Nevada is the only State in the Union in which cotton producers were given the acreage they requested.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I am getting some further details and shall perhaps have them in a half hour, but the record of a 110-acre allotment of cotton to Nevada for 1950 does not in any way resemble 3,000 to 5,000 acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has answered the question, because, as I understand, he was present at the conference at which all the cotton States were represented.

Mr. EASTLAND. I was not present at the conference. I was in Washington, but I was not present at the conferences at which the matter of the Nevada acreage was discussed. I have repeated the statement that was made.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall—and I am sure the distinguished Senator from Mississippi will also recall—the bill which was enacted during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and which is now law, was approved in advance by cotton growers throughout the Nation.

Mr. EASTLAND. The recommendations of the cotton growers were adopted in toto. In fact, Congress merely ratified what they asked us to do.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I mentioned, I have no doubt that the law would have worked exactly as we had contemplated, if it had been possible to obtain accurate data regarding cotton plantings for 1946, 1947, and 1948, and further, if the State committees and the county committees had set aside the 10 and 15 percent, respectively, to each State and county, so that adjustments might be made.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. In order to clarify the subject further for the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and other Senators I may say that I have before me Report No. 1509, House of Representatives, Union Calendar No. 628, dated January 21, 1950. Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the report. The individual acreages are given on page 6 of the report. Nevada is given 110 acres as of 1948. It shows 100 as the percentage reported by BAE.

Mr. ELLENDER. Those initials stand for "Bureau of Agricultural Economics."

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The figure represents acreage planted in the years mentioned. There was no acreage control in those years. However, the law provides for acreage controls beginning in 1950. I state unequivocally that the Senator's State was given the acreage which was requested by the growers of

his State. The liberal treatment thus given to the Western States caused great criticism in the eastern end of the Cotton Belt. I believe it was right to deal liberally with the Western States, but the State of Nevada was dealt with more liberally than any other State in the Union, and far more liberally than the State of California.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means with respect to cotton planted in the past.

Mr. EASTLAND. The big acreage in the six States was planted in 1949, as I recall it.

Mr. ELLENDER. There was no acreage planted in Nevada in previous years, so far as the record shows.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator have a report which shows the acreages included in the earlier bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. To which bill does the Senator have reference?

Mr. MALONE. I understood the Senator to say that Nevada was given the acreage which it had requested. The only acreage figure I can find is 110 for 1948.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the number of acres planted in the year which has been mentioned—1949.

Mr. EASTLAND. That was the number planted in those years. The Senator from Nevada knows as well as the Senator from Louisiana and I know that the acreage planted in his State is entirely new acreage. The year 1949 was the first year in which any appreciable acreage was planted.

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the Senator's statement, the report states that the acreage for 1950 will be 110 acres. I understand that raising cotton is a new industry in Nevada, but it involves long staple cotton, and it has very little to do with southern acreage. Nevada is a new State, agriculturally, still developing and still has, perhaps, less than 1½ percent of its area in cultivation.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is a surplus in the production of long staple cotton in the United States, just as there is a surplus in the production of short staple cotton. The statement quoted by the Senator shows that the allotment is 110 acres. I stand corrected. The Senator's State has taken no reduction, according to the figures which the Senator read.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is absolutely correct. As I understand it, the law is intended to deal with States which have actually planted cotton, and not with those commencing the growth of it. I may state to the Senator that under the pending measure, as well as under the existing law, a certain amount of cotton acreage is allocated to a State, or to a county, which is to be used by the committees for new growers. That is the only provision I know of which exists in any law for such growers.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. My statistician has handed me some figures which show that the acreage under cultivation in Nevada on July 1, 1949, was 1,150 acres. The allotment for 1950, however, will be 110

acres. I submit to the distinguished Senator that it is just a little silly to have 110 acres allocated to an entire State. According to the reports we are receiving about potatoes, as well as reports on other sections of the farm program, I have no doubt that our lack of information is catching up with us. At the same time, it seems to me that a State should be allocated an acreage which would make sense while in the development stage. According to the amendment which has been offered, potato acreage would be frozen. Apparently acreage is going to be handled from the Senate floor believing that acreage controls the amount of the product. The only thing we forget on the Senate floor is that if we pay enough for potatoes and pigs, in 2 years we will have potatoes and pigs 10 feet deep all the way from Washington, D. C., to San Francisco. We apparently know very little about what we are doing, and only hope that the taxpayers' money holds out until we learn.

Mr. EASTLAND. How much acreage would the Senator desire for the State of Nevada?

Mr. MALONE. I should say there should be a minimum of 5,000 acres. There were 1,150 acres last year.

I was wondering whether the distinguished Senators would entertain an amendment to the pending bill to make the minimum for a sovereign State 2,000 acres, or some other reasonable amount.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is totally unreasonable.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it would be totally unreasonable. I have figures before me showing the acreage for the State of Missouri. According to the BAE statistics, these figures were almost 100 percent out of the way—almost as bad as the Nevada figures.

Mr. MALONE. How much did they have?

Mr. ELLENDER. BAE statistics showed in 1945, 268,000 acres. However, Missouri farmers reported that they had planted in the same year 540,174 acres. The error was almost exactly 100 percent.

Mr. MALONE. Two thousand acres for a sovereign State would not be very much.

Mr. ELLENDER. Personally, I should be glad to consider an amendment, provided it remained in line with the actual plantings of last year, minus a reasonable cut.

Mr. MALONE. It was 1,150 acres last year. Would the Senator accept an amendment of that kind?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am merely one member of the committee, and I should prefer that the Senator submit his amendment to the Senate, and let the Senate pass upon it. I will say frankly, however, that I think he has a very fair request to make of the Senate in submitting the amendment.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will yield for one moment, I might say that we can carry crop control to ridiculous proportions in dealing with States, especially in a case where there has been practically no acreage, and it becomes an economic necessity to rotate crops. I shall be very happy to prepare an amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was attempting to point out to the Senate the essential difference between the joint resolution as it passed the House and the measure reported by the Senate committee as a substitute. The joint resolution passed by the House would increase the acreage by at least twice as much as would be the case under the joint resolution as reported by the Senate committee. The House measure provides for the larger of 70 percent of the average cotton acreage planted during the years 1947, 1948, and 1949, or 50 percent of the highest planting in any of those years.

In addition to that provision, which would increase the acreage considerably over the amount provided under the Senate version of the joint resolution, there is another provision which would, in my opinion, increase the acreage over the Senate version. The language to which I now refer provides:

That this section shall not operate to increase the cotton-acreage allotment of any farm above 40 percent of the acreage on such farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

That means that with respect to any cotton farm, no matter if sugarcane or sorghum or wheat or rye have been planted on it, 40 percent of the entire acreage is considered as being within the purview of the law insofar as the acreage limitation is concerned.

The Senate version of the joint resolution provides, that instead of 70 percent, only 60 percent of the average planting for 1946, 1947, and 1948 shall be the limit. The 50-percent provision for the highest year, is left out altogether, and the 40-percent limitation, although retained in the Senate version, is further limited to tilled acreage minus any acreage which may have been planted to any crop other than cotton. In other words, the law as it now stands on the statute books—and it was enacted in 1938—remains as then written.

Those points, Mr. President, represent the essential differences between the Senate version and the House version of the joint resolution.

As was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] when he addressed the Senate a few days ago, the facts adduced before the Senate committee show that there will be increased plantings under the Senate version of from 600,000 to as much as 790,000 acres of cotton. Under the House version, there might be an increase of from 1,400,000 to as much as 2,000,000 acres.

The Department of Agriculture has figured that although a ceiling of 21,000,000 acres was fixed in Public Law 272, it is probable, as I mentioned previously, that there will be at least 2,000,000 acres "frozen"—that is, they will not be planted. Therefore if the joint resolution as reported to the Senate is enacted it will mean that we are not going over the 21,000,000 acres provided for 1950 in Public Law 272 and the chances are that the actual amount of acreage which will be planted to cotton in 1950, should the Senate version be enacted, will be

1,200,000 acres below the 21,000,000-acre quota.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. At the time the Senate passed the cotton acreage allotment bill last year was it estimated that these 2,000,000 acres would be frozen, or was it considered that most, if not all, of the 21,000,000 acres would be planted?

Mr. ELLENDER. The evidence shows that it was anticipated that not more than 19,000,000 acres would be planted.

Mr. LONG. That was at the time the bill was passed last year?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The basis for that statement was the following: The Congress passed an act in 1942 or 1943 providing that all war crops planted in the cotton States would be considered as planted in cotton for the purposes of cotton allotments in the future, and, of course, that resulted in much difficulty. Because of the existence of that law it is now felt that although a quota of 21,000,000 acres has been established for 1950, only 19,000,000 acres will be planted. If the Senate version of the House joint resolution is enacted, it will mean that probably a maximum of 800,000 acres will be added to the 19,000,000 acres the Department says will be planted under the present law.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Department of Agriculture figures that the measure would add about 800,000 acres. The cotton trade estimates that it will run about 400,000 acres. I am frank to say that I believe the Department of Agriculture has better facilities and that its figure is more nearly accurate. But I believe, as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico said, that the figures of the Department are liberal, and that the joint resolution before us, if enacted into law, will not result in an increase of 800,000 additional acres.

The States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Georgia have surplus acreage because of the credits they received for war crops, and with the enactment of the Senate version of the joint resolution will not plant the minimum acreage which is provided for in the previous legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, I think the evidence shows that even if the joint resolution as passed by the House were enacted, although it provides for a greater acreage than does the Senate version, the 21,000,000-acre ceiling would not be reached.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Actually in many cases the effect of taking the BAE figures has been that as applied to the individual farmer who might have correctly stated his acreage—he will not be given what his proper share of the acreage allotment would have been. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. It results in that, yes.

Mr. President, unless the Senators have some questions to ask, I am about to conclude. There is only one other



portion of the joint resolution I did not explain. That is section 2, which provides:

No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas are in effect with respect to such potatoes.

As I recall, there was quite a discussion on that section a few days ago when the distinguished Senator from New Mexico obtained the floor. I desire to say that I believe that one of the most serious mistakes the Senate has made in the enactment of farm legislation was to provide for support prices without any means in the law to curtail production, either by a marketing quota system or on an acreage allotment basis. I do not believe that any kind of a farm program can long survive unless it contains the means of controlling farm production while supporting farm prices. The primary purpose of any type of agricultural adjustment legislation of this kind is to bolster prices and enable farmers to secure a fair market value from their crops; when the program becomes a dole for the farmer, and crop production exceeds all bounds of consumption and demand, the taxpayer will refuse to foot the bill. If the farmer wants to be able to count on his Government to protect him by assuring a minimum price, he should, he must, be willing to agree to controls on his acreage and production. The American farmer may well consider that runaway production under a price-support program might kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

#### AMENDMENT TO COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, under the cotton acreage allocation the State of Nevada was allocated 110 acres for 1950, while there were 1,150 acres actually in cultivation in Nevada during the year 1949. In the debate with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] this morning he indicated he would entertain an amendment to bring the acreage for Nevada at least up to the 1949 acreage.

Mr. President, Nevada is a new State. Less than 1½ percent of its acreage is in cultivation, and it is a growing State. It is necessary to have crop rotation. It probably is not too well known that the southern boundary of Nevada, approximately on the thirty-fifth degree of latitude extends as far south as the northern boundaries of Mississippi and Alabama.

It is realized that subsidies naturally call for acreage restriction, but some judgment may be exercised in respect to a sovereign State which is a new State and in a state of development. Therefore I submit the following amendment, to be added to the joint resolution as a new section:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law there shall be allotted to the State of Nevada for the production of cotton in 1950 not less than 1,150 acres, which is the acreage planted to cotton in Nevada in 1949. The additional acreage required to be allotted by this section shall be additional to the national acreage allotment.

XCVI—143

Mr. President, I submit the paragraph just read as an amendment to the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

#### CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY AND THE AIR FORCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report from the Committee on Armed Services certain nominations involving routine promotions in the Army and the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). Without objection, the nominations will be received.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration and confirmation of these routine promotions in the Army and the Air Force, and that the President be notified. The highest promotion on this list is to the rank of colonel. The promotions are all routine promotions. They have been in the committee for the prescribed period. No objections have been heard to them. I ask for the immediate consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland for the immediate consideration of the nominations?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator again state what they are.

Mr. TYDINGS. They are nominations involving routine promotions in the Army and the Air Force, the highest of which is to the rank of colonel. They come from the committee with a unanimous report.

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

The Chair hears none; the nominations are confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order. The Senator from Maryland has no right to yield the floor to any Senator after he relinquishes the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to proceed to make a statement. I shall not yield to any Senator. I thought the Senators who rose wanted to make insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment. However, if the Senator from Vermont wants the regular order, I shall defer.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the regular order is preferable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will wait until I can secure the floor in my own right; but I appreciate the offer of the Senator from Maryland to yield to me for the purpose of making an insertion in the RECORD.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum,

if the Senator from Maryland will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield for that purpose, provided I may have the floor after the presence of a quorum is established.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for that purpose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the calling of the roll be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WITHERS in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the request made to vacate the order for the calling of the roll because we do not have a quorum?

Mr. TYDINGS. That might be. But many Senators are eating their lunch; and if the Senator does not mind, I should like to proceed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Very well; I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for a call of the roll is vacated, and further proceedings under the call are suspended.

#### PROPOSAL FOR A WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the great preponderance of the United States in the field of atomic and hydrogen weapons has given to the free peoples of the world the reasoned belief that no nation on earth will dare attack us or them for fear of the frightful consequences of quick retaliation.

Statesmen and military men of the greatest eminence in the western world have repeatedly stated that the possession of a huge stock pile of these great bombs by the United States has been the greatest single force in keeping the world at peace during the past several years.

In their search for security in a troubled world, the people of the democratic nations of western Europe have based their justifiable hope for safety upon the solid rock of the military might of the United States. They have done this voluntarily in spite of the ideological, political, economic, and military pressures that have been applied to make them turn away from us.

Until these western Europeans can rehabilitate their ravaged and war-torn countries and provide more adequate military strength of their own, they have realistically taken refuge under the wings of the American eagle. They know that the claws of this great eagle can carry large numbers of deadly bombs which, if necessity demands, could be loosed quickly on any aggressor.

At present the United States has pending in the United Nations two disarmament proposals. These are being currently considered by two separate committees of the United Nations. The first

committee seeks to reach an agreement with the member nations to outlaw completely the A, H, and other bombs, to destroy the means of making them, and to control for peacetime purposes the raw materials from which they are made. The second committee is concerned with achieving disarmament on conventional weapons only.

Negotiations on the part of both of these committees have proceeded since 1946, down to approximately January 19, 1950, when the Russian representatives withdrew from the United Nations. This work has therefore ceased. Presumably, negotiations will be renewed if and when the Russian representatives return. So far agreements to accomplish the objectives of the two committees have not been reached.

The proposal of the United States to achieve disarmament is a civilized and proper undertaking. These proposals were first made in 1946, when the Allies had just won a long, costly, devastating, and bloody struggle. The differences between them then were of a minor nature. The United States entertained the fond hope that upon the wreckage and ashes of a war-ravaged world a firm peace could be built. Our country quickly seized the leadership in this quest and offered to destroy its greatest weapons and the means of making them if other nations would agree to its proposal. It was then the hope of this country that if an agreement to outlaw the great bombs was reached, it would immediately be followed by other disarmament agreements which would lift the fear and burden of a new war from the hearts of men.

Steadily since that time the powerful Allies who won World War II have drifted apart. Disagreements have been frequent. The schism between east and west has continued to widen. The threat of war between former allies has at times been imminent. Slowly and surely the great nations have divided into two hostile camps, with Russia the leader of one school of thought and action, and the United States the leader of the other.

Instead of disarmament, as was proposed, rearmament is now being practiced by those mighty allies, who but 5 years ago stood shoulder to shoulder against a common enemy. Lately the rearmament has been accelerated. Russia is now devoting to her military forces five-sixths of the same effort she devoted to it in the first year of her war against Hitler. Even today Russia is devoting to her military might two-thirds of the effort that she devoted to it in 1945, the last year of the war.

Russia is now maintaining 200 divisions, many of them armored. As at present constituted, we have approximately 10. The U. S. S. R. is building up a mighty air force. In some categories, it is superior to ours in quantity, and high in quality. In certain categories of long-range, heavy bombing planes Russia is lacking. However, she is diligently working to fill this void. Much of our great Navy, in the category of ships, has been put in mothballs and is substantially on a stand-by basis.

Russia is building up steadily a large fleet of new, efficient, and powerful submarines. Reports indicate she is constructing heavier surface craft also. Both the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. are increasing their stock pile of A-bombs, and undoubtedly both of them are working on the construction of H-bombs.

This over-all general comparison of the armed might of Russia with that of our own country shows, I believe, that the present advantage in military might, taking into account our commitments overseas, lies with the United States. This is primarily because of our large stock pile of atomic bombs and Russia's relatively small stock pile of this most decisive weapon ever invented for use in war.

One of our pending proposals in the United Nations is to achieve the prohibition of the manufacture, possession, and use of the A- and H-bombs. If the proposal is accepted by Russia, it will mean a tremendous reduction in the armed strength of the United States, with no compensating reduction in the armed strength of Russia.

It will mean we give up the very thing which experts have proclaimed to be the greatest single factor for keeping the peace. Considering our great distance from the European Continent, it would likely threaten our military preeminence in Europe as well as at home.

Therefore, Mr. President, further effort on the part of the United States to achieve prohibition of the manufacture, possession, and use of the A- and H-bombs, without accompanying and compensating disarmament programs by Russia and other nations, may lead the United States and the democratic nations associated with us into the abyss of disaster.

More than anything else, the possession of a large stock pile of these decisive weapons has given to our country and the democratic nations allied with us a feeling of firm and irreplaceable security. We are so far ahead in stock piling the bombs that no other country can match us in the reasonable foreseeable future.

Our country has access to the largest part of the known world supply of uranium. Russia does not have access to a similar volume of raw materials indispensable to the making of the great bombs.

The scientific and mechanical ability and know-how of the United States and the thousands of great industrial establishments where this knowledge and ability can be translated quickly into weapons give the assurance to our people and to the North Atlantic Security Alliance that we are not lagging behind in the great essentials of modern defense.

All these factors taken together have poised the peoples of the free democratic world upon the highest peaks of national and international defense. We are infinitely stronger than any other nation, in the number and quality of the most decisive weapons known.

But, Mr. President, if we continue the laudable course of disarmament in the United Nations through the medium of two separate committees therein we are

inviting grave dangers. With one committee seeking to achieve agreement for the outlawing of atomic weapons and the other working for a scaling down of other conventional weapons, we could be placed in an untenable position.

For example, if the Russians, at some future date, should accept our proposals for the prohibition of the manufacture, possession, and use of A- and H-bombs, without agreeing to our other proposals for the scaling down of conventional weapons, we would be caught in a trap. We cannot afford to agree to the prohibition of the A- and H-bombs only. There must be accompanying and compensating disarmament in the field of conventional weapons, to offset this sacrifice of our armed might. Otherwise, our own people and the people of western Europe would strongly oppose it, and I believe the United States Senate would not vote to ratify any such agreement, for the simple reason that it would transfer military dominance, particularly in Europe, from ourselves to Russia.

We would be embarrassed by the acceptance of the very proposition we put forth. The Russians could say: "All right, we agree to your proposition to outlaw the great bombs. Now let us proceed to do it. We have accepted it. What are you waiting on? Are you going to break faith upon the very proposal which you yourselves made?"

Thus if we refused to carry out the plan after agreement was reached to outlaw the great bombs, we would stand indicted before the world as having wailed on our own disarmament proposal.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those who are standing in the Senate Chamber will please be seated. Senators will find seats. Let there be order.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we secure Russia's acceptance and carry out the plan, we consequently raise Russia's might greatly while reducing our own. We shatter the present strong faith of western Europeans that they can look to us for protection. We place Russia in a position where without any bombs she can renew all the various pressures on the countries of western Europe.

If the two proposals pending in the United Nations are not henceforth handled by the same committee, so that any disarmament by one great nation is compensated for by equal disarmament by others, then we ought to recall our offer from the United Nations. The establishment of two committees to deal with two different kinds of armaments no doubt sprang from the best of intentions. However, such a policy is neither sound nor wise, nor likely to be rewarded by real accomplishment.

One European country, Norway, has more than 100 miles of her northern frontier adjoining the frontier of Soviet Russia. If there are no bombs in our arsenal with which to come to the aid of Norway and other such countries, they might begin to question whether, under the new alignment of armaments, they would be as safe as they formerly were.

From Italy northward all along Europe's Atlantic coast, Russia would un-



doubtedly try to pick off first one, then another of the democratic countries allied with us. So great would be her comparative might—already poised on the borders of these countries, with ours 3,000 miles away—that the mere threat of armed intervention plus other pressures would make it difficult for the western Europeans not to try for the best terms they could get from such a formidable and threatening power.

We should realize that the prohibition of A- and H-bombs, taken singly, might result in the destruction of the democratic world to a large degree.

If I were a Norwegian or a Dane, a Dutchman, a Belgian, or a Frenchman, and there were no great A-bombs in existence and all the other armed might of the world remained as at present distributed, I would make a new calculation of the existing power of Russia on the one hand and that of the United States on the other.

I would know that Russia had 200 divisions, many of them heavily armored. I would know that the United States had but 10. I would know that for purposes of war in Europe, without the bombs, the Russian air force was at least on a par with that of the United States. I would know that the great United States Navy, powerful though it is, is not equipped beyond a limited degree to defend the borders of western European countries where the Russian Army is already poised.

Mr. President, may we have order, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those who are standing in the Senate Chamber will please find seats.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would likely have a feeling that the West had lost the war of ideas with the East, so far as Europe was concerned. As threat after threat mounted, as pressure after pressure from Russia increased upon western Europe, I would begin to wonder whether I had best not make what terms I could with a powerful enemy on the spot, rather than rely upon the smaller forces of my friends and allies more than 3,000 miles away.

That, I believe, would be the reasoning of the great masses of the people of western Europe. The North Atlantic Security Alliance might be dealt a blow from which it could not recover. If this came to pass, the United States would then stand isolated in a world where strong Russian and allied forces stood on the borders of the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Arctic Oceans.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall refuse to continue unless there can be order in the Chamber. I simply cannot shout against the conversations of everyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Senate and in the galleries. Let everyone including the occupants of the galleries, be quiet while this important proceeding continues.

Does the Senator from Nebraska ask to be recognized?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I merely wanted to request the Presiding Officer to preserve order in the Senate Chamber. The

Senator from Maryland has made the request three or four times. Conversations are going on in the Senate Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let everyone be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to say that I feel that order certainly should be preserved. It is a very important speech, and I personally am anxious to hear every word of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. TYDINGS. That, Mr. President, is the grave danger in proceeding with world disarmament on a partial basis. It is a hazard to ourselves and the North Atlantic Security Alliance when two separate committees of the United Nations are trying to solve this great problem on a dual basis. To institute atomic controls and prohibitions alone would strike a deadly blow at our own defenses—a blow calculated to dismember the North Atlantic Security Alliance and weaken the whole democratic world.

The means for avoiding this danger, if disarmament is to be the continuing quest of the United Nations, is to consolidate these two committees. Disarmament must be equal, not one-sided. No nation can be asked to give up its preeminence in a single field of military might without accompanying and compensating disarmament by other nations in the same or other fields. Disarmament by example is not disarmament at all.

In essence, this shows the fallacy of trying to achieve world peace by disarmament unless the whole subject of world disarmament is confronted, analyzed and solved so that all nations shall disarm proportionately. In other words, the outlawing of atomic weapons, unless accompanied by the outlawing and elimination simultaneously of other weapons is a snare and a delusion.

All treaties calculated to achieve any measure of disarmament are based upon the indispensable ingredient of worldwide inspection. No nation will trust another's word as to the amount or extent of disarming which it is putting into effect. Each nation must know the actual practices being carried out, through inspection, by its own representatives. Without inspection there can be no disarmament. It is the sine qua non of the whole proposition.

So long as large armaments remain, even without bombs, the threat of war lingers. It has not been reduced to its irreducible minimum, but only by a degree. Thus if war comes—and it could come by the use of the permissible weapons—the moment it starts, all inspection ceases. Obviously, if we were at war with Russia, we would not permit her representatives to inspect our country, nor would she permit our inspectors to enter her borders.

As inspection is an indispensable part of every treaty, these treaties would provide that the disarmament agreements remain in effect only while inspection is possible. So when inspection ceases at the outbreak of war, the treaties are abrogated and declared null and void. It is then permissible for the nations who are parties to the disarmament pact

to begin rearmament in all categories, including A- and H-bombs. Each belligerent capable of doing so would at once begin the manufacture of these deadly weapons. As soon as they were produced they would likely be used, just as they were used, as soon as we made them, in our war with Japan.

So what have we gained, Mr. President, if disarmament carries through, even equitably, only in the top category of major atomic weapons? We have gained only a truce between wars. During the period between wars the great weapons would not be used anyhow. You have merely delayed their use somewhat. For immediately upon the advent of war, they are certain to be manufactured and used, as they are acknowledged to be the most decisive weapons known to bring the enemy to his knees.

All we have done by such a process is to march the hopes of mankind to the summit of peace, only to find that we must march them all down again.

Twenty years ago, Maxim Litvinoff, the Russian representative at the World Disarmament Conference in Geneva, said this: "The way to disarm is to disarm."

One cannot be saint and sinner at the same time. If the world wants peace through disarmament, it cannot achieve it by being a Roman rider, with one foot on the horse of disarmament and one foot on the horse of rearmament. There are no short cuts, magic keys, or miraculous formulae for the achievement of real world peace, other than through world disarmament.

Nor will the cause of peace be aided by partial disarmament in any category of weapons by the great nations unless with such agreement there is accompanying and compensating disarmament by all the parties thereto.

Therefore, today I again raise my voice for two purposes: First, to end the procedure in the United Nations where two committees are working to secure agreement on two separate phases of the disarmament program. This must be a single undertaking, either in or out of the United Nations. The present division of work and effort of these committees is fraught with the grave dangers I have pointed out. If this work is to continue, it should be done by a single consolidated committee, to avoid misunderstanding and irreparable loss of our prestige before the world.

Secondly, I renew my plea for a real world disarmament conference, where this subject will be considered in its entirety. I ask for a conference devoted to this one purpose. So long as the threat of war remains, as it will remain without world disarmament, there is little or no real prospect of settling the other disputes of men and nations on any permanent basis.

Finally, in the face of the resurgence of Russian military power on land, sea, and in the air—and in the field of atomic bombs—we must review our total military potential and that of those associated with us. If this arms race is not halted, it will mean more rather than less defense; more rather than less taxes, for military purposes; more rather than less sacrifices; more rather than less

concern for the ultimate fate of mankind.

Mr. President, this is something which I think may interest the Senators who are present.

The present announced policies of the State Department seem to condemn us to this course. In an article published in the Reader's Digest for March 1950 entitled "Is War With Russia Inevitable?" Mr. George F. Kennan, the able counselor of the State Department, says war is possible. He says it may come either by accident, or from the fear of the Russians that someone is going to attack them. Speaking for the State Department, he tells us that there are only three alternatives open to us: "(a) a return to isolation and armed neutrality; (b) war, or (c) to continue the policy of throwing our weight into the balance wherever there are relatively good chances that it will be effective in preventing the further expansion of international communism."

There Mr. Kennan closes the door. We must either retreat back to America and pursue a policy of armed and isolated neutrality, or go to war with Russia, or just hold fast as we are.

All imagination, energy, ingenuity, and diplomacy on the part of our Government and people are by such a policy completely and unmitigatingly discounted. They are all deposited in a steel-riveted sphere of frozen vacuity.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to finish my remarks, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Without additional State Department policy, the American Nation and those associated with us are compelled to live on the other side of an iron curtain already hiding nearly half of the world and its people.

Mr. Kennan's three alternatives, taken together, are mountainous in their defeatism. They are not in the American tradition. They place a new low on American ingenuity. They offer nothing but the ultimate expectation of the incineration of mankind. Like Mr. Micawber, the State Department seems willing to wait for something to turn up.

Evidently the recent words of Dr. Einstein that "annihilation of all life on this planet is now within the realm of technical possibility" seem to have been completely overlooked. Like Nero, we seem to show a willingness to fiddle while our world burns. We seem to have no plans, other than those stated, to break the stalemate.

There is little hope held out by these alternatives either to our own people or to the people of western Europe. There is no hope held out to those nations, once free, that are now behind the iron curtain. This lethargic statement parades us before the world as impotent, devoid even of the will to try, and exhibits a paucity of thought and action in the face of a gathering storm which could sweep away all Christendom, all civilization, all living things.

I would offer another alternative to the three which the State Department says are our only recourse: the alterna-

tive of taking the initiative, stating our objective before all the world and carrying our message in every manner possible to all people behind the iron curtain.

I would start it by calling a world disarmament conference, by going to the very core of the matter, at the beginning. There are excellent precedents for this in time of great national trial and danger. Woodrow Wilson did it in his fervent appeal to the people of other nations, over the heads of their own governments, with his fourteen points which helped crack the resistance of the enemy in World War I. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill did not hesitate to appeal to the people of other nations by setting forth the allied objectives in the Atlantic Charter. Would not a ringing appeal for real world disarmament under adequate guaranties against bad faith tear the mask of propaganda, crimination, and recrimination from the face of those who would keep the world in an armed camp?

We are the greatest advertisers and salesmen the world has ever seen. The dynamic quality of our business life is built largely upon advertising and salesmanship. Why not employ these great American attributes to carry an honest message behind the iron curtain? It would say in effect:

"We in America, the most powerful Nation in the world militarily, economically, and financially, are offering to the governments of all other peoples the proposition to disarm to the lowest possible degree, retaining only such forces as are necessary to keep law and order within our countries."

This would be a hard message to explain away to the people on the other side of the iron curtain. It shows clearly and precisely where the United States stands, what our motives are and what we desire.

There must be many Russians who want to be relieved of the awful burden of slaving not for themselves and their families but for the waste of giant armaments. There must be millions of Russians who would like to be relieved of the threat and fear of war. This is a difficult invitation for any government to reject. Sooner or later people will begin to realize that much that they need and desire could be obtained if this policy were adopted.

Yes, there is a fourth alternative—a call for world disarmament. The impact of that message, properly framed, will stir millions in every land all over this earth. It will stir them particularly when they come to know that the alternative is as Dr. Einstein has said, the possible incineration of all mankind.

Let us tell the people of the world precisely what our purpose is. If we do, we will reap a good harvest in the verdict of millions of people all over the earth. They will come to know that America is the friend of the common man. They will learn who opposes and destroys the ideal which we seek.

We cannot win the cold war by dynamic negativism or by burying our heads in the sand in the illusion that the enemy will pass by. We can win it by strong, aggressive, imaginative, diplomatic action.

That is the call of the hour. It is the call that millions are waiting for.

I renew my plea for the President of the United States to call a world disarmament conference. It is fraught with great possibilities for good, even though it fails. It is burdened with blessings if it succeeds. It is the call that stems from strength. It is a call that all but a few will heed. It is a call to end both the cold war and the hot war. It is a call to restore to mankind those inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—with which our Creator has endowed us.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the thought which came to my mind as the Senator was speaking about the vacuum was that what he was endeavoring to do by his splendid statement was to break the seal which was causing the vacuum, and get some action by the State Department and by the President and other nations in an endeavor to come to some type of world-wide agreement on the armament question.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. I should like to commend the Senator from Maryland. I have listened to him with keen interest. I certainly hope that not only the President, but the State Department, will heed the warning and the message which he has given us.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his generous support. At the expense of reiteration, it seems to me that if we were to utilize every possible means which we have at hand, and accentuate all the means at our command to carry the message, that the United States, the strongest nation in the world, militarily, economically, and financially—I will not say spiritually and morally—is proposing to all the governments on earth a world disarmament conference down to the lowest possible point necessary to keep law and order in each country, so that the millions who now slave for the waste of building great armaments may devote their energies to their homes, to schools, hospitals, roads, food, clothing, and shelter, provided their government and the other governments would only join with us in that quest, it would be a powerful and revolutionizing statement, even if its objective were not realized, which might bring great results in ways which we cannot even now see. If the idea were carried to its ultimate conclusion and such a conference were held, it would be a great blessing to all mankind.

Mr. THYE. In other words, our silence as a nation might be interpreted as evidence of confusion on our part and a hesitancy to take the aggressive leadership necessary to bring about the disarmament which is absolutely necessary, particularly in view of the hydrogen element from which we are now attempting to build bombs.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has put his finger on the important point. We are going to have disarmament, or, if we have a war at some period in the future, there is no man in this Chamber who can be certain that when it is all over the place we now stand on and the



people who are young will still be here. There are potentialities inherent in the type of warfare with which we are now confronted which lead, as Dr. Einstein said, to the possibility ultimately of all life on this planet being wiped out. That message, together with the one I have briefly outlined, ought to find lodgement in the dullest intellect in the world, wherever it may be.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I enjoyed the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, particularly his concluding comments. I was reminded of the world situation back in the days when, from this country, there came forth the idea enunciated in the Declaration of Independence. It spread throughout the peoples of the world a flame of desire for nobler things and for freer government, and it was the beginning of the disintegration of autocracy. It seems to me the present situation is analogous. The peoples of earth are hungry for "the way out"—out of fear, out of tyranny, out of debt, out of war. They are looking for more light. I am satisfied that if the aggressive and dynamic suggestion and the idea which has been so ably presented on two occasions by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, were properly presented with force, energy, and dynamics by our State Department, it would cause hope to spring afresh in the hearts, and minds, and souls of the peoples of earth; even as the Declaration of Independence did in 1776.

Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senate that there have just come into the gallery some 25 or 30 young men and women from Europe. Their coming is a gleam in the darkness. They are here to spend a year to get acquainted with America, with American ideals, and American ways of life. They belong to the Moral Rearmament Group, which is really doing a great job. The Senate will remember that it was only last year that the Chaplain of the Senate visited Caux. He came back spiritually exhilarated. He wrote two articles for the Sunday Star, as I recall, and they have been placed in the RECORD. He wrote of the spiritual uplift and experience he had when he was at Caux.

Yesterday we heard read the Farewell Message of George Washington. In it Washington stressed the importance of religion in a people of morality and spirituality. Today the Senator from Maryland has given us a lift with an idea—a liberating idea. At noon I took lunch with this fine group of young men and women and I received a similar lift. I feel there are forces working for good. The world situation is critical but not hopeless. We Americans have adequacy in our blood. Always, with the help of God, we have proved equal to the emergency. In the days of Valley Forge, when things looked darkest, and when Washington was in doubt about the future, a young man named Lafayette came from France and brought with him to Washington and his leaders the message, in substance, that the eyes of Europe were looking with hope and expect-

tation toward America, with its new ideas, with its new political and liberating concepts. From that young man came encouragement and direction to Washington to carry on.

I say, Mr. President, that today the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] by his proposal and our young European friends by their presence, furnish a good omen for the world of tomorrow.

I am an optimist. With courage, with the desire to adventure—casting out all doubt, fear, and self-distrust—undaunted by present conditions, with faith, hope and confidence, we will ultimately find the answer, Mr. President.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before I yield the floor I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that his illustration respecting the wide effect of the publication of the Declaration of Independence upon the world is very apt. What he said respecting that document shows that if an idea is what we believe to be moral and spiritually right, and if it is honestly projected and widely understood, as I believe a simple message of the kind I have outlined would be, no one can measure the force of that idea down through the corridors of time. No man can measure its contribution, even if the proposal fails, toward causing a ferment among the people on both sides of the iron curtain who want to have a better way of living than the one they now have.

In my opinion one of the reasons the Russian revolution succeeded was that there was just enough apathy concerning the retaining of the old Czarist regime, and enough resurgence toward establishing a new regime, so the new regime was able to seize power because the people of Russia thought it offered a better promise for them, whether it did or did not really do so.

I believe that now there is a God-given opportunity for leadership by the United States to utilize every agency at its command, to use all its efforts, all its salesmanship ingenuity, all its advertising ingenuity, in sending this simple message out all over the world. It cannot do any harm. It springs from strength. The world knows how strong we are. We defeated one nation almost by ourselves, and contributed materially toward defeating two others, and in doing so we had to go across two great oceans. We do not have to apologize or to explain our position. The world knows how strong we are. The force of that message might conceivably rend some of the curtains and tear down some of the barriers now standing between the East and the West.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I pay my respects to the very able Senator from Maryland for an address which he not only presented forcefully, but which contains much merit.

Getting back to the practical side of the situation, I should like to ask the Senator several questions. Does the special counselor whom the distinguished Senator quoted reflect the position or the philosophy of the present

head of the Department of State, or is the Senator speaking for himself? In other words, I should like to know from the Senator from Maryland, because of the position he occupies as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, if the appeal is a reflection of the present leadership in the State Department?

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe I can answer your question affirmatively for three reasons. First, he says substantially what the Secretary of State said in his extemporaneous remarks of 10 days ago.

Secondly, it comes from the counselor of the State Department, who obviously would not take a position opposed to the position of his chief.

Thirdly, the Reader's Digest very generously waived its copyright to the article so that it might have the widest examination in reprints all over the country.

I believe any one of those three reasons is sufficient, but taking the three factors together there can be only one answer: Yes; what I read and quoted is the present position of the State Department of the United States of America.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his answer.

I should like to ask him another question if he will yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield for another question.

Mr. WHERRY. Could the appeal proposed to be made to the leadership of the world and to all the peoples of the world, be made through the United Nations?

Mr. TYDINGS. That opens up a tremendous field for argument. I should prefer to answer the question in this fashion: I believe there is a better way to do it than through the United Nations. I believe the dramatics of the United Nations have now pretty well passed away. I believe that we have a great opportunity for presenting a dynamic proposal. I believe the call would have to come from a very high peak of authority and eminence in order to carry the conviction that it came from a source that was strong and powerful, that it came in a sacrificial sense, that it came from one who would give up more than anyone else to achieve an ideal.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his answer. I should like to ask one more question, if the Senator will yield for a final question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator from Maryland agree with me that this dramatic appeal which is proposed to be made, which would be judged by the whole world, should be made in the open? Would it not, with all the dramatics going with it, when given to all the world—even though in the end the satisfactory results the Senator hopes for might not be achieved—be more effective if made openly?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; certainly. There are many who live behind the iron curtain whose labor, sometimes under conditions almost of slavery, goes into a giant armament system instead of into the production of houses, of food, of clothing, and so on, who, if they heard

the message, would question whether the government under which they were forced to live ought not to be replaced by some other form of government. There are many ramifications growing out of the proposal other than simply the matter of disarmament, but the greatest advantages to be achieved are those resulting from disarmament.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his remarks.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. There are some points the Senator has made with which I am not in agreement, as the Senator knows from our private conversation, but as to the necessity for hard and constructive thinking about the affairs of the world we are in complete agreement.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. I congratulate the Senator upon the spirit which has moved him, and I hope his spirits will not flag, and that he will not fail to continue to rise on the floor of the Senate and express his belief and his thoughts on a subject which we must continue to examine and reexamine in behalf of the peace of the world.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his remarks. Before I yield the floor I should also like to thank him for his own efforts to try to achieve a new approach to the stalemate which exists between the east and the west.

I would not want to surrender the floor without saying what I do not believe is necessary to say, that, of course, until we secure disarmament which gives us the same security we feel with armament, we must keep our defenses very, very strong. This is not a plea for unilateral disarmament, for disarmament by example, or any kind of disarmament which would leave us relatively weaker in any respect than we are now. It is a plea for strength in the interim up to disarmament, and for disarmament whenever it is possible.

#### COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] I send to the desk the amendment lettered "G" which I ask to have stated, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "planted" and insert in lieu thereof "harvested."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Section 2 of the bill as it is now written has the effect of repealing all price support on potatoes which are planted after the enactment

of this measure. The amendment which I have offered on behalf of myself and other Senators, by changing the word "planted" to "harvested" would have the same effect except that it would apply to all potatoes which are harvested after the enactment of the pending measure. The reason I offer it is that if such provision is not made there is a certain area in the United States in which farmers are now engaged in planting, and it will be impossible to tell who has or has not planted prior to any given date. During the 2 or 3 weeks' period the bill may be in conference, or during the period while it is awaiting the signature of the President they will have an incentive for engaging in an almost round-the-clock planting. The result would be that next summer, we will have the greatest congestion of potatoes ready to harvest at one time the country has ever seen, and the result will be a completely demoralized market.

I have discussed the question with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the majority leader, and I understand he has considered the merit of the amendment and might be willing to accept it. Will the Senator from Illinois respond to that statement?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret I did not hear the statement made by the Senator from Delaware. I was discussing another very important matter with my friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Candidly I was not paying attention to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was pointing out to the Senator that the reason for offering the amendment is that it would prevent a congestion of potatoes on the market next summer. Without this amendment the farmers would have an incentive for planting faster during the next 2 or 3 weeks. During that time the farmers would have a price-support incentive for all-around-the-clock planting. I understood the Senator from Illinois recognized the merits of the amendment, and was willing to accept it.

Mr. LUCAS. I did advise the Senator from Delaware that I thought his amendment was sound. After talking over the matter with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] I found that I might have been slightly confused. The Senator from Florida will have something to say about the amendment. There is no doubt that the amendment, as now worded, is discriminatory.

However, as I said in my speech the other day on the floor of the Senate, on this subject, it seemed to me that it did not discriminate very much, because most of the potatoes which are planted now and some which are now on the market in the extreme southern section of the country sell on the market for a price higher than the support price. There may be a few exceptions to that; but on the whole, as I understand from the Department of Agriculture—and the Senators from the South can correct me if I am wrong as to this—I think probably 90 percent of all the potatoes which will be produced in the next month will sell at a price higher than the support price. So the support price really does

not have too much effect on what we call the early potatoes which are grown in the southern area of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if we accept the statements by the Senator from Illinois as correct, then there would be no objection at all to my amendment, because if the support price is not necessary to the southern potatoes, it would not make any difference whether we change this provision, and the amendment would eliminate the discrimination in respect to the farmers, from Virginia and North Carolina west to the California coast.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that in view of the opposition of my distinguished friend the Senator from Florida, who is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I should like to have the Senator from Delaware present the amendment, and I should like to have the Senate vote on it, rather than to adopt it as my own at the present time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out the word "planted" and insert in lieu thereof the word "harvested."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as I have pointed out, I think my amendment is most necessary because of the planting season in North Carolina and Virginia. The potato farmers in those States are now in the midst of planting. In the next 3 weeks, given reasonably good weather, the potato farmers in North Carolina will be able to complete the planting, if it is necessary that they do so in order to get under the deadline; and the same thing is true in regard to most of the potato farmers in Virginia.

As evidence of the fact that a large percentage of the potatoes from that area do move through Government channels, under the support program, I shall show how the potatoes from North Carolina were moving in 1948. I do not have the 1949 records with me; however, so far as I know, the 1948 figures present a fair comparison with those for 1949.

On June 22, 1948, the State of North Carolina shipped 195 carloads of potatoes. That area would be involved under this particular amendment. Of the 195 carloads of potatoes which North Carolina shipped on that day, 155 of these went under the Government support program and were diverted from the normal channels of trade.

On the same date, the Eastern Shore of Virginia shipped 132 carloads of potatoes. Sixty-five of those carloads of potatoes, or nearly half, went to the Government support program.



The Norfolk section of Virginia, south of Chesapeake Bay, where the potatoes could be planted in time to come under this proposal, shipped on the same day 73 carloads of potatoes, and 64 carloads of them were sold under the Government support program.

So a large proportion of the southern potatoes can and do move under the Government support program and can result in just as great destruction of potatoes as we are now experiencing.

To show that June 23 was not an unusual day, so far as shipments of potatoes are concerned, if we refer to the situation on the following day, we find that on that day North Carolina loaded 149 carloads of potatoes, and only 16 carloads of those potatoes went into the normal channels of trade, whereas 133 carloads of them were diverted to alcohol factories or for use in other ways.

On the same day the Eastern Shore of Virginia shipped 264 carloads of potatoes, and 176 carloads of them went under the Government support program.

I do not think it is necessary for me to read the figure for all the States which shipped potatoes on that day; but the records show that as to the potatoes produced in the intermediate States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, and the States to the west of them, a large proportion of the potatoes move into the support program, as much so as do the northern potatoes. If at this point we are going to try to correct the potato situation by repealing price support so far as all northern potato farmers are concerned, then let us repeal price support so far as all the potato farmers throughout the country are concerned.

As the Senator from Illinois points out, when we do that at this time, it is discrimination against one group of farmers, because then we have singled out as a guinea pig, we might say, the potato farmers. However, if we are going to single out the potato farmers, because of the scandal insofar as potatoes are concerned, let us do so with respect to all potato farmers, not merely those in one section of the country, because it has been costing just as much money to administer the price-support program for southern potatoes as it has for northern potatoes.

Another reason, and to my mind the most important one, why the Senate should adopt this amendment is that if it is not adopted the result will be that all the potatoes which are planted prior to the enactment of the law will have price support, whereas those which are planted after the enactment of the law will not have price support. Consider the situation, for instance, in Virginia or in North Carolina or in any other State of the Union, for that matter: There would be no way on earth by which the Government could tell whether John Jones planted his potatoes before midnight of a certain day or whether he planted them the following morning, after the bill had been signed. There would be no way to tell which group of farmers planted their potatoes before the joint resolution was signed and which group of farmers planted their potatoes after it was signed.

Under those circumstances, there is no way on earth by which a law based on the exact time of planting could be administered. Therefore, any law enacted under those circumstances, when we have knowledge of that situation, is ill-advised and unsound.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think we have no alternative but to repeal price support all the way across the board, or else drop the project in its entirety.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEAHY in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Was there any implied promise to those who planted potatoes that they would continue under existing supports? Would the present proposal result in our violating what might be called an implied representation or promise to them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would say, in reply to the Senator's suggestion, that the proposal of the Senator from Illinois under section 2 constitutes a violation of an implied promise on the part of the Government to the potato farmers. But my point is that if we are going to violate that promise, let us violate it to all the farmers, not merely to a few farmers in the North, and leave the southern farmers unaffected by that violation. In other words, my point is that it is impossible to separate the groups of farmers, so far as this matter is concerned.

I think the Senator will recognize, as I do, that if the farmers of Colorado today are in the midst of planting, there will be no way on earth 3 months from now to tell whether the farmers planted their potatoes today or tomorrow. In fact, any farmer would run his tractors all night, in order to get all his potatoes planted ahead of the effective date—and so would I, if I were in his position.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois could not be enforced; there is no way on earth by which it could be enforced. The result would be that the farmers would plant exceptionally heavy during the next 3 weeks; consequently, when the harvesting season came, all those potatoes would be harvested in the same period. That would result in a great congestion of the potatoes next summer and a completely demoralized market. All of them would be harvested at one time, and that would cost the Government an amount of money which could hardly be imagined.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As to the farmers who plant their potatoes after the measure becomes law, would there be the same degree of violation of implied promises?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That would depend entirely on how far—

Mr. MILLIKIN. I mean to say, the farmer would be planting his potatoes at that time with his eyes open; he would know what was ahead of him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Colorado will agree with me, I think, that

it depends entirely upon how soon a time following enactment of the measure the Senator from Colorado has in mind. As to Maine, I agree with the Senator, but I am referring to farmers in the area where potatoes are now being planted. Such a farmer—John Jones, let us say—might plant his potatoes today. John Smith, with the same intentions and the same promise from the Government that his price would be supported, has bought his seed potatoes and has bought his fertilizer and has plowed the ground and has done everything except put the potatoes in the ground. In respect to this proposal, we would have the same responsibility with respect to the man who is planting his potatoes tomorrow as we would with respect to the man who is planting his potatoes today, because each of them has made his investment and has no alternative but to proceed.

The amendment of the Senator from Illinois proposes such a violation of a promise; but if we are going to violate the promise, we should do so for the entire group, because, as I have said, 3 months from now it will be impossible to obtain sufficient enforcement agencies to be able to determine just when the potatoes were planted. Unless we are going to make a division on geographical lines and say that the distinction shall apply to all potatoes south of a certain line, it will be impracticable to make such a division.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. There is no question about the force of the argument presented by the Senator from Delaware, and there is no question about the discrimination or about the repudiation of the implied promise on the part of the Government.

I do not think the Senator from Colorado was in the Chamber the other day when we were discussing the potato situation. My only purpose in offering the amendment, I may say to the Senator from Colorado, is that from the standpoint of the Treasury of the United States, the potato situation is so serious that the time has come when the Congress must take some action with respect to the potato program. Otherwise, the potato program alone, which has cost the taxpayers half a billion dollars, will ultimately destroy the foundation stones of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which has done so much for the farmers of the Nation.

When the Senator from Illinois submitted the amendment the other day before the committee—and it was carried in the committee—he came to the floor of the Senate immediately thereafter and presented a measure which would place the potato growers of the United States under the same strict, rigid controls as the ones presently applying to the farmers who are producing the basic commodities, such as wheat, corn, tobacco, and cotton. I propose to follow that through immediately with hearings, and to have reported to the Senate a bill which will place the potato growers under such controls, to the end that we shall not have a potato surplus every year.

My thought was, I may say to the Senator, that the only way we can get quick action on that matter is to cut off the support price entirely until we can act on a bill of the kind I have mentioned. If we do not do so, we may not get down to business on a bill and, in the end, we may lose at least \$50,000,000 upon the 1950 potato crop. I am trying to save that for the Treasury.

Senators on the other side of the aisle, as well as Senators on this side of the aisle who are talking about economy all the time should realize that here is an opportunity to save \$50,000,000, without hurting anyone. The potato growers have fared better than any other group of farmers in America. We cannot continue these large subsidies.

I am not blaming anyone. The Congress of the United States, Democrats and Republicans alike, are responsible. We had the program during the war. We followed it after the war. The Eightieth Congress followed the same mandatory price-support program, and at the present time, in the Anderson bill, potatoes are placed under a mandatory price support of from 60 to 90 percent. The move proposed by the amendment seems to be in the right direction, although I admit it repudiates an implied promise, and is drastic legislation. But sometimes drastic legislation is necessary in order to arrive at a solution of an existing problem.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the able Senator from Illinois pointed out the possibility that \$50,000,000 might be saved through the enactment of the amendment he proposes. I think that is a fine saving; heaven knows I am for it. But it occurs to me, and I should like to ask the able Senator from Delaware whether it is not correct, that if by the operation of the proposal of the Senator from Illinois, \$50,000,000 can be saved, cannot a substantially greater amount be saved by accepting the perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unquestionably. I should say that about half the cost of the program will apply to the potatoes which would be planted prior to the possible enactment of the legislation. I agree with the Senator from Illinois it is drastic legislation, and I also agree with him that drastic legislation perhaps is necessary if we are to clean up a situation which has become a national scandal. I have criticized the potato program on numerous occasions during the past 3 years, yet we have never been able to get any legislation which would correct the situation.

I understand the Senator from Illinois has introduced a bill which he considers a step toward a solution of the problem. I think we should approach the problem with the thought in mind of solving it, not of going through another year, 1950, throwing away another \$100,000,000 and destroying a large volume of good edible food. I shall support the

Senator from Illinois in his effort. As to whether his bill is what I would go along with, I do not know; I have not studied it. But I think we should take some action to obviate the wholesale destruction of potatoes, and not sit idly by and have a repetition in 1950 of what has happened during the past 5 years.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I want to thank him for the statement he has just made. I am very grateful to him for his viewpoint, which coincides with that of the Senator from Illinois. I am not so much interested in the word "planting," as against the word "harvesting." I think, however, the Senator from Delaware has a very valuable point with regard to the substitution of the word. My amendment involves a deeper principle. I am trying to get something done with the potato program which will prevent a repetition of the scandalous things which have happened under the potato program year after year, and which have disturbed the press and the people of the country. It simply does not seem to me to be fair and right that potatoes should be subjected to no controls when other commodities, such as the basic commodities I mentioned a moment ago, are under rigid support controls.

I am tremendously concerned with the wheat program, the corn program, and the soybean program in Illinois and the Middle West. I am trying to do something to stop the criticism and public condemnation of the entire program which has been enacted by the Congress over the past few years. That is all the Senator from Illinois is trying to do. I am trying in the long run to eliminate the objectionable features from the potato program, and these include the exorbitant subsidies; in this way we may save the rest of the agricultural program.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like first to reply to the Senator from Illinois, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not question the intentions of the Senator from Illinois, nor do I object to what he is trying to achieve. I point out, however—and I think perhaps the Senator will agree with me—that in trying to achieve his goal by means of his amendment to the joint resolution in the manner in which he has written it, there is a possibility that it would cost the Government several million dollars more than would be necessary, as a result of encouraging the farmers, by placing the incentive before them, to plant more rapidly for the next 3 or 4 weeks' period.

The Government would have to buy those potatoes at the particular time of the year when many of them could not be stored for an indefinite period. They would rot. Therefore, they would be removed from the market channels and within 3 or 4 weeks thereafter there would be a shortage of other potatoes coming into the market. It would re-

sult in exorbitantly high prices to the consumers. Therefore without my amendment, I think we would defeat the purpose we have in mind. We might save \$25,000,000 or \$50,000,000 in one place, but we could very well lose more than half of it in another place, and thus benefit no one. I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I shall ask the Senator from Delaware a question in a moment. I shall have to precede it by a very brief statement, so I can make my question intelligible. I noticed with some concern the confession made by both the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Illinois that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois involves a repudiation of an implied agreement. I do not like to be put in the position, and I do not think any other Member of the Senate does, of voting for an amendment which amounts to a repudiation of an agreement, expressed or implied.

What I want to ask the Senator is this: Is not this the correct actual situation: Whenever Congress passes a law, such as the price-support law, it does so with the entire moral and legal right both to repeal and change the law at any time the national welfare shall make it advisable so to do, and therefore, even though the law be in effect at the moment of planting, any farmer who plants and makes his investment in advance, as was indicated a little while ago, does so subject not only to the legal right but to the moral right of the Congress in safeguarding the interests of the Nation to change or repeal the law at any time. I do not at all agree with the view that in adopting the amendment, whether it be with the word "harvested" or with the word "planted," we are violating any agreement, expressed or implied. I ask the Senator whether he does not think my statement is a correct statement of the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Missouri is correct—that Congress has a right to repeal or change any law which may have been passed. While I feel that there is an implied promise to the farmers, I point out to the Senator from Missouri, as a reason why I have no objections to going along with the change at this time, that when the support price was first passed as a wartime measure, we told the farmers that within a certain period after the war the price-support program would be discontinued. The farmer, therefore, fully expected no supports in the postwar period, yet Congress did extend such supports. By the same token, we are changing it now. It may be said we violated an implied promise when we projected the price-support program for another year or two, yet there was no objection. The fact that we projected it beyond the period when we said it would cease does not preclude our perfect right to stop it at any time we wish.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I merely wanted to make it perfectly clear at this point that, if I vote for the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, I shall not consider



that I am violating any moral obligation of the Government any more than I am violating a legal obligation. If I thought it violated a moral obligation, I do not think I should vote for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Missouri about that. I think we have to weigh the other factors involved, such as the effect on agriculture generally and on the Nation as a whole if we fail to take this action.

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the other factors outweigh the consideration of the immediate welfare of the potato growers, then we have no alternative except to vote for the amendment to repeal the potato-support program.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. In other words, I take it the Senator agrees that the Congress, the legislative body of the Nation, is charged with a duty and responsibility of taking care, so far as legislation can do it, along these lines, of the welfare of the people of the United States as an entirety.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. And when we pass price support law, particularly as the Senator has well pointed out, during the war conditions, we pass that law with the moral as well as the legal right to change it whenever in the judgment of Congress the best interests of the Nation will be subserved by such change. Is not that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the way I feel. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, much as I always dislike to disagree with the able lawyer from Missouri, the distinguished Senator [Mr. DONNELL], I am constrained to say that, in my opinion, the passing of the so-called Anderson bill occurred at a time when the potato farmers of the country had already planted potatoes. There can be no question about that so far as the South is concerned. At the present time they are operating under the law. When we follow through with the amendment I have offered, if it should become law, we are absolutely repudiating not only an implied, but an expressed promise written into the law. In the opinion of the Senator from Illinois, we have a right to repudiate it because of the great emergency which exists in the potato-subsidy situation. That is my reason for offering the amendment. In other words, I am willing to do what I am trying to do because I believe it is a step in the right direction toward saving the entire farm program from complete collapse. As I think every Senator knows, public confidence is pretty low with regard to the potato program. If the economy of the Nation demands such a drastic step, I am willing to take it. If any Senator says that we are not repudiating an implied promise, I cannot agree with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Regardless of whether we are repudiating an expressed or implied promise, there is no more

repudiation in changing the wording as I suggest than would otherwise be the case.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a different proposition. The whole tenor of my amendment is not changed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was my understanding that the Senator from Illinois was attempting to work out some correction of the potato problem.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. If I had not introduced a bill following this amendment my conscience would not be very clear. But we shall have a bill before this session of Congress which will place the potato growers of the Nation in the spot in which I think they want to be. In other words, I believe they want complete and rigid controls from here on. They do not want to be placed in their present situation any more than does any other farmer in the Nation.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. We have had much discussion about morality, and particularly about the manner in which things have been carried on by the administration. I had never suspected that the Senator from Missouri would take a more liberal view, let me say, on this question than has the administration. I want to read what I think is an entirely accurate statement:

It has been the historic policy of the Department of Agriculture not to change a program in the middle of a crop season. The Department policy in this respect has been repeatedly stated by numerous high officials.

The most recent official reiteration of record of the Department's policy was the testimony of Mr. Ralph S. Trigg, Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, and President of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Trigg, while testifying on September 19, 1949, before a Senate subcommittee hearing on S. 2482, to repeal price support on potatoes and eggs, stated the policy of the Department, in reply to a question, in the following language:

"If there are any adjustments to be made, we think they should be made at the end of a marketing season of a commodity, whether it is a calendar-year basis or another basis, but not in the middle of a program to the extent of removing supports entirely."

We have been assured today, by other top-ranking officials of the Department of Agriculture, that that policy has not been changed.

In other words, they recognize that there is some obligation, certainly moral and possibly legal, when we have announced a program and farmers have proceeded under it to carry on. Our wartime program was to be carried on for 2 years after the war. We lowered the support price of potatoes from 90 to 60 percent. We continued the program on the other basic commodities. That was a carefully considered action. This is the first time there has been a responsible suggestion that a change in the middle of a season did not constitute some degree of repudiation of certainly an implied obligation. I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Illinois, who

frankly recognizes that is the case, although he feels that the circumstances justify it.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I want the Senator from Maine to understand that the Senator from Illinois is doing this on his own responsibility, and not as majority leader. I conferred with the Department of Agriculture concerning this amendment, and also concerning the bill which I introduced, and representatives of that Department helped me prepare the bill. I think the Secretary of Agriculture, if he were called to testify, would probably take the same position he took in September.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, since the validity of the moral pronouncements of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been called into question, may I defer my request for recognition? It is such a strange and unusual situation that I should like to hear what the able Senator has to say about it.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not think it is necessary for me to say much more, because I think my position is perfectly clear and sound. I appreciate what the Senator from Maine has said. I assume he was reading from—was it someone's testimony?

Mr. BREWSTER. It was a statement by the Potato Council. The quotation which I read was from Mr. Trigg's testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Illinois was kind enough to say that the Secretary of Agriculture would confirm the statement that we did not contemplate changing the program in the middle of the season.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I can well understand that the policy of not changing the program during the middle of the crop season is perfectly sound and should be followed, but I do not think that alters the fact that the Congress of the United States is entitled at any moment to use its best judgment as to whether existing laws, whether they be price-support laws, tariff laws, or whatever they may be, should be changed or repealed. When I vote for a bill which is to be enacted into law, unless there is some provision which says how long it shall remain in effect, I think every Member of the Congress has a perfect right, if we find conditions changed to the extent that it is advisable to act from the standpoint of the welfare of the Nation as a whole, to vote to repeal such a law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I concur with the Senator from Missouri in the statement that we have a perfect right to do so. We have a perfect right to change a law at any time. This is not the first time it has happened.

The price-support law was supposed to expire 2 years after the war. In 1948,

in the latter days of the session, we enacted the so-called Hope-Aiken law. Had it not been enacted, there would have been no price-support provisions. The potatoes in Maine were in the ground at that time.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is in error. The potatoes were in the storehouses.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We enacted that law in June. It was during the planting season in Maine. We enacted it about the 19th of June, because it was almost the last act of Congress at that session. The same is true of 1949, when we enacted the Anderson bill. We changed the rules in the middle of the game with regard to the wheat farmers, who planted wheat in the fall. After the wheat was planted, we changed the rate of support. Congress has done that on other occasions. I think we have a right to change the rules the other way.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The actual facts are that potatoes are planted certainly before the end of June. They are usually planted before the 1st of June. The Senator says we changed the law. As a matter of fact, under the marketing practices, Maine potatoes are all in storehouses by November. I think the Senator from Delaware must be familiar with that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. In other words, on December 31 potato prices were still supported at 90 percent. Every potato in Maine necessarily must have gone into the hands of the Government unless there was some assurance that they would be supported for the remainder of the marketing season. It is quite true that the wartime program could have expired on December 31, but everyone with common sense recognized that unless there was some support of the 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 bushels of potatoes remaining in the northern market at that time they would all be turned over to the Government. It was for that very practical reason that the support price on potatoes was extended for 6 months, the remainder of the marketing season. In my judgment that was nothing other than a recognition of a practical solution of the problem. It does not seem to serve as an example of changing the situation in the middle of a crop season.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not questioning the right of Congress to extend the program 6 months beyond the first of the year in order to give them time to market the potatoes.

Mr. BREWSTER. It saved the Government millions of dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Otherwise the Government would have had many more potatoes at the end of December. I recognize that fact.

Mr. BREWSTER. Those potatoes would have been turned over to the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the fact remains that in 1948, after the potatoes were planted, Congress did change the rules of the game for the subsequent year. Last year, when Congress projected 90-percent support on wheat for this year's crop, again Congress changed the rules of the game. Had the Anderson Act not passed, the flexible provisions of the Aiken law with its lower price supports would have been in effect. So that we have on other occasions during the crop year changed the level of support on agricultural commodities. When we adopted the support program at the beginning of the war it was all new legislation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder whether the Senator will recognize the fact that there is a moral obligation which the Government owes to the potato and wheat growers. If the Government decides to increase the allotment, certainly there is no violation of any moral or legal obligation, but if the Government decides to curtail and reduce the allotment, the situation is quite different. No one is suggesting that the Government does not have a legal and moral right to be more generous. Whether the Government has a right to repudiate an obligation already existing is the issue which is presented here.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I deny that there is any obligation existing. I do not believe there is.

Mr. BREWSTER. I said that is the question which is presented here.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator indulge me, please. I would appreciate it if the Senator would permit me to finish my statement. I agree that in a normal situation there should never be any change made during a crop season. I fully agree with that. I believe it would take an extraordinary situation to justify Congress to change rules during a season. However, I think that if Congress, in its wisdom, determines that the situation is such that the best interests of the Nation as an entirety will be served by a change during the season, Congress has a perfect right, not only legally, but morally, and indeed, the duty, under some circumstances, to do it.

Mr. President, if I may I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Delaware. Does the Senator from Delaware believe that merely because Congress provides a certain tariff level, let us say, on a particular commodity, which leads investors to erect buildings and make their investments, Congress is thereby precluded from changing the tariff whenever, in its judgment, the best interests of the Nation as a whole may make it advisable to do so?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It has always been recognized that Congress can change any law which it has enacted, and that it should change a law at any time the best interests of the country as a whole justify the change. It is more unfortunate that the correction was not made at

the time of the enactment of the law last year.

Last year when the Anderson bill came back from conference, I was one of the Senators who voted against the bill, because, as I pointed out at that time, I felt it would not work, and that it would ultimately result in the greatest wholesale destruction of food which the country had ever known. I still feel that way about it. I believe that section 2 is a step toward correcting the potato situation. We may see other food-destruction programs if we do not now recognize the fact that we have on the statute books a farm program which cannot be supported by the Treasury. The program must be lowered, not only on potatoes, but on other commodities. I intend to introduce another amendment to the pending resolution which I believe will partly take care of the situation. If we do not lower the support prices, potatoes will be only a small fraction of the overall loss.

Mr. MILLIKIN and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have little remaining interest in the debate, because the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri has restored the pillars to the temple, and I am satisfied with his definition of the law. I should like to remind the distinguished Senator from Delaware that of course the purpose of agricultural acts is to serve notice on the farmer how he can plan his life, do his work, and how he can invest his capital. I agree that we can change any law. We can make a tax law retroactive, within certain limits. We can, as the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri has suggested, change our tariff laws. We can change anything we have passed. We can undo it and we can amend it. The question is still whether we should do it. I did not want what is proposed here glossed over with any kind of fancy semantics. We have passed a law under which people have planted crops. The question is whether we should change the law before the crops are harvested, and after the farmers have spent their money, and after they may have changed their ways of life. Perhaps the situation warrants it. A very strong argument can be made that it is an extravagant law, that it provides unjust windfalls, or a law that we cannot see through, and that a change is warranted. However, I should like to see this debate proceed on the basis of what is really involved, without any glossing over with fancy terminology. We changed our gold-clause contracts at one time on the ground of paramount public interest. We have done all kinds of things of that type. Some of them, I think, were unfortunate. I think we should always be extra cautious in pulling back any implied promise to people. We should have a very strong case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The point I am making is that we should not take one group of farmers and penalize them alone. Let us take all potato farmers and put them in one group. Let us not draw a geographical line across the



country and say that we are going to repeal supports on only those farmers north of the line. If we do not do that, we do a severe injustice to farmers who are in the midst of the planting season because it would encourage them, by dangling our price supports, to go ahead and plant potatoes in the next 2 weeks that they would normally plant in late March or early April.

If Congress is going to take this drastic action, if that is what we decide to do, I think we should not upset what might remain of our so-called free market by now taking action which will completely demoralize the potato market next June and July.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has answered in part an objection which I raised to his argument awhile ago—that is, he points out an administrative difficulty. I still suggest that there is a difference between changing the rule on someone who has already planted his crop and changing it on someone who has not planted his crop. The Senator answers by saying that there is a dead line that causes administrative and policing difficulties. That situation exists as to every piece of legislation in which there is provided an effective date.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not to the extent to which we have it in this case. If it were not for the fact that the law could not possibly be enforced, as I see it, I would not propose the change. I can see a greater responsibility with regard to the acres which are planted than as to those which are not, yet there are borderline cases in which we have an equal responsibility. When a man who has now gone to the extent of investing his money ready for planting we do have the same responsibility. That is the difficulty of trying to correct the situation in the middle of the season.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Colorado is not now taking any position in this matter. I have listened with great interest to the debate, but, as I said before, we should know what we are doing, and know the implications.

Mr. THYE and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBY in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I wish to say that the Senator from Delaware is entirely correct in calling to our attention the fact that unless some emphasis is placed upon the question of the acres to be harvested, there will be a rush to plant additional acres before the measure goes into effect, thereby causing greater difficulty to the administrators, and possibly placing a heavier drain upon the Treasury than otherwise would be placed on it.

I also call to the attention of the Senate the fact that there are times when the rules are changed. For instance, take the poultry producer whose flock of pullets comes into production in the fall of the year. The Department of Agriculture reduced the support price for eggs 8 cents as of the first of the year. The pullets to which I have re-

ferred are grown throughout the summer of the previous year, and come into production in the late fall. They are actually in production now, and the producers are receiving 8 cents a dozen less for the eggs than they actually anticipated at the time they placed their orders for the baby chicks, and grew the pullets.

Mr. President, that group of farmers are certainly placed under a handicap, in view of the high prices of grain, such as corn and wheat, under the high-support levels. They are being placed under a further handicap because they are the buyers of this high-priced grain which they must acquire in order to produce the eggs. So I say that the producers of poultry and the producers of eggs have been placed under a handicap in the past 2 months because of the new announced support price on eggs.

I believe the amendment offered by the able Senator from Illinois, by which he proposes immediately to strike off any support to potatoes does not go far enough. To that amendment there should be coupled an actual acreage control or a marketing agreement provision so as to cover it all. But that cannot be done on the floor. Such proposed legislation should go to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and an intelligent program developed through hearings. Producers should be allowed to come before the Senate committee. In that manner it could be determined what should be embodied in the legislation. Then it could be brought to the floor and enacted. In that way the producers would have greater confidence that all of us were trying to get to the bottom of the question, and draw up the legislation in the proper manner.

At the present time of the farmers who are engaged in the production of potatoes there are those who have held back a certain amount of seed stocks which are now in warehouses to be planted this spring. They probably lost an opportunity either to sell seed potatoes to the producers in the deep South or they have lost the opportunity to place their potatoes on the market. I think we are changing the rules at a time when it is going to be most embarrassing to the farmer who held back seed stock which he proposed to sell to the southern producers when the southern producers asked for seed last fall.

Mr. President, I share the feelings of the Senator from Illinois. I know he is sincere in his efforts, and that he is just as grieved over the fact that we must change the rules at this late date, as any other Senator could possibly be. But I honestly believe that we should not confuse the growers any more than they are already confused, by agreeing to the amendment, unless we can couple the amendment with some expression that we intend to deal with the subject by legislation which will embody marketing agreements and also acreage controls, so that when the producers see us in action here they will know that they are going to be protected in the end, rather than that all support is going to be taken off.

The earlier potatoes are already coming to market. Some of the potato farm-

ers have already had the benefit of the 60-percent support on crops they have now harvested. So I say that before we act on the amendment let us embody acreage control or marketing agreements so that we may know what we will have in the legislation, and where we will be after the legislation has been enacted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I think it is most unfortunate that we are trying to write this legislation on the floor. Nevertheless, we are confronted with the fact that we have pending on the calendar a measure which is now before the Senate by which it is proposed to repeal the price support of all potatoes which are planted thereafter. If we are going to do that, let us do it with our eyes open, and let us do it across the board. Let us not divide the potato farmers into two groups, but do it all across the board, and thereby remove or do away with the congested period of potato harvesting, which would not only upset the economy of the farmers, but also increase the cost of the program so far as the Government is concerned.

The Senator from Minnesota has overlooked one thing. He pointed out that only on the basis of acreage control can we hope that a reasonable quantity of potatoes will be planted. I was not necessarily referring to that fact.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator permit me to correct my own statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me finish, and then I will yield.

It is not a question that the potato farmers will plant more potatoes than they would with or without the law. What I am trying to point out is that Farmer John Jones would at an earlier date plant the 10 acres he is going to plant, perhaps the first of April. He will rush and get them in the ground the latter part of February or the first of March, thus trying to get them under the deadline. The result will be not more acreage planted, but simply a congestion for a period of 2 or 3 weeks of potato planting, whereas the planting of potatoes should be spread out over the usual period. That is the reason why I offered the amendment, so that if the legislation is enacted, it will not result in upsetting the economy for the marketing season in the months to come.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield long enough so I may correct my own statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Instead of saying acreage quotas I should have said marketing quotas. I should like to correct the RECORD in that respect. Then we would overcome the difficulty the Senator from Delaware has called to our attention. If we have marketing quotas we would overcome the difficulty the Senator from Delaware has outlined.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think the Senator understood me. Let us consider for example the county of Wicomico in Maryland immediately below where I live. If the legislation took its

normal course, up to the time of the signing of the measure by the President, the farmers in that county could rush their planting and get most of their potatoes into the ground ahead of the deadline. Under the marketing quota they are still entitled to plant the potatoes when they get ready to do so, and they can market them when they get ready to do so. What I am contending is that unless the amendment I have offered is agreed to, farmers will rush to plant their potatoes in a 2- or 3-week period, earlier than they otherwise would, and they would be ready at a time when the North Carolina potatoes would come into the market. Marketing quotas do not provide that a farmer can market only so many potatoes at a given date. It merely provides that so many potatoes may be planted, but the date for planting may be earlier or later.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, at the outset I said I approved of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware to the committee amendment because it went further than the latter and would have the effect of protecting the Treasury against the potatoes now in the ground or that could be planted in the next few weeks. But I went even further and said that unless we provided in the law for marketing agreements, marketing quotas, we would confuse the producers or growers of potatoes, rather than clarify the situation for them. It is for that reason I said that while the Senator from Illinois is absolutely correct in offering his amendment and the Senator from Delaware is absolutely correct in proposing his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, yet both of them leave a problem still unanswered, and that we should enact legislation which would provide for marketing agreements and marketing quotas, and which should go through the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where hearings could be had. In that way confidence on the part of the producer would be developed, because he would have an opportunity to be heard before the legislation was enacted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement in response to what the able Senator from Minnesota has said. The Senator from Minnesota was not present last week when I introduced a bill on the subject of potatoes. Previously an amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois had been placed in the joint resolution. The Senator from Illinois made a short statement respecting it, and followed that by introducing a bill.

It is the opinion of the Senator from Illinois that the only way that legislation affecting potatoes can be passed in the present session of Congress is to adopt the amendment.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has now returned to the Senate. He introduced a measure similar to the one I recently introduced. I am satisfied, from his attitude the other day, that he is willing and ready to hold hearings immediately upon that bill. So long as we have in the joint resolution the amendment I proposed, we are bound to get a potato

bill this year. But just so sure as the amendment is not agreed to, the hearings will drag out over weeks, and we may not have any action in the House. What will then happen is that we will have another year of large potato surpluses, with no relief for the taxpayers of America. That is what I want to point out to the Senator from Minnesota.

Furthermore, if the potato program is permitted to continue, and potato growers are subsidized out of all reasonable proportions, then, as I have said many times before, our entire farm program dealing with the basic commodities will be seriously threatened. The potato growers are not objecting, as I understand, to being placed under rigid control through marketing quotas and marketing agreements. But what I fear is that if we do not agree to the amendment we will not get a potato bill through the present session of the Congress. If we do not get it passed during this session of the Congress, not only will the Treasury lose a great deal of money, but the farmers and the people generally will lose confidence in the entire farm program. The Senator from Minnesota is no more anxious to pass a bill of this sort than is the Senator from Illinois.

The Senator from Illinois made it very clear in his speech that he was ready to go forward at the proper time and have hearings on the potato bill which I introduced. That bill is rather a long one. It is technical in nature. Hearings will be held upon it. Such a bill cannot be written upon the floor of the Senate and acted upon on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, it seemed to me the wise thing to do was to offer a simple amendment which everyone can understand, and the adoption of which will definitely produce a potato bill this year.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator does agree, then, that he will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware because that would cover all potatoes, and not impose a drastic hardship on those growing potatoes in the latter part of the season or the latter part of the year. It would affect all growers of potatoes whose potatoes would be marketed today and marketed henceforth.

Mr. LUCAS. I told the Senator from Delaware that I was very much in sympathy with his amendment and I thought it proper that I should go along with him in substituting the word "harvested" for "planted."

But after talking to my good friend, the Senator from Florida, who is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I suggested to the Senator from Delaware that he had better present the amendment and let the Senate vote upon it, because the Senator from Florida is much opposed to it.

But I am in total sympathy with what the Senator is trying to do.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure we appreciate the position of the Senator from Illinois and we know how greatly he is

concerned about the matter. I appreciate also the degree of influence which he wields on the floor of the Senate and the control he exercises over the program we take up here. So there could be no Member of the Senate who would be more likely to be able to redeem his assurance that this will be taken care of in due course.

But I think even he recognizes, in view of the history of legislation, that the execution of the potato growers at this time, as is accomplished by his amendment, coupled with the assurance of the Senator from Illinois that subsequently there will be legislation which will take care of them, does leave them in a somewhat precarious position, particularly because I believe the Senator from Illinois will agree that legislation looking to this matter has been before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for 5 months, but no hearings have been held. If hearings had been held, we could have gone into this matter. The potato producers are ready to go into hearings on it, and I can assure the Senator that there will be no delay so far as the potato growers are concerned. The delay which has occurred thus far has been due to other legislative problems.

We are not critical; but we feel it is a little drastic, particularly when we are not the cause of the delay, for the Senator from Illinois to cut off price supports now, with the assurance that subsequent action will be taken.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that it is a little drastic, but not in view of the potato situation, particularly when potatoes have had support preference over any other agricultural commodity, either basic or nonbasic. So I think the potato growers could stand a complete loss this year and still would be far ahead.

However, I am not proceeding on that theory in any way whatsoever. I am proceeding on the theory of getting a potato bill passed at this session, so that we can stop the trend of a detrimental public attitude, a lack of public confidence in the entire program, and also save \$50,000,000 or \$75,000,000 of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. BREWSTER. What the Senator from Illinois is doing speaks so loud that it is difficult for us to hear what he says. If only the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would have a hearing on the quota bill of the Senator from Illinois or the quota bill of the Senator from Oklahoma, then we would be very greatly reassured.

Mr. LUCAS. I guarantee the Senator from Maine that there will be a hearing upon the potato bill. I do not know whether the Senator from Oklahoma is now in the Chamber, but I know exactly how he feels about the matter; and there will be a hearing.

The only way we shall get a hearing and the enactment of a bill on the subject is by adopting this amendment at this time, because the protests among the potato growers will then be so strong for the enactment of the kind of a program envisioned by the bills which have been introduced that we simply will have to hold hearings.



Mr. BREWSTER. The potato growers have not been able thus far to influence the Senator from Illinois to adopt their viewpoint, so we are not sure that it will be possible to do so subsequently. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has had full power to hold hearings at any time in the last 5 months.

Mr. LUCAS. I am only one of the members of the committee. During that period the potato growers have not talked to me at any time about holding any hearings whatsoever. I think they perhaps have written to the chairman of the committee. But the Senator can count on having the Senator from Illinois cooperate with the potato growers in obtaining the passage of the proposed legislation to which I have referred and thereby prevent the recurrence of potato surpluses.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. When the Senator refers to the bonanza for the potato growers, that may be true of some of those who have been growing potatoes for a long time; but I am thinking of some of the thousands and thousands of young men who have started in that business since the end of the war, and who probably have obligated themselves not only to produce potatoes but also in respect to certain seed stock. Such young men now have their seed stock on hand for planting in the coming season. I am thinking of them. By the action proposed here today, we would take everything away from them.

Senators say that if this amendment prevails, they promise the potato growers a day in court, so to speak, a day before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I know the Senator from Illinois will see that there will be a Senate committee hearing on his bill. I know he will do that. I will help him, if necessary, to get it; but I do not think he will need my help.

Nevertheless, we will go through the entire spring season with argument on the proposed legislation, and we may not be able to secure its enactment, for in the measure now before us there is no mandatory provision on our part, in respect to the enactment of such legislation.

As a result, we leave in a serious predicament the young potato grower who has assumed the obligation of purchasing high-priced machinery and paying inflationary prices and paying high prices for seed. We leave him with no assurance that he will get any relief in the future, although, probably, he was one of the young men who carried the responsibilities of the Nation by fighting on the battlefields in the recent war; and since that time, over a period of the last 3 or 4 years, perhaps, he has gone into farming. We would do away with all price supports so far as he is concerned, and we would do so just as he is preparing to plant his crop.

Therefore, I think we should deal with the entire question now, and not now cut the price supports from under him; and perhaps later, perhaps in 3 or 4 weeks, begin a hearing, but perhaps by the con-

clusion of the session not give him any support.

The young man who incurred many obligations in order to have a chance at the bonanza to which the Senator from Illinois has referred will not be the one who will be protected; the one who will be protected will be the man who has made his bonanza, and who probably will be in Florida, and can stand the change.

I am not talking about the latter group. I am talking about the young men who, during the past 3 or 4 years, in a time of inflationary prices, have had to purchase the equipment and have already made that investment.

That is why I do not wish to see this amendment prevail, because it will take everything away from such young men, and will leave them dependent upon the possibility of the taking of future action by the committee and by the Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not think it is possible to enact any law which does not have an adverse effect upon someone. The argument the Senator from Minnesota is making can always be made, namely, that someone will be adversely affected. It is true that a man who went into the potato business last year or this year may be hurt a little. But that always is the case; someone is always getting economically hit, so to speak, as a result of the enactment of legislation. If that argument were valid, and if we had to follow that theory from beginning to end, no legislation affecting the economy of the country would ever be enacted.

The Senator can take that position, of course; and it is perfectly logical for him to do so if he wishes to. But I am one who cannot continue to see the editorials and the articles which are written about potatoes, and continue to receive the hundreds of letters from people in my section of the country who ask, "What, if anything, can you do about potatoes?" without attempting to do something about them.

The Senator from Minnesota and I both know that the potato growers have had half a billion dollars in subsidies since the war—more than the subsidies paid for all other commodities, basic and nonbasic, put together. When anyone tells me that the potato growers have not had a bonanza out of the subsidies, and that we should not stop it, for fear of injuring some young fellow in Minnesota who has just started in business, I point out that he is not the only one who is injured by the present situation.

Mr. THYE. Let us not single out Minnesota; let us also include North Dakota, Alabama, and many of the other States.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, yes; and we can include Illinois, too. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota was thinking of some of the young fellows in Minnesota who are of voting age, and I do not blame him for doing so.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Illinois does not want the words "voting age" included in the Record. He and I do not operate that way; at least, I never have operated that way.

I am thinking of the young man who went into farming following the war. All we have to do is to look at the record, and we find that that young man paid \$2,300 or \$2,400 for a tractor last fall, and nearly \$400 for a spreader, and he has commenced to obligate himself for the purchase of planting machinery and insecticide spraying machinery. The Senator and I have no conception of what his obligations are unless we examine the figures. Otherwise, we have no conception of what the young farmer who has begun farming in the past 2 or 3 years has had to obligate himself for.

At the present time it costs anywhere from \$5,000 to \$6,000 or \$7,000 to begin farming. This young man has obligated himself for \$7,000 or \$8,000 or \$10,000 in order to get a crop. If the Senator and I take the props from underneath his price support this afternoon, without assuring him that adequate legislation on the subject will be enacted, he will have nothing to take to the banker when he asks for a renewal of his note or for a little additional credit in order to be able to carry himself through the coming planting season. In such event, he simply will not get any credit.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry I used the words "voting age." Let us substitute the words "legal age."

Mr. THYE. Let us drop that from the Record. We do not want the Record to convey the idea that the Senator and I are trying to get votes by what we do here. I do not have to get my votes until 1952. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is one of the able members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think he will agree with me that there is not a single member of that committee who will not vote for the kind of bill the Senator from Illinois has been talking about, after we have had hearings and have perfected the bill. We have discussed this whole matter pro and con across the table, both in executive session and elsewhere, and I can assure the Senator from Minnesota, so far as I am concerned, that hearings will be held within the next 10 days on this bill.

I am saying to the Senator that the only way we shall obtain the enactment of such a bill at this session of Congress is by the adoption of this amendment at this time. If we do not, this matter may drag out over a long period, and perhaps there will not be any legislation of this sort passed by the House of Representatives. But if we vote for this amendment, and if it is adopted, everyone will see to it that hearings will be held.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has referred to the adoption of his amendment as the only way by which the enactment of a potato bill can be forced at this session of Congress. Let me ask him who he thinks will be forced.

Mr. LUCAS. No, I do not say it is probably the only way, but it is the only sure way, I may say to my friend from Vermont, to get a potato program this year. We have gone a long time, and

nothing has been done about potatoes. This is the first time it has been seriously considered by the committee and the Congress and this has been wholly the result of the little amendment which the Senator from Illinois proposed to the joint resolution respecting cotton and peanut acreage allotments. It has created quite a bit of controversy.

Mr. AIKEN. If we have been unable to have a hearing on the joint resolution within the past 6 months, what causes the Senator from Illinois to hope we shall be able to have hearings on it before the end of the potato-planting season, so the law can be enacted before the end of the potato-planting season this year?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know. The Senator from Illinois does not have very much influence around here, but I believe he has enough to get the potato legislation considered. I think the Senator knows that if we have hearings there will not be a member on the committee who will not vote for the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder whether the Senator would have the same enthusiasm for repudiating a contract with potato growers in the State of Illinois, if Illinois were not the State having the lowest potato yield of any State in the Union, or approximately so? Suppose the potato growers of Illinois produced 400 bushels an acre, instead of 100.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is now asking a hypothetical question having nothing whatever to do with the issue. The Senator from Illinois does not care to be dragged now into a dead-end street on some other issue which is not before the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe that the same moral right to violate or repudiate a contract made by the Government with potato growers would hold good for the repudiation of a contract with the cotton grower, the corn grower, the hog grower, or the wheat grower?

Mr. LUCAS. Whenever the question is raised, the Senator from Illinois will answer it.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from Illinois should tell us now where he stands. Who knows but what someone will come in tomorrow with a proposition to repudiate price support for the corn grower?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois will cross the bridge when he gets to it. The only question now before the Senate is the one regarding the price support of potatoes.

Mr. AIKEN. And the repudiation of the contract with the potato growers.

Mr. LUCAS. That is all right; if the Senator from Vermont desires to offer an amendment taking the support prices away from corn, wheat, cotton, or some other basic commodity, the Senator from Illinois could answer that in due course.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont believes that the integrity of the Government should be binding, and that when the Government makes a contract, even though a bad one, it should comply with the contract and then hope to profit by the experience.

Mr. LUCAS. There have been many instances cited. The Senator from Minnesota cited one a short while ago, with

regard to the lowering of the support price on eggs by the Department of Agriculture, which was done by regulation. The Senator from Colorado called attention to the repudiation of the gold clause.

Mr. AIKEN. But is it not a fact that in lowering the support price on eggs, the Department of Agriculture kept within the law?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. Though the Department kept within the law, it still might have been a hardship to many farmers and seemed to them to have been a repudiation. But that is neither here nor there. We have only one issue before us today, and it can be decided any way the Senate desires. I have done my best to present to the Senate something which will perhaps get us out of the trouble we are in with respect to potatoes. How Senators representing potato-growing States can continue to ask for this kind of subsidy, on the theory that otherwise there would be the repudiation of an implied promise, when they have had half a billion dollars of subsidies since the war, more than those of all other basic and non-basic commodities put together, is a little more than I can understand. If Senators representing potato-growing States do not want to correct this situation, and are insistent on obtaining the subsidy, then let them vote the amendment down, and, when the amendment is voted down, let the Government go ahead and pay another \$50,000,000 or \$75,000,000 out of the Treasury to potato growers, who destroy the potatoes after raising them, under the present program. Senators may do as they wish. When I have finished, I shall have done all I can to apprise the Senate and the country of what the situation is. I am doing the best I can in that regard.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am in thorough sympathy with the objective of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I know the potato program has been an undue burden upon the taxpayer. The law may not have been perfect, and certainly the administration of it has not been perfect, in my humble opinion. But I want to call the attention of my distinguished colleague to a possible result which I do not think he intends. As I understand his amendment, it will not apply to potatoes already planted when it becomes the law. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, unless the amendment is adopted—

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am assuming I shall support the Senator's amendment. In Princess Anne and Norfolk counties, in Virginia, a good many potatoes have already been planted, but not all of them. On the Eastern Shore of Virginia, and extending into the Eastern Shore of Maryland, a few potatoes have been planted, but not a great many. The joint resolution will have to go back to the House for action, and to the White House to be signed. It will probably be the 8th of March at the earliest before it can become a law. In the meantime we have gotten almost up to the full planting period in Tidewater Virginia

and the Eastern Shore of Maryland, yet there will be a few farmers who had wet land or some other condition which made it impossible for them to plant, whose potatoes will not be planted by the time the joint resolution becomes effective, unless we are going to make them lie about it. In fact, who is going to say, "The potatoes were planted just today"? The farmers are operating by days now. I was wondering whether my distinguished colleague would be willing to eliminate an administrative feature which I think would be very difficult to enforce. Certainly it would be most unfair to say to one farmer, "You planted on the 7th of March; you will get paid," and to another, "You planted on the 8th of March, and you can get nothing." If the Senator would be willing to fix a definite date, let us say, the 15th of March, it would take care of all the other potatoes that go to market in June. There are a good many winter potatoes in Virginia, as there are also in the North and in the West; and we can look into the subject when we have a little more time.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator puts it on the 15th of March, the farmer who planted on the 16th will lose out.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But I am saying that in these areas that bring potatoes to the market in June, they have got to plant them by the 15th of March, otherwise the potatoes will not mature.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can offer an amendment of that kind. If he does, I shall be glad to consider it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I hope, if I do, the Senator will accept it.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I cannot undertake to say that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator would not vigorously oppose it, though.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not vigorously oppose anything the Senator from Virginia does.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I want to cooperate, but I should like a little reciprocity. [Laughter.]

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is no question that the dramatization of the potato program by the Department of Agriculture and the metropolitan press has done a great deal of harm to the entire farm-support program in the United States. We do not want to forget that the farm-support program helped America win the war just as war contracts in industry helped. Under the law, we were bound to continue the farm-support levels for 2 years following the war. We are not bound to continue the supports at that level from now on. There have been several factors which have contributed to the present unfavorable situation regarding potatoes. I should like to point out before I go any further that potatoes are not the only crop by any means. It is true that immediately following the war, and even respecting the 1948 crop, it cost \$224,000,000 to support the price of potatoes. It will probably cost \$80,000,000 this year. But potatoes are not the only crop. It will cost at a minimum about \$70,000,000 to support peanuts for last year. It will cost about \$75,000,000 or so for the support of eggs. When the books are all balanced, a few years hence, it will be



found that the cost of supporting some of the grains and other commodities will have amounted to as much for the year 1949 as the cost of supporting potatoes. But let us see how we came to be in the present situation. The Department of Agriculture, as authorized by law, allocates to each State each year a certain acreage which the State is permitted to plant in potatoes, and to be eligible for price supports. They have done so. Each year since 1943 the potato farmers have planted fewer acres than have been allocated to them by the Department of Agriculture—fewer acres than the Department has estimated were necessary in order to produce the amount of potatoes needed by the country for human consumption. But the yield per acre has been increasing. I am very happy that is true. It has been increased with respect to other crops also. Some of the tobacco growers have doubled their yield per acre. The peanut growers, while taking a cut in acreage last year, increased their yield by 8 or 9 percent per acre. It is a very proper thing for farmers to use their land to its best advantage, and they have a limited number of acres to plant, of course they are going to try to get the most out of those acres. So the increase in the yield per acre has been a factor in the overproduction we have now. We also have many more small fields, I believe, than had been planted in previous years, fields that would produce from 25 bushels up to 200, 300, or even 500 bushels, which do not come under the classification of commercial producers. That has added to the crop materially. We have also had, as a factor contributing to our difficulties, a gross underestimation of the yield of potatoes for last year. In September it was estimated that the yield of potatoes would be 363,000,000 bushels. That was the estimate of the Department of Agriculture. It would have been approximately the amount of potatoes which the United States needed during the last year. But between September and December the estimate on the yield increased from 363,000,000 to 402,000,000 bushels, some 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 bushels more than the country needed. It is incredible that such an error could have been made in estimating the size of the potato crop, but nevertheless the error of 40,000,000 bushels crept in somewhere. The growing season was pretty nearly over by the last of September, in all parts of the United States, and yet, when the potatoes were counted, it was found there were 40,000,000 bushels more than the Department of Agriculture had estimated there would be.

We have been afflicted, from the viewpoint of the potato growers, with a considerable decrease in the per capita consumption of potatoes. That has been due to several causes, but is principally due to the fact that persons who work in our plants and factories have had in recent years more money with which to buy meat and poultry, and they have bought more meat and animal products and fewer potatoes, until we are now probably at an all-time low in the history of the United States with regard to potato consumption per capita.

We might add also to the trouble of the potato industry the great increase in the cost of transportation and handling which at this time makes it unprofitable to ship potatoes from the surplus area of Maine into the interior part of the United States and to dispose of them in that way. In fact, it appears to be cheaper for the port cities on the Gulf coast and the Atlantic coast to buy Canadian potatoes, which our Government permits to enter this country unrestricted, and to pay the price, including the duty and water transportation. Canadian potatoes can undersell the potatoes which are produced in this country.

Those are some of the reasons, Mr. President, why we find ourselves in the difficulty we have had with reference to potatoes. I might say, and I think I could prove it, that the situation has been very badly handled this year, not only through an overestimate of the acreage over-all, but through a gross overestimate of the acreage allocated to the commercial potato areas. Furthermore, there has been, to my knowledge, no serious effort to increase the distribution of potatoes through the normal channels of trade, although under the Agricultural Act of 1948 and the act of 1949 the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to move the surplus crops through the normal channels of trade and increase their use, if it is possible to do so.

A month ago Washington celebrated Broiler Week, which resulted in moving immense numbers of broilers to Washington. Every restaurant in the city served broilers, whether we wanted them or not. There has been no comparable movement in behalf of the potato crop.

Another rather unfortunate circumstance has been that nonprofit institutions and the poor people of the country have not been able to get potatoes as they should for human consumption. The potatoes are available, the need is present, but the rules and regulations established for their distribution are such that most institutions do not bother to try to unravel the red tape necessary to get the potatoes. In my own State, the overseers of the institutions for the poor do not bother to go through the rigmarole necessary to get potatoes for the families which are being assisted by the public.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] said there may have been an implied agreement on the part of the United States Government to support the price of potatoes this year. I say there has been no implied agreement, but there has been a direct contract on the part of the Federal Government to support the price of potatoes this year. A notice to the potato growers was issued on November 16, 1949. It was issued at that early date in order that the potato growers, both North and South, could make arrangements for their seed and fertilizer to prepare to produce the 1950 crop. In the South, probably as far north as Washington, D. C., a great part of the expense of the crop has already been entered into. In the North, where fertilizer is such an important item, I know that if the potato growers have not already made their pur-

chases of fertilizer they will probably be out of luck in getting it this year, because of the shortage of potash and possibly of other ingredients.

The commitment which the Government entered into with our potato growers on November 16, 1949, has some modifications in the program in which we engaged last year. First, there is a reduction in the support price of potatoes from \$1.08 a bushel to 96 cents a bushel. Then there is a reduction in the amount of acreage which each commercial potato-growing area can plant. The Department has insisted on a reduction of 86,000 acres for the 1950 crop, as compared with the 1949 crop, and each State has already had allocated to it the number of acres it can plant to commercial potatoes.

Maine has been allocated 120,400 acres. North Dakota has been allocated 102,800 acres.

California was allocated so many acres for late potatoes and so many acres for early potatoes, and so forth.

The allocations have all been made, but they have been reduced from those of last year to the sum total of 86,000 acres which the Department of Agriculture estimates will produce an over-all potato production of 335,000,000 bushels.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does that take into consideration the experience in the past few years in which potatoes have been planted more closely together and have been more highly fertilized?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I think the Secretary has estimated 100 bushels to the acre in Illinois and 450 bushels to the acre in Maine. There have been some differences in the methods of planting, but not to the degree which some persons would have the public believe. Many of the planters who used to place their rows 36 inches apart now place them 34 inches apart. If they put them too close, the law of diminishing returns sets in. The farmer cannot properly cultivate and take care of the crop. Thirty-four inches apart is considered to be the minimum feasible distance, but there is no question that potato growers have found out how to produce much more efficiently than they did in prewar days.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand that potentiality has been taken into consideration in fixing support quotas for the growing year.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand my distinguished colleague is of the opinion, if we have no additional legislation, that there will be no great surplus for the Government to buy on the basis of the present quotas.

Mr. AIKEN. Unless the Department of Agriculture has grossly underestimated again. But, with the experience of the past few years, there is no reason why that should be the case. It seems that the potato industry has just about reached the maximum of its production at the present time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator think that the Department might make the same mistake three times in succession?

Mr. AIKEN. It should not make the same mistake three times in succession. I am advised that the Department is allocating an acreage which it is expected will produce 335,000,000 bushels of potatoes, some 17,000,000 bushels less than would normally have been required in the year 1949.

There was in the Agricultural Act of 1948 a provision which was continued in the Agricultural Act of 1949, as follows:

Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices prescribed by the Secretary may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support.

That was intended to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to require compliance with marketing agreements, and orderly marketing of the potato crop if the grower expected to benefit from a support price guaranty.

This provision of the law was not enforced last year. I understand that the Department felt that there was not time to put it all into effect last year, and, further than that, certain commercial areas of the country, particularly, one out in California, as no doubt the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] recalls, refused to enter into a marketing agreement.

Although there was authorization for the Secretary to require marketing agreements last year as a qualification for price support for potatoes, yet for various reasons that was not done. I am advised that had marketing agreements been in effect it would have been possible to save at least two-thirds of the cost of the potato program at this time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What was the reason assigned for not doing it?

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the Department said that there was not time to get these agreements into effect and enforce them last year. I have not had any discussion with the Secretary directly on this subject. Furthermore, California refused to come in. At that time it was felt by the Department that the crop might be short, or at least not much more than was needed—in the middle of September the estimate was only 363,000,000 bushels—and that those who did not enter into the agreement would profit by reason of the support price which was being given to those who did enter into it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I quote from the statement made this year on the 1950 crop:

Eligibility for price support will be conditioned on having appropriate marketing agreements and orders in effect and in operation.

It goes on to say:

It should be possible for all such areas to have programs in operation for 1950.

I take it that answers the question why they did not feel it was necessary last year, but do feel, and have so de-

clared, it is necessary for this year. The report was issued in November 1949.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Department felt it was not feasible to put the program into operation effectively last year. I believe also that at least during the early part of the season the Department felt it was not going to be needed. They are going to carry it out this year. The amendment which I shall offer a little later will strengthen the hand of the Department of Agriculture by making the requirement for marketing agreements mandatory instead of simply permissive for the Department.

There is no use considering the support program in terms of Maine potatoes or Florida potatoes, because, as a matter of fact, they are all in the same boat. Florida cannot blame Maine for the trouble. Maine cannot blame Florida for the trouble.

With the situation as it is now, most of the surplus which would be destroyed is left in the State of Maine and on Long Island. If, instead of supporting the price, the potatoes are taken off the market and the Government says, "Put them all on the northern markets"—and they are A1 potatoes—I am afraid that the price for the early Florida potatoes would be subjected to a disastrous drop. On the other hand, the situation could be reversed. So we should not consider the problem in terms of Florida, Maine, Idaho, Minnesota, Wisconsin, or Illinois, with its hundred bushels to the acre. That does not enter into the picture at all. It should be considered in terms of the potato situation throughout the United States, the needs of the growers and the needs of the consumers.

The Senator from Illinois has proposed an amendment, which was approved by the committee last week and is printed in the pending bill. It provides that no support can be given to potatoes which are not already planted at the time of the enactment of the bill. That means that we would probably have support for all of potatoes as far north as Virginia, with the possible exception of western North Carolina, Kentucky, and the neighboring area, but no support for the potatoes north of that latitude. As has been admitted by the Senator from Illinois, that is just plain discrimination against northern potatoes. However, he said he would take care of the matter by having hearings promptly and by enacting a quota law which would bring all potatoes within a quota requirement. That is a mechanical impossibility.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I called the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture this morning relative to hearings on the bill to establish potato quotas, and he said there was no prospect of an early hearing. So I believe that instead of talking about immediate hearings, in order to hurt nobody we had better talk to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. It is utterly ridiculous to say that we should let potato growers force hearings. Who can better force hearings than the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture?

I believe the talk about putting the responsibility on the potato growers and passing the buck to them by cutting all supports off from under them so that they will do something, is hot air.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator from Idaho is entirely correct. I do not see any more indication of a hearing on the potato quota bill in the near future than there has been in the last 6 months since the bill was introduced. I think the President might well plan to sign the potato quota bill as an act of this session on the same day that he plans to sign the anti-poll-tax bill into law, because there is just about the same likelihood of getting it through in time to affect this year's potato crop.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Madam President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that in the committee, in the discussion of the bill which has been introduced by the majority leader, I think it was the consensus, on the part of the chairman and others present, that we would immediately have hearings on the bill. Is not that a fact?

Mr. AIKEN. That was discussed, but there was no assurance that there would be early hearings, and certainly the time which might be denominated "immediately" has already passed, as that happened a week ago, and there still has been no move to call for any hearings on the potato quota bill. I think we should at an early date consider a potato quota bill, but I do not think it is possible to enact one into law and get it into operation until at least three-fourths, if not all, of the 1950 potato crop has been planted.

Then what do we do? We require those who have already planted their potatoes to comply with quotas. We cannot require those who have already dug their potatoes to comply with them, because those potatoes have gone on the market under the old law. What do we do then? We require those who have planted more than their quota to destroy the crop at their own expense—or what? The situation is so complicated we cannot put any new law on the subject into effect this year.

Madam President, I think we should hold hearings on the subject and get some kind of law, if it appears advisable, before the end of the present session, to take effect next year. But potato growers have to know in the fall what they are going to do about their crop in the following year. In fact, the Senator from Illinois knows the potato-quota bill contains a requirement that the allotments or allocations shall be made by September—either the 1st or the 30th—of the previous year. We cannot go back to last September now and determine how many potatoes each State shall have for its quota or each grower shall have for his quota. It is simply a mechanically impossible proposition which the majority leader is putting up to us.



I should like to make one other comment respecting the remarks of the Senator from Illinois. He said that if we do not do something about the potato program, even repudiate it, it would break down the whole farm-support program. I maintain that the repudiation of an agreement by the United States Government with the producers of a certain crop will do more than anything else to destroy the confidence of the farmers of the country in their Government. If we repudiate an agreement with the potato growers, can the wheat grower or the cotton grower or the peanut grower or the tobacco grower or the egg producer or the honey producer or the wool producer or any other producers who are guaranteed support prices by the Congress and by the executive branch of the Government, depend upon the Government to carry out its agreement with them?

I should like to have those beguiled advocates of the Brannan plan to take note of what is going on here today, and seriously consider whether they want to depend for their income upon a check from the Government contingent upon an appropriation by Congress, when the majority leader of the Senate advocates the repudiation of the price support promised the potato growers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Vermont doubtless is familiar with the considerable uproar which arose recently when the House of Representatives failed to vote funds for Korea. He will recall that there was a great outcry made that we had a moral commitment to Korea. Does not the Senator think that a moral commitment to our own citizens, namely the potato growers in this instance, is as important as a moral commitment to Korea?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont has always believed that the word of the United States Government should be as good or better than the word of the best of its citizens. We do have that moral commitment, and we have no right to break an agreement.

I admire the courage of the Department of Agriculture in taking the stand it is taking. Frankly, I thought the amendment was offered to take the Department off the hook. I hear that the Department is very much provoked that Congress should require them to break a contract with the farmers in the middle of the season.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the Senator will agree that the integrity of the Government is a priceless asset, and that any government which becomes corrupt and whose word is no longer good, cannot long exist. We certainly have a splendid example of that before us in the case of the government of Chiang Kai-shek. His government was corrupt, and look where it is now. I think this is a very late date for our Government to start breaking its word, even though it may be with only a small unfortunate group of potato growers, not even with all the potato growers, but simply with a part

of them. I think we had better keep our word with them.

Mr. AIKEN. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that it is just as important for the United States Government to keep its word with a small group of potato growers as it is to keep its word with the next-greatest nation on the face of the earth. We must maintain the integrity of our Government.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, what was the document from which the Senator read a while ago, which represented, I believe, in his opinion, a promise from the Department of Agriculture to the farmer?

Mr. AIKEN. It is a document released by the Department of Agriculture on November 16, 1949.

#### USDA ANNOUNCES 1950 POTATO PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

A 1950 price-support program for Irish potatoes, continuing price support at the 60-percent-of-parity level in effect this year and setting a lower national commercial acreage allotment of 1,137,800 acres for 1950, was announced today by the Production and Marketing Administration.

These steps, taken in recognition of decreased potato consumption and increased yields per acre—

That answers the question asked by the junior Senator from Virginia a moment ago—

are designed to effect a better balance between potato production and requirements.

I have only this to say in reference to the two amendments which are now before us, the committee amendment sponsored by the Senator from Illinois, which would prohibit supports for any potatoes except those already planted, and to which I am opposed, and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which would prohibit supports for any potatoes not already harvested. So far as I know the only ones harvested so far are in southern Florida and perhaps in the extreme lower coast portion of some of our other States.

I feel a good deal like the Senator from Illinois does about the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. If we repudiate our agreement with half the potato growers, it is only fair to repudiate it with all of them. But after the amendment of the Senator from Delaware has been acted upon I will offer an amendment which is printed and on the desks of all Senators, and which reads as follows:

On page 7, strike out lines 11 through 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. No price support shall be made available for any Irish potatoes planted after the enactment of this joint resolution unless marketing quotas hereafter authorized by law, or marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, are in effect with respect to such potatoes."

As Senators have heard, the Department of Agriculture intends to exercise its authority in that respect. I think it will have a very beneficial effect if the Congress backs up the Secretary of Agriculture in his effort by making use of the marketing agreements providing for the orderly marketing of potatoes and

keeping the cheap grades off the market when they are not needed. I think that will make it mandatory instead of simply permissive.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the opinion of the distinguished Senator would that amendment, if agreed to, and if it became law, together with the other restrictions which have been suggested by the Department of Agriculture, keep the situation clean this year?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would, and I believe the Department thinks that if it can enforce marketing agreements—and I admit there is going to be a job in policing any potato program or any other crop program—and if the growers can keep within their acreage allocations, which they have done for many years, and with the lower support price, dropping from \$1.08 to 96 cents a bushel eliminating certain production in very high-cost areas, that the potato program should somewhere near break even this year. I do not know how we can be sure of having enough potatoes in any year without asking for a few more than we think we are going to need, because sometimes we will have a bad crop year.

We had just about the finest year for growing potatoes last year that the country has ever seen. We obtained an unexpectedly large crop, even where improved production methods were not in effect. Even the Senator from Vermont planted a bushel of potatoes and got enough for himself and the neighbors.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the Senator's opinion that if the amendment he proposes to offer is agreed to it will be necessary for the Department of Agriculture to go further than simply enforce marketing agreements? I understand the Senator provides not only for marketing agreements, but also for marketing quotas. But what is the judgment of the Senator as to whether the Department of Agriculture could accomplish the purpose we seek?

Mr. AIKEN. I personally think the Department of Agriculture has enough authority to accomplish the purpose of control, of jurisdiction over marketing agreements and orders and marketing practices. When we were considering the Agricultural Act of 1948 representatives of the Department of Agriculture asked for inclusion of that provision in the law, which we put in for them for this very purpose. That was continued in the Agricultural Act for 1949.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the judgment of the Senator that if that is done next year it will be unnecessary to put a program of marketing quotas into effect? That to me would seem to involve a much more difficult program, and enforcement, and all that goes with it.

Mr. AIKEN. I have always believed that the exercise of this authority would control the marketing of the potato crop so that the expense of the taxpayers would be reduced to a minimum or to a

negligible amount. If it does not succeed, then I think the entire potato program is definitely jeopardized. But I believe it will succeed. That is why I supported the provision for the last 3 years.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to ask the Senator one more question. Does the Senator feel that if the marketing agreements had been in full force and effect during the present year—and the Senator said the Department of Agriculture has authority to enforce such agreements—the situation in which we now find ourselves could have been averted?

Mr. AIKEN. I am advised by some of the persons in the Department that they think if it had been in effect last year, the cost could have been reduced by about two-thirds. It could not have been completely eliminated, because the enormous crop, due to the perfect growing season, could not have been exactly foreseen.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask this final question: In view of the Senator's experience and in view of the statements just made, if the Department of Agriculture would use the authority it now has relative to marketing agreements, and with the average production we are supposed to have, is it the Senator's opinion and judgment that, everything included, the purpose relative to the surplus of potatoes could be accomplished?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that to be a fact.

I would also say that we have spent only \$24,000,000 or \$25,000,000, to date, on the potato program. The rest of the expenditure is anticipated, from now on. The Government could, if it saw fit to do so, push the potatoes of the 1949 crop on the market, and could pay the loss on the 1950 crop of southern potatoes. I do not think that would be the wise thing to do. Nevertheless, the Government could carry over a great deal of the expense from the 1949 crop to the 1950 crop if it wished to operate in that way. That is what I had reference to when I said we cannot consider this matter in terms of Florida, Maine, Louisiana, and Idaho, but we must consider it in terms of the potato crop of the entire United States.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator tell us what marketing orders under the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 are included?

Mr. AIKEN. Marketing agreements, as I understand, are agreements entered into between the Secretary and handlers in a particular marketing area, whereby it is agreed to market the crop in an orderly manner and to keep the second-grade production off the market, unless the market demands it; and whatever marketing order is issued by the Secretary as a result of the agreement must be approved by the producers.

I am informed that all potato-growing areas in the United States now have marketing agreements, or have them practically completed. One county in California, as I have said, rejected the marketing agreement last fall; but I am advised that they have informed the Department that they wish to vote over

again on that matter, and that they will approve the marketing agreement, so that all potato-growing areas in the United States will undertake the orderly marketing of their crop.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry I did not hear all the discussion that took place; I was serving on one of the committees just now.

The Senator does not contend, does he, that under a marketing agreement the Department can curtail acreage this year?

Mr. AIKEN. No; but the same provision of law which permits the Department to require compliance with the marketing agreements also gives the Department the right to announce production goals and acreage allotments. That is under the same provision of law.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, as to the production goals which are announced, there is no way by which the acreage can be controlled, is there?

Mr. AIKEN. Not unless we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator from Vermont think that is the most effective way to control production?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the repudiation of an agreement with the potato growers which was made on November 16 is the most effective way of handling this situation. In other words, if we were to do so, we would say, "We are going to let your crop fall apart and go to pieces, with no support at all." That is what it amounts to.

Let me reconsider the statement I have just made, and say that what the Senator from Illinois has proposed would doubtless be an effective way, but it would not be a very honorable way.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Vermont is familiar with the efforts put forth by the House of Representatives in order to get the potato growers to adopt an arrangement whereby acreage could be controlled, is he not?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not familiar with the efforts the House of Representatives has made in that respect.

Mr. ELLENDER. For the past 3 years, efforts have been made by the House of Representatives to secure the enactment of such legislation, and to put potatoes in the same category with cotton and other basic crops in so far as acreage controls are concerned. But the only answer the House received from the potato growers was, "Let us look a little further into it." They never have been able to get together on it, apparently.

Mr. AIKEN. But what is done by the House of Representatives does not excuse the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I grant that. But, as I have always contended before the Senate committee, it strikes me quite forcefully that no farmer should expect this Government to protect his crops by price supports unless at the same time he is willing to enter into an agreement to curtail production by reducing the acreage. The only way I can see that this matter can be handled is by forcing the issue.

Mr. AIKEN. But the law already permits the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the acreage, and he has done so.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, there are just a few noncooperators who will not abide by the marketing agreements; and they usually plant all they can plant. Both the cooperators and noncooperators use more fertilizer than they should and they plant their potatoes closer, all of which results in greater yields. The first thing we know, there is a very large surplus which affects adversely those who have entered into the marketing agreements.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me point out that the noncooperating areas have, as I understand, agreed to cooperate this year; and the Secretary has served definite notice on them that if they do not cooperate, they will not get any price support at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. They should obtain no support, unless they do cooperate. I am sure the Senator will concede that under the marketing agreements, however entered into, the only thing the Department can do is to try to prevent those who enter into the agreements from selling their culls; otherwise, insofar as the sale of potatoes on the market is concerned, no effort is ever made to prevent that.

Mr. AIKEN. The marketing agreements entered into by the producers in different commercial areas have to be approved by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. This year the marketing agreement for our State excludes No. 1 potatoes up to 2½ inches in size. Those are not culls at all. But we have excluded them, under the marketing agreements. We also have complied with the acreage quotas in every instance; in fact, we are away under the acreage quotas.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator from Vermont permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; if I may have unanimous consent for that purpose.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Maine has stated that all growers in Maine have complied with the marketing agreement. Have all of them agreed to it? I was informed differently.

Mr. BREWSTER. The compliance in Maine with the acreage quotas is the highest in the country. It is between 85 and 90 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, in Maine there are from 10 to 15 percent of the farmers who have not complied, but who are growing potatoes to the extent of their ability?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And of course that situation necessarily adversely affects the potato growers who cooperate.

Mr. BREWSTER. But only in a very small way. The production is away down. We have reduced our total production this year by 10 percent, which is



the same as the national quota. If it had not been for the very fine growing season and for the 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes being brought in from Canada, we would not have had any problem at all. Those are the only two factors which have caused the problem this year.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, the very amendment I offer will require the 10 to 15 percent of growers to come under the marketing agreement; otherwise, they will not get any support at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will the Senator's amendment accomplish that?

Mr. AIKEN. By providing that compliance with marketing agreements or marketing quotas, if established by law at a later date, shall be a requisite for price support.

Mr. ELLENDER. But only as to co-operators.

Mr. AIKEN. There are thousands of noncooperators who are exempt from any of these programs at all. Those who produce less than 3 acres are not covered by any of the programs, as I understand. I said earlier today that they are, in part, responsible for the surplus we have this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose the Senator's amendment were to be adopted—would the 10 to 15 percent of Maine growers who have not—

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, if the Senator will permit an interruption, let me say that I find I must correct the statement I made a few moments ago. I have just been handed the official figures, which are that 93 percent cooperated on acreage and 100 percent cooperated on the marketing agreements.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator perhaps would be correct if he stated that from 10 to 15 percent of the total growers of the country have not done so.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sorry I was in error in my previous statement.

Mr. AIKEN. When we give the percentages, we should consider that the crop last year was approximately 10 percent larger than was needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to ask the Senator this question: Regardless of when we should do it, does the Senator not believe that the only effective remedy we can provide is to pass a marketing-quota law giving the Secretary of Agriculture the same power that he now has with respect to cotton and other basic crops, in an effort to control potato production?

Mr. AIKEN. That may be true not only with respect to potatoes but with respect to every other crop.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. But as to whether it would be effective, only experience can tell.

As I said a little earlier in my remarks, it will be a terrific job to police any program of this nature, and probably will be more difficult in the case of potatoes than, let us say, in the case of cotton, which goes through a certain number of bonded warehouses, or in the case of wheat or similar crops. It will be difficult to police any kind of a potato program.

However, I think what I am proposing is the best thing to try this year. What

I object to is a repudiation of the agreement the Government has made with the potato farmers, and I understand the Department of Agriculture does not want to have it repudiated in the middle of the season.

I think what is proposed will bring any cost to a minimum, if not to the vanishing point. If it does not, then I shall be perfectly willing either to abandon the program altogether, or to have a strict quota law put into effect for the 1951 crop.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the Senator's amendment, I notice that he suggests that no price supports shall be made available to farmers unless marketing quotas hereafter authorized by law are established.

Mr. AIKEN. Or marketing agreements. Marketing agreements can be put into effect for this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. So far as I am concerned, and judging not only from the experience I have had in my own State, but also from what I have read and heard, I do not believe the marketing agreements will do the job. We might just as well discard it so far as production of potatoes and probably quite a few other commodities is concerned. But the question I want to address to the Senator is this—

Mr. AIKEN. I want to answer the Senator's first question, first. If marketing agreements and the control of marketing practices do not do the job, then the Department of Agriculture did not know what it needed in order to do the job when it asked for that provision of law.

Mr. ELLENDER. That may be true. I want to ask the Senator this: He says that no price support should be made available unless quotas hereafter authorized by law are established.

Mr. AIKEN. Or marketing agreements.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator want to introduce a bill to that effect, or will he support a bill during this session of the Congress, so that the Department of Agriculture can effectively carry out the program?

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, I have been favorably inclined toward providing quota provisions, not only for potatoes but for other crops which may come under the price-support program. But I am opposed to repudiating in the middle of the season an agreement already made, particularly when it leaves part of the crop, let us say 30 percent of it, already planted, and the other 70 percent not planted, and therefore excluded from the support program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the views of the Senator be tempered in the event the law provided for the 1951 crop and omitted this year's crop?

Mr. AIKEN. The views of the Senator from Vermont would be very much tempered, but he would still be opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, which cuts off the support for two-thirds of the potato growers of the country in the middle of the season.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Sena-

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator has referred a number of times to marketing agreements. I notice in his amendment the term employed is "marketing orders." Are the terms "marketing agreements" and "marketing orders" synonymous?

Mr. AIKEN. Marketing orders must be approved by the producers. The Senator is probably familiar with the marketing agreements and marketing orders in the case of fluid milk, but in that case the Department of Agriculture actually sets the price of the product from month to month, usually under the terms of a formula which has been arranged for the particular area involved.

Mr. DONNELL. In noting the contents of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, I observe that there is a reenactment of certain sections, namely, section (b)—that is to say, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act—which is described in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 as "relating to market agreements." There is then a reenactment of section 8 (c), which is described in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 as "relating to orders."

I was wondering whether the term "marketing orders," as set forth in the Senator's amendment No. 15, of February 20, 1950, means the same as the marketing agreements, in view of the distinction made in what I very hastily observed in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator from Missouri knows, I am not a lawyer and not too familiar with legal terms, but I understand the marketing orders are made under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. The Senator will recall that the first Marketing Agreement Act, which was passed along about 1934 or 1935, was declared invalid in part by the Supreme Court.

As a result, the price of milk in my State went down to a little over 1 cent a quart, and something had to be done and done in a hurry. In the early part of 1937 the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act was enacted, which met the objections of the Supreme Court, and which has worked effectively in most of the fluid-milk centers since that time. As to the term "marketing orders," and its relation to the marketing agreements, these two provisions augment each other. Usually the agreements are the terms agreed upon, and the orders put teeth into the agreement. The orders must be approved by the producers.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator I am not asking this question from any mere technical aspect, but I want to be sure I understand, in considering the Senator's amendment, just what marketing orders are.

Mr. AIKEN. May I say to the Senator from Missouri the amendment has been considered by lawyers who are familiar with this type of law, and they have advised me, who am no lawyer at all, that the wording is proper.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Vermont has advised the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture already has authority to impose upon the potato-growing industry marketing practices or agreements.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator from Vermont advise us whether under the existing law the Secretary has authority to impose marketing quotas upon the industry?

Mr. AIKEN. No; only in terms of acreage allotments. He cannot impose them in terms of bushels marketed, except as required under a marketing agreement.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, it is stipulated that marketing quotas must be in effect before there can be any further price supports. Can the Senator tell us about how long it would take to put into effect a system imposing marketing quotas upon potatoes?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the 1950 crop undoubtedly would be 90 percent planted before it is possible to get that type of legislation passed. There have been bills before the Senate for the past 5 or 6 months, and no action has been taken on them and no move made to hold hearings on them. Senators on the floor were advised this very afternoon that the chairman of the committee said, so far as he knew, there was no date in the immediate future which had been set for a hearing on the marketing-quotas bill, although I may say I think we should hold hearings before long.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Then, in effect, the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois goes far beyond what we may now believe, when it requires the imposition of marketing quotas, because it would require several months to perfect such a program. Is that not correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would take a considerable length of time even to set up the machinery to invoke marketing quotas even after a bill is passed.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Again I want the Senator to understand that this question is not asked from any captious or technical aspect, but I want to be sure whether the right words are being used. After all, if we adopt the amendment, we want to know that it is going to accomplish what the Senator from Vermont sincerely desires it to accomplish. I notice in Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, that section 8 (c) seems to be the one applicable to so-called orders, and as I mentioned a moment ago, it appears, as I read, very hastily, and possibly mistakenly, the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, there is a distinction between marketing agreements and orders recog-

nized by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. The amendment, Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act, describes orders in this way:

#### ORDERS

SEC. 8 (c) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture shall, subject to the provisions of this section, issue, and from time to time amend, orders applicable to processors, associations of producers, and others engaged in the handling of any agricultural commodity or product thereof specified in subsection (2) of this section. Such persons are referred to in this title as handlers. Such orders shall regulate, in the manner hereinafter in this section provided, only such handling of such agricultural commodity, or product thereof, as is in the current of interstate or foreign commerce, or which directly burdens, obstructs, or affects, interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity or product thereof.

I am wondering just what it is the Senator has in mind as being covered by the marketing orders to which his amendment refers.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator from Missouri that perhaps the Senator from Vermont could answer captious questions better than technical ones.

Mr. DONNELL. I did not mean the questions in either sense.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe it is the type of wording which the Department of Agriculture will use. Whether the suggestion originally came from that source, I do not know, but I will undertake to reassure the Senator from Missouri as to the wording, within the next 15 or 20 minutes. If it is not exactly what we mean to provide for, it will be changed so that it will mean what I think it now means. I think it is the proper wording, but I shall find out and reassure the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. I very much appreciate his courtesy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he takes his seat?

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

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator not think that for the record it would be well to restate the two differences between the terms as used in the amendment in the phrase "this joint resolution unless marketing quotas hereafter authorized by law, or marketing orders under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended." For the record, what is the difference between marketing quotas and marketing orders?

Mr. AIKEN. The marketing quotas would have to come under a law which does not exist.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Marketing agreements are in existence. The Department contemplates requiring the use of them this year, and the amendment would back up the Department in requiring the use of them and make mandatory the provision which has been permissive up to this time.

I see the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has come into the Chamber. Perhaps he can tell us more about the plans for hearings on the marketing-quota legislation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Madam President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield, I should like to make a very brief statement.

Mr. AIKEN. With the unanimous consent of the Senate, I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The committee knows, and I think the Members of the Senate know, that I am for high prices for farm products. I am for high prices because it is necessary to have high prices for farm products as well as to have high wages and high salaries, in order to build up a large national income so that the people can make enough money to pay the enormous taxes which they must pay. That is the basic reason why I am for high prices for farm products. On that basis I am for a support-price program for potatoes, but the present program has not operated very well. In order to get a better support-price program the amendment which is now before the Senate was placed in the joint resolution in order to serve notice on those persons interested in potatoes that they must help us work out a program which we can support.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Oklahoma recalls that all but two members of the committee voted to approve this amendment. I do not understand that they bound themselves to support it word for word, but they believed it should be brought before the Senate for action at the earliest possible date.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is exactly what happened in the committee.

There is before the committee at the present time a bill proposing to provide money for the Commodity Credit Corporation. We have not acted on it officially. I hope that within the next few days we can report that bill. The next bill that is to be considered, from my viewpoint, if the members of the committee will go along with me, is a potato bill which was introduced by me in the last session, and was introduced in this session by the majority leader. If the pending amendment is adopted, those Senators interested in potatoes will be interested in coming before the committee and helping us work out a program which we can all support. That is what I shall work toward.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the intention of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma to include a provision which will establish marketing quotas for potato growers as well as the growers of other crops?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. On potatoes, especially, I want to establish a support price, provided there shall also be established not only fair controls, but mandatory and enforceable controls. Otherwise, I shall not go along with a support-price program. We cannot subject the Treasury to demands for money for support prices unless we give power to the Secretary to impose controls and power to enforce them. I think we should raise enough of the basic com-



modities to supply the domestic demand and the export demand, and then we should have a carry-over. Perishable products cannot be carried very long.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Can that be accomplished with only marketing agreements which the Senator from Vermont says we now have, or would it require additional legislation? I am very much interested in the Senator's reaction to that question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Personally, I hope for limited production based on a limited acreage.

Mr. WHERRY. In the final analysis, would the Senator care to state, if he is ready to make a statement, that the legislation should carry a provision for establishing marketing quotas in addition to what the Senator has just said?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I would be for that if I could get the committee to go along. I want to have rigid controls. I want the farmers to raise all the potatoes they can, to be sold at a fair price. I want enough to export and enough to have a carry-over at least during the year.

Mr. WHERRY. That necessitates marketing quotas.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That involves a question which has always confronted me. How are we going to enforce marketing quotas? It is a very broad field.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is a matter which must be worked out.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit me to make this last observation, I should like, if it can be done under marketing agreements, to have support prices paid in the market place, which, it seems to me, would be much more satisfactory.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that before he entered the chamber I expressed to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] sympathy toward a marketing-quota bill, but expressed doubt, and even opposition, with regard to attempting to impose a marketing quota on potatoes this year, knowing full well that most of the potatoes would be planted before we could get such a bill enacted into law. Therefore, I thought if the Department requires compliance with marketing agreements and orders for this year's crop, we can see how it works. There could still be a marketing-quota bill on the books, and the Secretary not be required to use it if the other provisions work.

In reply to the question asked a few minutes ago by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] as to the difference between a marketing agreement and a marketing order, I have a communication from my assistant, which reads as follows:

A marketing agreement may be entered into between the Secretary and the handlers of a commodity following public hearings. If the Secretary finds such agreement will effectuate the purpose of the act, an order is issued by the Secretary which controls all

handlers subject to it. The order must be approved by two-thirds of the producers of a commodity.

This two-thirds vote of producers is the same as for marketing quotas. So marketing orders, which are accepted by producers—and I understand the commercial potato producers have expressed their willingness to accept them—would virtually have the force of a marketing quota, at least for this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Missouri asked a question a moment ago on which I might be able to shed some light by reason of the fact that I participated on two occasions in connection with hearings dealing with marketing agreements affecting citrus fruit in the peninsula of Florida. As I understand the law and the procedure which would be followed under it, this is what occurs: If the Secretary feels that a marketing agreement would tend to bring about the results which are desired under the act, namely, more effective regulation of the flow of the product and a better distribution and a better and fairer price, he calls hearings, and at those hearings the affected parties, both producers and handlers, are given an opportunity to appear and state their views. The hearings generally are rather extended and are held in various parts of the area affected. When they get close to the end there may be a final hearing in Washington. After the agreement has been worked out in a form that seems to be most acceptable to the industry affected and is also in such form that it can be approved by the Secretary, he reduces it to a fixed formula, an agreement between the parties, himself, and the persons who shall sign it, the handlers. The handlers are given the opportunity to sign that agreement. In the case of Florida citrus fruit producers—and I would not pretend to make my statement apply to other products because there may be other provisions applicable to other products—the requirement was that not less than two-thirds of the growers by number of growers, or growers who produce not less than two-thirds of the fruit, should by referendum vote approve the proposed agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture.

It was also the requirement that 50 percent of the handlers should execute the agreement. However, that was not the entire prerequisite, as I remember it. The approval by not less than two-thirds of the growers by number of growers, or who produced not less than two-thirds of the volume, was an absolute prerequisite. In other words, democratic rule was provided for, in that a two-thirds majority of the growers was required to approve the provisions embodied in such an agreement, as a condition prerequisite to placing that agreement in effect or issuing an order based upon it. Naturally the agreement would affect only the parties to it, that is the handlers actually signing it. But the next step provided by the Agricultural Marketing Act was that in order to make effective the terms of the agreement and make them applicable to and enforceable

against the dissident handlers, the Secretary of Agriculture could and did issue marketing orders in exactly the same form as the marketing agreements. The marketing orders became enforceable as against all persons in the industry, whether or not they were signers of the marketing agreement.

Under the terms of the two marketing agreements which have been in effect with reference to Florida citrus fruit, we have had two different types of control. First, as I recall, was a volume control. It fixed the volume which might move in interstate commerce. The volume was allotted at certain fixed period by governing committees which made recommendations, on which the Secretary of Agriculture acted. In that way the movement of only a sufficient quantity of fruit to supply the markets at reasonable prices was permitted. Distribution of loss of the surplus was effected within the industry.

The other agreement, the present one, which has been in force now for some years, controls the grades and sizes of fruit which may be moved in interstate commerce from week to week, or over periods of weeks. In that way both the flow of fruit and the quality of the fruit are controlled.

In each case the marketing agreements were supported by orders, which were enforced by the maintenance of an inspection service, not only through the transportation companies—the railroads, and the ships—but at various key bridges and places on the highways, so as to control the movement by truck out of the peninsula of Florida. The flow of fruit was accurately controlled and this proved highly effective in bringing about better conditions in the industry.

As the junior Senator from Florida understands, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont, which is identical with the first amendment proposed on this subject in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that the Senator from Florida is the author of the wording which I have in my amendment. I did not recall it until the Senator explained the marketing agreements.

Mr. HOLLAND. The amendment as proposed by the Senator from Vermont makes no reference to marketing agreements, but only to marketing orders. It is the understanding of the junior Senator from Florida that the existence of marketing agreements is a prerequisite to the existence of marketing orders, which will adopt the same form. Much as the Senator from Florida would like to see the problem dealt with effectively through marketing agreements and orders, as it undoubtedly could be, provided the industry cooperates, it still is his view that dissident areas in which the growers refused to approve proposed marketing agreements or to subject themselves to orders, could rather effectively break down any proposed control. It was for that reason that the Senator from Florida felt that the quota conditions should be stated in the proposed amendment, as well as the marketing order conditions.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Florida understand that all the commercial potato areas have now indicated their willingness to come under marketing agreements? I realize that that will leave probably 500,000 or 600,000 acres of potatoes, grown in small quantities throughout the country in small fields, which will not come under any program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no information on the subject, but I did see in the press, a day or two ago, an article emanating from Bakersfield, Calif., stating that one very important producing area there wanted no continuing control or support program. Whether the article properly related the attitude of that important producing area the Senator from Florida is unable to say.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary of Agriculture has served notice that anyone who does not come under the marketing agreements and orders will not get any support. He is within the law in doing that.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida believes that it would be effective if all the large-growing areas would come under marketing agreements and orders. If two-thirds of the growers of a great separate production area, highly competitive with the rest of the industry, declined to come in, it might break down the whole program.

Mr. AIKEN. I will say frankly that if such an area refuses to come in, feeling it would cash in under the price supports given to other areas, the entire potato price support program will have to go, if it cannot be controlled.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the Senator whether the procedure which he has in mind for marketing orders for potatoes is similar to the successful procedure being followed in the New York milkshed in connection with the marketing of milk?

Mr. AIKEN. In general, I would say that they are similar. I think it would differ in this respect, that in the case of milk the Secretary of Agriculture actually names a price to be received from month to month, although the price which he names is arrived at under a formula which represents the consensus of agreement in the area as to what a good formula should be. In the case of marketing agreements, he has to approve the marketing methods.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I recall, the milk-marketing agreement had to be approved by two-thirds of the dairy farmers in the New York milkshed.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. It is also true of any marketing orders for fruits and vegetables.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. First, I should like to thank both the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for taking the time and giving careful attention to answering my questions. I should like, if I may, to have the attention of the Sen-

ator from Florida for a moment to ask him if there are marketing orders, as he understands them, which may be made without marketing agreements. In that connection I invite his attention to the heading above section 9 of Public Law 322, Seventy-fourth Congress, which is an act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which heading reads "Orders with or without marketing agreements."

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that that is the case in some industries. As to which industries, I am unable to say. That was not true in connection with the citrus industry. I have had no experience whatever with orders independent from marketing agreements, and certainly they would depart entirely from the theory which has been used in the citrus industry, where there has been required first united effort, cooperative effort, by a great controlling majority of the industry, that is, two-thirds of the growers and more than half of the handlers as a basis for any order. Irrespective of the attitude of the handlers, however, I believe that an order can be entered if two-thirds of the growers have given their approval.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator again for his kindness.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, if I still have the floor, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, I should like to ask a question, because up to this point no one, to my mind, has made a clear-cut statement of what a marketing agreement is. As I understand marketing quotas, they have reference to amounts that can be sold, bushels, or heads of livestock, or heads of cabbage.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Marketing agreements usually run to restricted acreages.

Mr. AIKEN. As used in the case of potatoes, I am sure the term "marketing quota" refers to the number of bushels which may be marketed. The Secretary already has authority to set the number of acres which can be grown.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I was about to raise. The contention of the distinguished Senator from Vermont is that under the present act, the marketing agreements, if carried through, would restrict acreage. Is not that true?

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary has already allocated the acres.

Mr. WHERRY. Then what are we providing in this legislation which the Secretary does not already have authority to do?

Mr. AIKEN. We are making the use of that authority mandatory, and backing up the Secretary in the use of it.

Mr. WHERRY. Are we making mandatory that he can use marketing quotas under some order before we pass the legislation?

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. WHERRY. We have not passed marketing quota legislation to apply to potatoes yet, have we?

Mr. AIKEN. He cannot require the use of marketing quotas, because there is no legislation to that effect.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the use of including that in the amendment, then?

Mr. AIKEN. That is in anticipation of the proposed marketing quota law being enacted before the end of this session.

Mr. WHERRY. If that is the understanding, I suppose there can be no objection, but there is much difference between a marketing quota and an agreement the producers and handlers arrive at themselves.

Mr. AIKEN. I might also point out that the Secretary is trying to control the production of grain crops this year though acreage allotments. In the case of wheat, there was a 17-percent cut in the acreage. However, the indication as of January 1 was that the crop would not be very far below last year's crop, due to the fact that when acres are cut, growers discard their poorest acres, and try to raise more on the acres which are left. The Secretary has the power, under the law, but he evidently hopes not to have to use it, and there has been talk to the effect that if acreage allotments fail, then quotas will be necessary in the case of grain crops next year.

Mr. WHERRY. Before that is done, legislation will have to be enacted.

Mr. AIKEN. In the case of potatoes, that is true, but not in the case of such grain crops as wheat and corn.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The additional authority in line 4 that the Senator from Missouri has been talking about, and I refer to the words "or marketing orders" authority which the Secretary does not now have?

Mr. AIKEN. He has it now, and I understand he intends to use it this year.

Mr. WHERRY. So that is not a new authority. That is an authority he already has?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Before I take my seat, Madam President, I should like to state that the State of Vermont last year raised 100 percent, exactly, of the amount of potatoes allocated to the State by the Secretary of Agriculture. There were four States in the Union which raised the exact amount which was expected of them. Others raised more. Others raised less. South Dakota, for instance, raised only 50 percent of the amount its farmers were entitled to raise, because of a poor crop year. But South Dakota was almost the only State that had such a miserable year for raising potatoes.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that marketing agreements are wholly voluntary?

Mr. AIKEN. They have to be approved by two-thirds of the growers, and marketing quotas have to be approved by two-thirds of the growers.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; but we do not have any law upon that subject. The agreements are voluntary.

Mr. AIKEN. No; we do not have a law on potato quotas. But if we did have, the consent of two-thirds of the growers would be required to put it into effect.



Mr. LUCAS. In the case of potatoes the only control we have is through voluntary agreement at the present time, which I understand was attempted, and some success was had with it last year.

Mr. AIKEN. No; they are not voluntary. The acreage plantings are not voluntary. The Secretary of Agriculture can put into effect acreage allotments, and he can issue marketing orders, and if they are not approved by the growers, he can deny price supports to those commercial areas which do disapprove them.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not understand that the Secretary has anything to do with acreage allotments, unless they are voluntary upon the part of the grower himself.

Mr. AIKEN. They are voluntary to this extent: The Secretary denies support price to those who fail to comply with them.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course.

Mr. AIKEN. And they do comply with them. There has not been a year since 1943, that the over-all planting of potatoes has not been less than the amount requested by the Secretary.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont one more question. Does the Senator agree with me that the Secretary, under the marketing agreements and orders which have been issued pursuant to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, has succeeded in bringing only 55 percent of the 1949 crop under marketing agreements?

Mr. AIKEN. That might have been true last year. However, he did not make compliance with marketing agreements a qualification for price support last year. Had he done so, no one knows how many would have agreed to come under marketing orders.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows that certain sections of the California growers have definitely said that they would not come under marketing agreements?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, last year.

Mr. LUCAS. I have telegrams in my office from farmers in a large section in Pennsylvania who voted on the referendum question, who refused to come under the agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. But may I ask the Senator if that vote was not taken last year? And is it not true that the California areas have indicated to the Department that they would like another vote on the marketing orders, and indicated their intention of coming under them?

Mr. LUCAS. That I cannot say.

Mr. AIKEN. And the Secretary has also informed them that if there is no compliance with marketing orders, there will be no support price for 1950. I think he has acted very properly in that case.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that his amendment, if it is adopted by the Senate, would have no effect whatsoever, but would leave us just where we are?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot agree with my distinguished friend. I think that is exactly what it means, and that is what the Secretary of Agriculture says it would mean.

Mr. AIKEN. I remind the Senator from Illinois that this provision of the law was requested by the Secretary of

Agriculture for the very purpose for which I think he should have used it last year. If he had done so I am told he might have cut out more than \$50,000,000 for the expense of supporting the 1949 potato crop, and he would not have had any more than the poor people in the institutions of this country could have used had he made it possible for them to secure the surplus crop.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a conclusion the part of the Senator from Vermont, and I cannot confirm it or deny it.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont thinks it is a correct conclusion. No sufficient effort was made to move the surplus potatoes, either through increased consumption in the ordinary channels of trade or by making them available to poor people or to nonprofit institutions.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator from Vermont, as I understand, wants to continue this situation as it is at present, regardless of what is the attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont wants to require the Secretary of Agriculture to use this provision of the law, which he did not use last year.

The Senator from Vermont further understands, while we are discussing the desires of the Secretary of Agriculture, that the Secretary of Agriculture is not at all in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, and has put in writing that he does not believe we should change this program after the agreement with the farmers has been made.

Mr. LUCAS. I have stated before, if I may reply without violating the rules of the Senate too much, that I have offered this amendment upon my own responsibility. The Secretary of Agriculture did not know anything about it.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand he did not know about it, and that he even does not approve it.

Mr. LUCAS. And the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture does not change my opinion at all as to the merits of my amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. And the Secretary of Agriculture has had very much less success in changing the opinion of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator from Vermont has been quoting what the Secretary of Agriculture says, and has been standing upon it when he has had to stand upon it to make his point.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that we both quote the Secretary of Agriculture when it serves our purposes to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can speak for himself along that line, because I did not bring up that subject first.

Mr. AIKEN. The influence on the Senator from Illinois is obvious.

Mr. LUCAS. It apparently has not had much influence on the Senator from Vermont, because the Senator from Vermont insists that we go on with the potato program regardless of what the cost may be.

Madam President, it does not make any difference what the Secretary of Agriculture should have done last year, or what he should do under the amend-

ment proposed by the Senator from Vermont. The truth of the matter is if we do not get a bill in the present session of Congress dealing with this program, and dealing with price supports under rigid controls, acreage allotments, marketing agreements, marketing quotas on bushels or bags of potatoes, the program will continue as it is now, and as the Secretary of Agriculture said it should continue, which will cost in the neighborhood of \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 or \$70,000,000 more than it ought to cost or would cost if we would adopt the simple amendment I have offered, and finally secure adequate legislation respecting the potato program.

I do not know whether the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry said on the floor of the Senate that he was ready to hold hearings at once and report a bill, but he came to the Senate floor for that purpose. I left the Chamber for a moment. He told me definitely that he was ready to go into the question and hold hearings and report a bill and get some action at the present session of Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry did appear in the Senate Chamber and gave as his opinion that we should hold hearings, and that in the not far future, but not the immediate future; that there would be hearings upon a bill providing marketing quotas for potatoes.

There are two bills before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. One was introduced about the middle of last year by the Senator from Oklahoma, the chairman of the committee, and one was introduced more recently by the Senator from Illinois.

There is one marked difference between the two bills, as I understand. The bill introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma would grant authority for compensatory payments, whereas the bill offered by the Senator from Illinois would not grant authority for compensatory payments. I am sure the Senator from Illinois will agree that when witnesses and the committee members engage in a discussion as to whether compensatory payments which are now played up as the backbone of the Bran-  
nan plan come under discussion, that the discussion is not likely to be brief either in the committee or on the floor of the Senate or on the floor of the House. For that reason we cannot expect to have a potato quota law enacted. I advised the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] while the Senator from Illinois was off the floor, that I would look sympathetically on such a law. We cannot expect to get it passed before most of this year's potato crop is planted.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator in favor of putting the potato growers under rigid controls?

Mr. AIKEN. I stated during the absence of the Senator from Illinois that if the proposal which I am making now fails to control the potato situation this year, that I would either favor abandoning the support program altogether or adopting rigid marketing controls.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In all fairness does not the Senator from Vermont, capable and able and efficient as he is, feel that the potato grower in this country has had quite a fair trial as to matters dealing with the growing of potatoes?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Department of Agriculture has had an even fairer trial and an even better opportunity to profit from the experience of the potato programs of the past few years. The overestimate of the amount required, and an underestimate of the yield, plus certain other mishandled phases of the program, have placed us in our present position. As late as September 1949, the Department of Agriculture estimated the potato yield at 363,000,000 bushels. That was after potatoes had been dug in two-thirds or three-fourths of the States of the Union. Yet in December they found the yield to be 402,000,000 bushels—just a slight error of 39,000,000 bushels in estimating the crop.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is utterly unfair to place the responsibility upon the Secretary of Agriculture in view—

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator permit me to conclude?

Mr. AIKEN. The responsibility rests upon him. The Department is responsible for the application of the law.

Mr. LUCAS. The Secretary is responsible for the application of the law, but I cite to my good friend from Vermont the testimony that was given here the other day by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], when he read into the RECORD several letters which he wrote when he was Secretary of Agriculture, calling upon the Congress of the United States to pass effective laws dealing with potatoes, and we completely ignored his request.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator from Vermont was ready to undertake to review the potato laws at the time.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator just now told me that he was not in favor of a law which would provide another chance to find whether the marketing agreements or marketing orders would operate effectively.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that is not what the Senator from Vermont said. The Senator from Vermont said he would look sympathetically upon a potato-quota law. He would not only look sympathetically upon it, but he would oppose putting a potato-quota law into effect this year, after most of the crop has already been planted.

After the potato growers have gone to the extent of purchasing fertilizer and seed and planting their crop under the agreement made with the Department of Agriculture, I would not require them then to be forced to destroy part of their crop which has already been planted at their own expense.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have just one more question. The Senator from Vermont

had me convinced that this amendment was the proper one, and I was ready to vote on it. I was convinced on the statement which was made that the Senator is not asking for any additional authority, but only that the present statute shall be mandatory and that the Secretary will have to use it.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. As the Senator said, if he had used it this year, two-thirds of the cost would have been eliminated.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that about two-thirds of the cost would have been eliminated if the agreements had been effectively enforced.

Mr. WHERRY. So the Senator from Vermont is telling us that he wishes to make the present authority obligatory upon the Department of Agriculture. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And if that is done with the marketing agreements, those agreements in themselves will go a long way toward solving the situation, if not completely solving it; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I said that if that fails, I will be in favor of abandoning the support program altogether or else imposing rigid marketing controls.

Mr. WHERRY. So the responsibility rests squarely upon the Secretary of Agriculture for not making the statute mandatory or at least for not using it in 1949.

Mr. AIKEN. He had the authority he asked for.

Mr. WHERRY. And because he did not use it, we find ourselves in this situation. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. But in fairness to him, I think it should be said that last year he did encounter considerable resistance which is not being put forward now.

Mr. WHERRY. But he could have used it, regardless of that.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; he could have used it, resistance or no resistance.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I am convinced.

#### BUDGETARY PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I hold in my hand a speech delivered by Mr. E. C. Sammons, president of the United States National Bank of Portland, Ore. It was delivered by him before the Credit Policy Commission of the American Bankers' Association, at Chicago, Ill., on January 25, 1950. Madam President, this is one of the best speeches dealing with problems concerning the budget of the United States Government that I have read in many a day. It is such an able discussion of the budgetary problems of our Government and of what Mr. Sammons thinks the American people and the United States Congress should do about them, that I ask unanimous consent to have his speech printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks. I wish to make several comments on the speech, if I am given permission to have it published in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

SPEECH BY E. C. SAMMONS, PRESIDENT, THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL BANK OF PORTLAND, OREG., BEFORE CREDIT POLICY COMMISSION, AMERICAN BANKERS' ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL., JANUARY 25, 1950

The late humorist, Will Rogers, once said if all the economists in our country were laid end to end in a straight line, their opinions still would point in all directions. This year's prophecies are not that way. They all seem to be alike in pointing in one direction—toward good business. Frankly, I am not an economist—don't pretend to be one—never have studied the technique of an economist—I am just one of the rank and file bankers of the country, and I am going to talk to you from that point of view.

You have already heard excellent discussions here in this meeting on various subjects of vital interest to all bankers. My assignment is Banking Credit in 1950. The topic is so broad it gives me plenty of latitude to discuss almost anything, and while it is a little early in the day to talk about food, I am going to give you a little "verbal hash"—a "little of this and a little of that!" If you will listen to at least one phase of it, I know you will be better off, and so will the country.

Banks in America as a whole prospered in 1949; there were plenty of opportunities to lend funds—to individuals or corporations at fair returns, or to segments of Government at lower rates. I think the same opportunities will prevail this year. While we had something of a shake-out in business the first half of 1949, the recovery was substantial in the second half of the year, and closed with a pretty fair tone.

Business is entering 1950 with a good deal more confidence and with fewer troubles than it had a year ago. You will recall that at this time last year, when we met in this room, a downturn was beginning to make itself felt, and there was naturally considerable anxiety over the probable depth and its duration. Unemployment was rising and a cautious consumer-public was beginning to hold back on its spending. The outcome was not bright. The inventory recession of 1949 was getting under way. No such worries are in evidence today. Business is enjoying a healthy rebound in consequence of the settlement of the coal and steel strikes. The strikes created steel shortages which will take some time to overcome. Purchasing power will be increased by the veterans' insurance refunds of \$2,800,000,000 during the first half. Continued Government expenditures for national defense, foreign aid, and public works will also be stimulants to business activity during the first half.

I have read a good many prognostications during the past 30 days on the part of bankers, economists, business executives, and editors, and they all point to but one conclusion—good business ahead for the near term. Seldom has there been such unity of opinion on the business prospect for any given period. President Truman and his advisers must have been reading the same prognostications, for they seem notably optimistic.

Business for the year as a whole just cannot be as good as predictions indicate, and I am sure the banking fraternity as represented at this meeting recognizes the possibility of moderate contraction later in the year; and will make their loans on a constructive if moderately restricted basis. There should be good opportunities nevertheless for banking volume and bank profit during the year. It seems reasonable to believe that expenses of banks, which have



been trending upward for some time, will be at a less rapid rate in 1950. These things are on the credit side; but I wish to talk to you in the next few minutes on some things that are not quite so rosy. I want to discuss our public financing.

There is a "cock-eyed" idea which seems to have gained much momentum in this country—and that is that "the Government can spend itself rich." This thought has reached dangerous proportions and I believe the bankers of America must do something about it. I further believe they can do something about it, and I am going to conclude this brief dissertation of mine with some concrete suggestions and recommendations. But, first, I should like to analyze with you, as some of the previous speakers have, what has been going on.

Our budget surplus has now disappeared and the Director of the Budget indicates a deficit of \$5,500,000,000 for the 1950 fiscal year; and the present program of the Government calls for continuing large deficits for the 1951 fiscal year. Constantly increasing expenditures are demanded by Government bureaus in amounts greater than the population should be asked to pay in taxes; and as far as I can detect from reading Government statements, there is no thought of cutting back, despite the definite knowledge that there is a great deal of waste in Government operations.

I am not alarmed by temporary deficits, but our Government has been running at a deficit for 17 out of the last 21 years. With the exceptions of the years 1929, 1930, 1947, and 1948, we have been in the red. Naturally we can understand the reason for deficits during the war years, but we can and should become alarmed about huge deficits in these postwar years. It is the momentum of Government spending that presents the biggest danger. In the 12 nonwar years in this 21-year period, our Federal debt increased more than \$57,000,000,000, and it is intended to add still further to this vast debt. I think it is time that our people make it plain to the Government that deficit in these prosperous years should be avoided. If our people do not do so, we can have serious doubts as to whether we will ever again see a balanced budget. It seems perfectly obvious now that the budget is out of control. There isn't a banker in this room who would let his bank's budget get out of control, so let's examine for a few minutes some of the details of your Federal Government—for it is your Government—and my Government. You and I are stockholders in our Government, and we have a right and a duty to see that the managers of our corporation handle our business properly. It is time to ask: "Is our Government well organized and economical?"

The Hoover Commission finds that we are paying heavily for confusion, overlapping, and waste. Here are some more facts worth considering about the Hoover report.

In an effort to organize the executive branch of the Government to relieve the President of a part of a superhuman burden, the Congress—upon recommendation of President Truman—created by unanimous vote, a Commission to Organize the Executive Branch of the Government.

This occurred in July 1947. The Commission was bipartisan, with six members from each party. It was but natural that the chairmanship should fall to Herbert Hoover. Always rated among the ablest administrators of all time, he alone of the 12 appointees knows intimately the problems which confront President Truman.

The Hoover Commission made a characteristically thorough approach to its mighty task. It began by defining some 24 of the principal problems of Government management. Having thus cut its cloth, it created special research committees called task forces. These comprised 300 leading researchers, some of the most eminent spe-

cialists available in each field. After periods of 10 to 14 months, these task forces returned to the Commission with their findings.

The result was the most imposing collection of facts, figures, and opinion on government that has ever been assembled—some 2,500,000 words of basic data of the most valuable sort. From this massive bulk, the Commission carved out its model of a streamlined modern government.

Herbert Hoover and his associates have presented the American people with a blueprint for good government. This is of the utmost significance, since, as a people, we have reached the point at which the size and cost of government can easily impair the effectiveness of our economy and lower our standards of living.

When Mr. Hoover was President, the Government employed 600,000 persons, and cost \$4,000,000,000 a year to operate. Today the budget is more than \$42,000,000,000 and the Government employs more than 2,000,000 persons, and comprises a maze of departments, bureaus, sections, divisions, and what-have-you—consisting of 1,816 different organizations. Manifestly, no President can carry a responsibility for personal direction of this establishment and have any time left for the broader duties of his office.

I crave your indulgence while we examine a few phases of the Hoover Commission report of Government inefficiency. First, let's go back to Wheeling, W. Va., on October 19, 1932, and hear Franklin D. Roosevelt talking. This is what he said:

"If this Nation wants to know what is wrong with its National Government, I will give them the answer in one word. That word is 'mismanagement.'"

Well, he was talking about four billions a year and 600,000 employees. Imagine the situation today as revealed by these facts regarding the 1950 budget:

The Army asked for funds to buy 838,000 tropical worsted uniforms at \$129 each—enough for all enlisted men in the Army and then some. How many of you are wearing suits that cost you \$129?

The Air Force requested funds to build 910 homes for families in Alaska that would have cost \$58,350 each, without any land cost; and on the island of Guam they asked for 828 family houses at a cost of \$48,000 each.

The present budget of the armed forces represents about \$100 per capita for the Nation, as contrasted with some \$2.25 before the First World War. Our task force reports that the current preliminary budget estimates of the three military departments for the fiscal year 1950 were for more than \$30,000,000,000. Such a budget would be justifiable only if the Nation were actually involved in warfare. It would require a sharp reduction in production for civilian consumption, precipitate the need for controls over the economy, and enormously increase inflationary pressures. It reflects a lack of realistic understanding by the three military departments of the economic and social factors of national security. Moreover, military budgets are not drawn with careful consciousness of cost factors. For example, an examination of the 1950 budget revealed estimates requesting modernization of 102 more tanks of a certain type than the Army actually possessed. In another case, a misplaced figure added some \$30,000,000 to budget estimate.

This year you will help pay a loss of \$500,000,000 by the Post Office. It is possible to cut \$200,000,000 of this loss by the use of modern methods and equipment and rates to help hard-working postal employees.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs employs one person for each 32 of the 393,000 Indians under its care.

The Veterans' Administration takes five times as long to settle insurance claims as private companies—uses four times the manpower per policy.

The Government owns three and one-half typewriters for each employee using these machines.

After dismantling a \$16,000,000 camp in Alaska, the Army shipped the resulting lumber to Seattle. The Department of the Interior took over the lumber and shipped it back to a point 10 miles from where it originally stood.

There is so much duplication in the Department of Agriculture that a farmer received conflicting advice about fertilizer from five different units of that Department.

To prevent the flooding of Cherry Creek, a small stream near Denver, the Army engineers tore down a dam which local engineers considered adequate and built a \$15,000,000 dam, 3 miles long and 140 feet high.

Some Government bureaus are stocked up with supplies 50 years in advance. The Government owns \$27,000,000,000 of supplies and materials. There is no central inventory of this vast property. We can live on this fat a long time.

Federal jobs are so frustrating that 500,000 persons quit the Government each year; yet it often takes months to secure the resignation of unsatisfactory employees.

The Hoover Commission also found that 40 Federal agencies rendered medical services; that half of the agencies of the Federal Government conduct medical or health activities of some kind, all competing for doctors and money; that the Federal medical activities cost \$2,000,000,000 in the last fiscal year, or 10 times more than in 1940; that these activities are utterly devoid of any central supervision. They found also that it cost the Government up to \$51,000 per bed to build hospitals, whereas the average cost of private hospital construction is \$16,000 per bed; that the Government is so concerned with building hospitals and providing treatment that only 4 percent of its medical funds are used on research to prevent illness.

Herbert Hoover, in a speech at the Shoreham Hotel on December 12, last, reported that as an indication of waste, there already existed in Federal hospitals at the time of the Hoover task force investigation, beds for 225,000 patients and only 155,000 were occupied. Yet Congress had made appropriations for, or authorized, hospitals with 50,000 additional beds, despite the fact that 70,000 are empty. The cost of the additional hospitals is estimated at \$1,300,000,000. President Truman canceled out \$300,000,000 of this program, but Congress restored the authority.

I have mentioned the Army and medical situations. Let's take one look at the Navy, whose Bureau of Ships is financed from 27 different appropriations; and the task force that studied that division tells us the Navy cannot even tell how much it costs to run a ship. How long do you think your business could survive such practices?

Let us remember that Government is your business, that you are paying for it, and it is within your power to help bring about reforms.

While it was impossible for the Hoover Commission to investigate all the work in the agricultural division, they did claim that it is a loose confederation of independent bureaus and agencies. A spot check disclosed that there were 47 agents from 7 separate services working with 1,500 farmers in one cotton-producing county in Georgia; there were 88 agents working among 3,400 farmers in 1 county in Maryland. Since we bankers work closely with farmers, we can safely say that the farmer would be twice blessed by the adoption of the Hoover report, for he would find his dealings with Federal agencies much less confusing and irritating and he would share with all other taxpayers in the benefits of reduced Government costs.

I will dramatize the vastness of the Federal budget. I hold in my hand a current

issue of the Sears, Roebuck catalog. It contains 1,377 pages; you can see the size of it. The Federal Budget is 241 pages larger than this Sears, Roebuck catalog; it is 1,618 pages. As to its size in dollars, the combined amount of the budget is \$43,297,000,000, so the average expenditure for each page of the Federal Budget is more than \$26,000,000,000. Assuming that a million dollars of the budget could be checked and approved each hour, a Senator or Congressman working 40 hours a week, 50 weeks a year, would be at the task for 21 years 7 months 20 days. That gives you a slight idea of how much of our money is being spent to run the Government.

David Lawrence, in an article dated December 12, says this: "Democracies cannot spend their way out of trouble. Sooner or later they have to realize that there is no such word as 'cannot' when reduction of expenses becomes imperative. The slogan of the future is not going to be the New Deal or the Fair Deal but one that will make its appearance soon—the Honest Deal. This means that the person who puts a dollar in the bank should be able to get back somewhere near a dollar in purchasing power in future years when he draws it out or when the life-insurance policies he now is paying for are paid to his beneficiaries."

Inefficient government apparently at one stage of his career was uppermost in the mind of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, because in his address in Sioux City, Iowa, September 29, 1932, he said: "I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetime in all our history. It is an administration that has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs and the reduced earning power of the people. Bureaus and bureaucrats, commissions and commissioners have been retained at the expense of the taxpayer."

If what he said was true then, what of the situation today when we have 1,816 bureaus, commissions, and other segments of Government, manned by approximately 2,100,000 bureaucrats?

On March 10, 1933, Mr. Roosevelt, in his message to Congress said: "Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy."

If he was right then—and the people thought he was, judging by their votes and their support—think how much more imperative it is now to look at our fiscal policy.

Two weeks ago last Tuesday, 3,296 shareholders, either in person or by proxy, re-elected our board of directors to tell me, as the pilot of their ship, how they wanted their property managed. All of you in this room had similar experiences within recent weeks, and I want to call your attention to the fact that you and I, and each and every one of us are shareholders in the greatest corporation in the world—the United States of America. We elect directors to manage our properties—but call them by different names; we elect Congressmen for 2 years; we elect another group called Senators for 6 years; but how many of us attempt to guide them in their handling of our properties? Mighty few of us, but we have got to begin to do it, and this is the challenge I leave with you and our fellow bankers over America—we ought to do something about the consequences of a loose fiscal policy. There isn't a one here who would permit our lending officers to advance money to customers, corporations, partnerships, or to any type of business if those individuals or businesses attempted to spend themselves rich. And we have got to make the citizens of America "at the grass-roots of America" understand the forces of inflation if we are to survive. And, speaking of politics, an analysis shows that 76 out of the 96 Senators—79 percent—are elected by rural majorities, and that 54 percent of the Representatives represent more rural counties

than urban counties. For the purpose of the study, a rural county was considered to be one in which there is no community with more than 10,000 population. The point I make is that in spite of the growth of cities, this is still a grass-roots country. People on the farm, in the villages, and in the small municipalities have the dominant voice when it comes to electing the men who make our laws. The future of America is in their hands, and I urge the country bankers in this audience to be as alert and as vociferous as any banker.

Our colossal public debt and our tremendous budget cost reminds me of a wisecrack made by a chef in Portland, Ore. He was asked how he would cook an elephant. He said, "I would cut it up in small pieces and cook it a little at a time." Well, our public debt and our budget are like that elephant—we will have to cut it into small pieces and work on those pieces. The piece that we should cook first is the Hoover organization plan.

If the heads of the 15,000 banks in America would each undertake to talk to one group of citizens a week through the rest of this year, I believe we could alert the populace—at least the thinking portion of it—to the dangers of increasing Government spending. As a starting point, we can all talk about the importance of getting the Hoover report adopted in its entirety. It is now but 20 percent approved. A lot more than that must be done, but at least that would be a start in the right direction. There is no reason why it should not be done—President Truman asked for the Committee, asked for the study to be made; Congress voted for the report unanimously; the facts are available, and I believe if put before the people clearly, the people will respond. Of course this program is political, but this is your country and mine, and we should say our say in support of it. "You cannot have your cake and eat it too" and yet so many politicians kid the public into believing they can. For instance, during the most recent elections, we saw many platforms which called for greater unemployment benefits, greater pensions for the aged, more support for farm prices, more aid to public works, added support for schools, greater veterans' budget, and of all things, "a fight against inflation, and lower taxes." People who present such platforms are either fools or liars.

This whole program is like a diamond—it has many facets. I have merely presented one or two of them. The appeal I make to you, my fellow bankers, is that you study the problem by procuring the data furnished by the Hoover Commission and follow up on that program.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt said in his address at Pittsburgh on October 19, 1932—"I have sought to make two things clear: First, that we can make savings by reorganization of existing departments, by eliminating functions, by abolishing many of those commissions, which, over a long period of years, have grown up as a fungus growth on American Government. These savings can properly be made to total many hundreds of thousands of dollars a year."

He spoke of thousands of dollars; the Hoover report talks of millions of dollars.

Now to summarize—the American people delegate to one man in the White House and to 531 men and women in Congress the job of running America, which in turn means the job of maintaining peace in a troubled world. But these elected representatives do not exercise absolute power as in a dictatorship—the sovereign power is public opinion. They constantly watch public opinion.

Fortunately within the huge mass of people there is an intelligent class of men and women who really care what goes on in Government, who manifest their interest not only by their votes on election day but by their constant alertness to what goes on every

day. This intelligent class is an active group of great influence and great power. It comprises those American men and women who make or unmake public opinion on vital issues, irrespective of which party is in power. These people furnish the leadership in our American system; they even affect the ebb and flow of world-wide tides of economic power. They are the active leaders in business, in labor, in agriculture, in industry, in education, in the church, in the professions, in finance, and even in the Government itself.

We have been considering in this meeting, and particularly in this speech, the question of the Federal budget—so have many others. For instance, Tom McCabe, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in his appearance before the Douglas Committee of Congress on Fiscal Monetary and Credit Policy, gave this testimony, and I quote:

"There is no antidote to inflation equal to the development of a budget surplus, and the use of that surplus to retire debt."

So you can see that if we become vociferous on the subject, we are in very good company.

I wish to be more specific as to how to do this job of alerting the people. Ask those in your audience to write personally to their Senators and Congressmen; tell them also that the most important thing is to get their wives interested, and get them to write letters personally. Get the subject discussed at such groups as the League of Women Voters, chapters of the Association of University Women, and other groups of business and professional women. That's the way public opinion is formed; it's the only way it is formed. Pressure groups of other kinds are working to get more money for spending—we should bring pressure in the direction of economy and lower taxes.

In the Preamble to the Constitution—of this, the greatest country the world has ever seen—our forefathers referred at the very outset to "we the people." And at its rebirth at Gettysburg, Abraham Lincoln, the savior of the people, again referred to "The Government of the people, by the people, for the people." This is our Government—it belongs to the people and we (you and I) are part and parcel of that phrase "we the people" and by our action we shall, as Lincoln also said, "either nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope on earth."

We as bankers should accept our undeniable responsibility and take our proper part in forming and guiding public opinion, and help stimulate the people into action to reverse these dangerous trends. We thereby will have strengthened the base for bank credit in 1950. But if we sit passively by and "let George do it," we shall get into trouble. Collectively, the banks of the Nation have 44 percent of all assets invested in Government bonds which will waste away in value under continued deficit spending. However, their value can be preserved by a sharp and prompt reversal of present Government financial policies. Our patriotic obligation is to work earnestly to that end.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I should like to commend a reading of the speech of Mr. Sammons particularly to my Republican colleagues in the Senate. The Republican Party, acting through an appropriately appointed committee selected from the Republicans of the Senate and the House of Representatives, in conjunction with a committee selected from the Republican National Committee, issued, a couple of weeks ago, what I thought was an exceedingly able statement of general Republican policy which would be presented by the Republicans to the American people in the congressional campaigns of 1950. I thought it was a remarkable statement, Madam President, because to



the extent that we can accomplish a degree of party unity by way of issuing policy statements or platforms. I thought that the recent Republican policy statement augured well for bringing about a remarkable degree of harmony among the various groups within the Republican Party. As we Republicans join forces in another congressional election this year I hope that we will be able to point to specific legislative proposals implementing our policy statement which the RECORD will show we tried to get passed into law by the Eighty-first Congress in its second session.

Regarding the statement of policy the Republican Party enunciated a couple of weeks ago, through the committee I have just mentioned, I wish to point out that it is an implementation of the great, progressive platform the Republican Party adopted at the convention in 1948. I think it needs to be read and interpreted in light of the party's official platform of 1948. I think the recent statement of Republican policy, Madam President, must be read as an interpretation, effectuation and implementation of the Republican platform of 1948.

Mr. BREWSTER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Not just at the moment; I shall yield before I get through.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wondered whether the Senator had read the statement.

Mr. MORSE. I not only have read it, but I have digested it very carefully. I have given a series of speeches across my State in support of the statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. It uses the word "supplementing."

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Maine, who also is chairman of the Republican senatorial elections committee, that in those speeches across my State, I pointed out what I considered to be the very fine provisions of the recent policy statement. I pointed out that within the statement itself it is perfectly clear that it was enunciated for the purpose of making clear that we propose to carry out our platform of 1948.

Mr. BREWSTER. We distinctly said "supplementing the 1948 platform," in order to avoid any question of repudiation.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I am not raising any question of a repudiation of the 1948 platform. I am trying to point out, if the Senator from Maine will bear with me, that what the new policy does is to implement and effectuate the 1948 platform; and those are stronger words than "supplementing."

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I would even prefer to add the word "effectuate" and have it put into the statement.

But I started to say, Madam President, that although I think the recent Republican policy statement is a very fine one to submit to the American people, in the 1950 congressional campaigns, nevertheless we must relate it to the 1948 platform by offering specific legislation in this session of Congress aimed at keeping the promises of the 1948 platform. I am offering this very able speech on the budgetary problems of the United States Government, delivered by Mr.

Sammons, in Chicago, on January 25, 1950, as my exhibit A, today, of some of the specific things which I think the Republican Party needs to do about economy in government. When? Right now, at this session of Congress, in both Houses of Congress, in order to make perfectly clear to the American people that we mean political business when it comes to carrying the fight to the Democrats in the campaign of 1950, in putting into practice the principles and recommendations of the 1948 platform.

Thus, Madam President, this afternoon, on the basis of the points made by Mr. Sammons in his able speech of January 25, 1950, I offer once again to my party, by way of specific recommendations for legislative action at this session of Congress—the second session of the Eighty-first Congress—the following proposals:

First, the adoption of the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission reports for the reorganization of the executive branch of our Government, and for the bringing about of some true economy in the administration of the affairs of our Government. I ask my Republican colleagues, what is wrong with making the Hoover Commission reports not only the recommendations of the Republican Party, as intimated, may I say, in the policy statement of 1950, but what is wrong with making those reports the legislative policy of the Republican Party in terms of specific legislative proposals during this session of Congress?

Madam President, this has been the position of the junior Senator from Oregon ever since the Hoover Commission reports were issued and ever since the Senator from Oregon had an opportunity to study them.

I wish to say that if we would take the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission reports and, as a party, would put them into legislative form, we would be keeping faith with the pledges and the promises we made in the Republican platform of 1948 and in our supplementary statement, as the Senator from Maine calls it—and rightly so, of 2 weeks ago, when again we made clear that the Republican Party is going to the country in 1950 on a program of true economy. If Senate hearings show that the facts warrant making some changes in the Hoover Commission recommendations I am willing to consider those changes. However I think it should be agreed that a presumption favors the adoption of the Hoover recommendations as submitted unless a clear showing of a need for amendments is made.

There should be some legislation introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives effectuating the Hoover economy recommendations and then a determined fight, in my judgment, on the part of the united Republican side of the aisle, to show that we mean political business in trying to pass those recommendations in the interest of a sound budget for the country. As Mr. Sammons says in this very able speech, the budget has to be balanced. I consider it an outrage that we have a deficit of over \$5,000,000,000 in our present

budget, Madam President, and I do not share the view that the deficit cannot be eliminated from the budget. On the contrary, I happen to hold to the point of view that if the Republicans in this session of the Congress will use both ends of the lead pencil, a sharp pencil point, and a good eraser on specific item after specific item, we could carry such a hot fight to the Democrats on the other side of the aisle that they could not escape the force of the logic of our position in support of sound economy. The budget can be and should be balanced in this session of the Congress.

To do it, we must do more than issue policy statements. To do it, we must offer legislation which will accomplish it, and as a united Republican group we must stand behind such legislation. So, on this first point, I ask again, What is wrong with making the major recommendations for economy in Government of the Hoover Commission reports the specific legislative proposals of the Republican Party in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress? In taking that position, Madam President, the junior Senator from Oregon does not vary from the consistent position he has taken ever since the Hoover Commission reports were released to the American people. He repeats this afternoon what he has said elsewhere. Those reports constitute the most scholarly, the most scientific, the most authoritative reports on Government economy ever presented to a Congress of the United States.

The second recommendation I offer in supplementing the platform of the Republican Party of 1948, implementing and effectuating the platform, is the major tax recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development, which have been before the Senate of the United States now for more than 3 years. For more than 3 years some of us on the Republican side of the aisle have taken the position that the problem of taxes in this country is not a problem of tax reduction or of tax increases at all, but the problem which confronts us in the field of taxation is a problem of tax revision. Our tax problem is basically one of tax revision aimed at getting the gross inequities out of the existing tax structure, so we can accomplish—what? So we can accomplish an expanding of our economy. Without that expansion of our economy there is in my judgment no hope at all for meeting the fiscal problems confronting the country. We must deal with the gross inequities in the tax structure of the country, and that is exactly what the tax revision report of the Committee for Economic Development is aimed at. I have yet to hear in all the debates on the floor of the Senate a single word of substantial criticism or condemnation from either the Democratic or Republican side of the aisle, against the tax revision program of the Committee for Economic Development, a program which has been before us for over 3 years, Madam President.

I ask again, Why do we not do something about it? I ask my Republican colleagues, What is wrong with it? I ask my Republican colleagues to point out wherein the junior Senator from

Oregon is in error when he says that this side of the aisle, the Republican side, ought to put into legislative form and give support to the tax recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development. Some of us have put these recommendations into legislative bills and they have been here on the floor of the Senate for over 3 years. I think it only fair for the American people to ask the Republican Party what is wrong with the tax-revision program of the Committee for Economic Development. The outstanding business leaders of America are for it. The outstanding tax authorities in America are for it. In fact, Madam President, those who have come to study the tax problems of the country invariably point to the recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development as constituting the first steps in the legislative reform of taxes that the Congress of the United States should take.

I am satisfied that a majority of the Republicans in this country—in fact, I am satisfied that a majority of my colleagues here in the Senate do not quarrel with me at all on the need for a tax-revision program. I am satisfied they do not quarrel with me when I say the tax-revision program offered by the Committee for Economic Development ought to be the starting point for any tax legislation adopted by the Congress. Across the land, in the 1948 campaign, when I spoke night after night under the sponsorship of the Republican National Committee, before audiences in that campaign which, I may say, many times were not overwhelmingly friendly to the Republican cause, I talked in terms of the need for a thorough-going tax-revision program. What was the response? A response of enthusiastic acceptance of the principle. I would say to my Republican colleagues today, I think the No. 1 domestic issue facing the American people, and the No. 1 domestic issue on which they want action in this session of the Congress, is the issue of tax reform. I am satisfied that the Republican Party in this session of the Congress has the ability and the foresight and the courage to go forward with legislation in the tax-revision field. If we do not, we are going to play into the hands of the Democratic Party, with its program of continued deficit spending and its program of adopting a "soak the rich" tax policy. The tax policy of the Democrats seems to be the false economic theory that all that needs to be done to meet the fiscal problems of the country is to impose higher taxes on existing wealth. Where will that program lead us? It will lead us into an out-and-out state economy.

In the 1950 campaign the junior Senator from Oregon will be heard to say that what the Republican Party must do in order to meet the tests of constitutional liberalism for which the junior Senator from Oregon is constantly pleading is not to adopt the type of tax program which the Democrats are offering, namely, a soak-the-rich program, which involves placing higher taxes on existing wealth, but to eliminate those gross inequities from the present tax structure which are discouraging business incentive. It is those gross inequities which are an impediment to an expansion of

our economy. They are making it impossible for us to develop the wealth we need from which we can obtain the new tax dollars with which to meet the obligations of our budget.

I close with a third recommendation, which is that in this session of the Congress the Republican Party should consider all issues from the standpoint of doing what is best in the interest of winning the peace. We should not, Madam President, consider a single one of the major pieces of legislation facing us in this session of the Congress without relating that legislation to the question of peace. I probably should not confess it, but I confess, Madam President, a growing pessimism on the state of world affairs.

I confess a pessimism in regard to the trend of the cold war. I do not see in the cold war at the present moment a trend of victory for the United States. I think things are going badly for the United States in the cold war. I think this matter of winning the peace is superior to and should supersede in our consideration every other issue which confronts us. We Republicans should not let the American people forget that the greatest defense weapon America has is a sound economy at home. Therefore, as we proceed to consider questions as to what we should do in order to turn the tide of the cold war from one of defeat to one of victory in winning the minds of men around the world in support of democratic ideals and freedom of choice, which is the essence of democracy, I suggest that the Republicans at least keep their eyes on the importance of a sound economy. I am one who has come to the conclusion that our domestic economic problems must be solved in the interests of a sound economy if we are to be in a strong enough position to meet Russia in case the cold war should turn into a hot one. I am just pessimistic enough to believe, Madam President, that it will turn into a hot war whenever Russia believes we have so weakened our domestic economy that we cannot beat her in a hot war.

The time has come for us to meet the question of a balanced budget, the question of a sound tax-revision program, not in terms of talk, but in terms of votes on the floor of the Senate in support of specific pieces of legislation. I recommend that my Republican colleagues start with two, the Hoover Commission recommendations for economy in government, and the recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development with reference to the tax-revision program, in the field of taxation.

#### AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, some time ago I introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an exchange of letters I had with the Secretary of State concerning our policy in the Far East, specifically with regard to Formosa and China.

I have recently received a letter from a Mr. H. G. McNeary, of Hong Kong, China, who, although he has been in China the greater part of 30 years, is one of my constituents. His family home is at Cornwall on the Hudson. Mr. McNeary

writes to me suggesting that one of the positive courses we could follow in China would be to encourage a spirit of resistance to communism among Chinese students in America. He also suggests that action groups could be founded among the Chinese workers and merchants in the United States, some of whom might aid in the resistance movement in China.

Such activities, Mr. McNeary points out, would also have the advantage of counteracting the work of Communists and Communist agents among the Chinese in this country. Obviously, much of this program would need to be inspired by the Chinese themselves, but the United States Government could certainly encourage and aid these movements. I am merely citing this as one worth-while suggestion for the consideration of the State Department.

Mr. McNeary also sent me two editorials, one from the Hong Kong Sunday Herald, and the other from the China Mail, also published in Hong Kong, dealing with the far-eastern situation. These editorials give, in my judgment, a sober evaluation of the situation by persons who are on the scene and who know what they are talking about when they talk about China.

The views set forth in these editorials correspond with some of the conclusions which I have reached without the benefit of the intimate knowledge and the facts available to these writers.

I invite the Members of the Senate and the country at large to read these editorials, not because they necessarily reflect absolute truth, but because they represent an informed opinion.

I also commend to the attention of those interested the proposal I have cited by Mr. McNeary.

I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert into the RECORD at this point the editorial from the Hong Kong Herald and the editorial from the China Mail.

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

[From the Hong Kong Sunday Herald of February 12, 1950]

#### DESTINY CAN WAIT AWHILE

Time was when we all had plans and programs for China. We were all as busy as could be, in all sorts of different ways. The Japanese got busy in Manchuria, and the Lytton Commission went in to see what business they had to be so busy. There were Boxer fund commissions, parliamentary delegations, tariff commissions, mediation commissions, alphabetical bodies, military advisers, plans, representations and what-not.

Now all that is ended. We are on the outside looking in, and nobody quite knows what to do about it. Washington has retorted to the childish little jibe about her alleged reluctance to carry out the withdrawal of the consuls by naming dates for those remaining to go out. It is certainly a vast change compared with 2 years ago, and none are more acutely conscious of it than the Americans. It is a sort of great western withdrawal.

A few years ago half the Continent of Asia was occupied by the Japanese. The Allied forces overwhelmed them and capitulation alone saved Japan herself from invasion in force. The west came to the east in such panoply of power as was undreamt of a decade before. Caesar in all his glory was never arrayed like MacArthur and Mount-



batten. The volume of power and the distances covered were alike without parallel.

We mention it just in case it has been forgotten—and because the contrast today is almost incredible. But then, so was the contrast between 1945 and 1942. Great tidal waves have been moving across the Continent. Changeless Asia has become preeminently the world focus of change. The end of it is not yet, whether one thinks of such gigantic units as China or India. Nor is anybody certain just what will be the shape of events to come in Japan.

There are a number of very vocal people who want to do something about this sudden reduction of the west to the modest role of mere spectators in China. And some of the things they want to do are plain silly. Some want armed intervention, direct or indirect. Some say the day is lost throughout Asia from the Indian Ocean eastward, and that the best thing to do would be to get out of these areas and let the Communist wave sweep over them. The American Secretary of State is hardly a happy man these days, but he has kept his head amid all the counsel and criticism to which he has been subjected.

In his exchange of letters a few days ago with Senator LEHMAN, the former head of UNRRA, Mr. Acheson emphasized that hasty or ill-considered action might do irreparable harm. He fully understood the public uneasiness over the fact that no positive course for the United States to follow within China suggests itself. But he agreed with the Senator that there was a positive course, and in the long run, a most important one. The United States, he said, should seek to maintain the friendliest relations with the peoples of Asia, and to show the Chinese people that its desire, as always, was the advancement of their welfare and interest.

"It is for us during this period to extend with tact and understanding a helping hand where we can, and a guiding hand where this will not be resented, and above all to see that the peoples of Asia have a true picture of us and a true picture of Soviet communism and a clear understanding of what each stands for. In a sense, we are thus on trial before the peoples of Asia."

Americans like red-blooded policies. There are none available in this period. There is little beyond pussyfooting to be done just now except in propaganda. It may be exasperating, but it is true just the same. The case for the west was never better—the facilities for direct influence on events never worse. They were made still worse by the impetuous decision to withdraw all the consuls. The provocation was acute, but the decision delighted those whose provocation was specifically directed to this end. The British decision went the other way, and we are convinced it was a better decision. It was better morally, however slow practical results may come. And it was better politically, for all the taunts about loaded godowns in Hong Kong. It is probable Mr. Acheson thinks so too, but he has been badgered into defensive tactics when others would have given more promise.

Happily, a stronger line in southeast Asia seems to be foreshadowed in Dr. Jessup's statements. In Singapore, he suggested that the United States might give military as well as economic and political aid to help the peoples of that area to resist communism. That is certainly a lot better than intervention in China, or defeatism in southeast Asia, or looking to Japan as the sole potential saviour of Asia.

[From the China Mail, Hong Kong, of February 15, 1950]

#### CLEARING THE DECKS

The conference of American diplomats on the Far East has opened in Bangkok. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have concluded their

tour of the Pacific and Japan and have presented their report on American defenses in these areas. At the same time, reports from Moscow indicate that the protracted negotiations between the Chinese Communist leaders and the Kremlin may be about to end. From these three major sources, therefore, the material will soon be available on which the administration can frame its detailed policy.

In these days, policy has to be global in scope, but that does not mean it cannot be flexible. Just as in war, strategy and tactics cannot be quite the same on every front, though there is fundamental agreement on the principle of containment of aggression. We regained the initiative in Berlin and in the West generally as a result of the purposeful policy of the past year. In the Far East we had the initiative after the war, but have now lost it in the larger sense.

Mr. Dean Acheson however, has cut his way through much deadwood to first principles. In these days of raucous and vociferous confusion that at least is something to be thankful for. He at least knows where he stands, even if neither he nor anybody else—pending the slow unfolding of events in China—knows precisely where we go from there, or when. That will have to be considered in the light of facts and the recommendations of the experts. Meanwhile, Mr. Acheson has made his way through the mists of confusion in one of the most remarkable series of statements any American statesman has ever made. He has dealt as faithfully with those with a pain in the neck as with those shuddering with a pain in the heart. His long silence before the recent uproar over Taiwan left the field almost wholly to the Republican critics. That has since been remedied, at least in the tactical battle for public opinion.

The critics know their own mind, of course, and what they would do. Senator KNOWLAND has just laid down a five-point program. Under this, there would be no recognition of the new regime in China. General MacArthur would coordinate all far eastern affairs. A military commission would go to Taiwan to play the same role there as in Greece. Conditions are completely different now, however similar they might have been when the Chinese Communists, like the Greek Communists, were mere guerrillas and not in occupation of the entire mainland. The Far Eastern Division of the State Department would be reorganized, because of its Alger Hiss influence. A demand would be lodged with the Communists that all American nationals be liberated at once, with an American naval blockade of the coast if it were rejected.

The objectives seem much too limited for the risks entailed. The plan does not restore influence on events in the mainland; if anything it removes all that remains, or that may develop in a measurable distance of time. Its political content is shrill, not tough. And toughness is the supreme need. If any synthesis is possible between this program and the general principles of American policy—always its greatest asset—it will have to be based on the purely strategic ideas of the Chiefs of Staff.

There is, too, another aspect of the battle for public opinion. It relates to the reaction to the atomic bomb, and now the hydrogen bomb. A few days ago Mr. Acheson again got down to first principles on this. He declared bluntly that no fresh approach was being made. It was open to the Russians to accept the Baruch plan for control or to suggest reasonable modifications. One such suggestion that has again been made is that is should be removed altogether from the domain of national sovereignty.

But, said Mr. Acheson, atomic agreement is not the fundamental question. What comes first is the establishment of friendly understanding between the countries. On

this the State Department has not given up hope. Continuing attempts were being made to extend the area of possible agreement with Russia. Once this is sufficiently wide, it should be possible to lay down this fact in black and white.

"Time after time we have seen that agreements with Russia are useful when they register facts which exist, and that they are not useful when they are merely agreements which do not register existing facts. An arrangement which meets the interests of both parties will stand. It will be founded on fact. Anything else will sooner or later be proved to be waste paper."

In other words, it is essential to take the psychological mainsprings of Soviet policy into account—and play from strength. Soviet policy was a mixture of ideology and imperialism, and all in all it was incompatible with world peace and the freedom of peoples. At the same time the Soviet Government was highly realistic and could adapt itself to facts. So in matching realism with realism Mr. Acheson's policy is based on an analysis of Soviet psychology. And realism consists in building situations so strong that their strength would be recognized by the Soviet Government. And in Asia no less than in Europe.

#### COTTON AND PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 398) relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, may I inquire what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WHERRY. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. I expect to call it up at the proper time in the course of the debate on the potato question.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4406) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KEE, Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. EATON, and Mr. VORYS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5839) to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. PACE, Mr. GRANGER, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4453) to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating

discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4406) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GREEN, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### REHABILITATION OF NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES OF INDIANS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, which were on page 8, line 12, strike out "expended" and insert "of contributions by the State toward expenditures"; on page 9, line 6, strike out "chairman thereof" and insert "President of the Senate"; and on page 9, lines 9 and 10, strike out "chairman thereof" and insert "Speaker of the House of Representatives."

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. ECTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 4453) to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

#### RECESS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 24, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 23, (legislative day of February 22), 1950:

#### IN THE ARMY

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Victor Z. Gomez et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 6, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Victor Z. Gomez and ending with the name of Marcus L. Whitfield, on page 1510.

##### UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Clement Anthony Siwinski et al., for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 16, 1950, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Clement Anthony Siwinski, which appears on page 1867, and ending with the name of Elizabeth M. Nichols which is shown on page 1838.

The nominations of the following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and title III of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948:

##### To be lieutenant colonels

Della Josephine Angst, [REDACTED]  
Martha Leola Cross, [REDACTED]  
Mary Lois Kersey, [REDACTED]  
Kathleen McClure, [REDACTED]  
Virginia Justin Phelps, [REDACTED]  
Marie Louise Ray, [REDACTED]  
Emma Jane Riley, [REDACTED]  
Margaret Johanna Steele, [REDACTED]

##### To be majors

Pauline Estelle Abell, [REDACTED]  
Evaline May Absalom, [REDACTED]  
Margaret Andrews Bacchus, [REDACTED]  
Laurie Marie Ball, [REDACTED]  
Ruth Lucile Blind, [REDACTED]  
Anna Lee Briggs, [REDACTED]  
Margaret Goodman Brown, [REDACTED]  
Charlotte Gage Butterfield, [REDACTED]  
Lucille Caldwell, [REDACTED]  
Virginia Christina Dietz, [REDACTED]  
Kathryn Grace Ecke, [REDACTED]  
Mary Elma Elrod, [REDACTED]  
Anna Marie Frost, [REDACTED]  
Willma Rebecca Hague, [REDACTED]  
Elizabeth Tunstall Hickson, [REDACTED]  
Marjorie Ostrander Hunt, [REDACTED]  
Rachael Ann Johnstone, [REDACTED]  
Kathryn McConnell Ludlow, [REDACTED]  
Dorothy Page Martin, [REDACTED]  
Margaret Elizabeth McEnerney, [REDACTED]  
Gladys Emma McManimie, [REDACTED]  
Mary Elizabeth McPherson, [REDACTED]  
Willma Mae Mizell, [REDACTED]  
Jacquelin Mozelle Mooneyham, [REDACTED]  
Gladys Myrabelle Nelson, [REDACTED]  
Genevieve Kelly O'Brien, [REDACTED]  
Helen Emeline O'Day, [REDACTED]  
Maimie Pauline Oliver, [REDACTED]  
Rose Ethel Panowski, [REDACTED]  
Bernice Cecelia Philipps, [REDACTED]  
Margaret Louise Philpot, [REDACTED]  
Bertha Pinckes, [REDACTED]  
Elizabeth Ray, [REDACTED]  
Myrl Dean Stiles, [REDACTED]  
Marion Eliza Swan, [REDACTED]  
Mildred Elsie Thomas, [REDACTED]  
Edith Margaret Toffaletti, [REDACTED]  
Janna Tucker, [REDACTED]  
Frances Works Van Pelt, [REDACTED]  
Kathryne M. Walls, [REDACTED]  
Margaret Mary Werlein, [REDACTED]

##### To be captains

Jean Doris Armstrong, [REDACTED]  
Joan Elizabeth Bennett, [REDACTED]

Virginia Marie Blanchard, [REDACTED]  
Carolyn Elizabeth Boatwright, [REDACTED]  
Madelen Cassidy, [REDACTED]  
Alberta Marie Courchene, [REDACTED]  
Elizabeth Narcissus Cox, [REDACTED]  
Doris Dee Diamant, [REDACTED]  
Elsie Ovedia Ellingson, [REDACTED]  
Harriet Marion Flvenson, [REDACTED]  
Mary Elizabeth Flannagan, [REDACTED]  
Virginia Spence Gary, [REDACTED]  
Elizabeth Guild, [REDACTED]  
Alice Hoyt Hartley, [REDACTED]  
Verdia May Hickambottom, [REDACTED]  
Bonnie Turnbull Martin, [REDACTED]  
Virginia Eloise Martin, [REDACTED]  
Ruth McCraw, [REDACTED]  
Murial May Moran, [REDACTED]  
Shirley Theone O'Dell, [REDACTED]  
Rita Elizabeth O'Donnell, [REDACTED]  
Frances Oppenheimer, [REDACTED]  
Viola May Peschel, [REDACTED]  
Ruth Ramee, [REDACTED]  
Lillian Tombacher Robinson, [REDACTED]  
Cora Edra Sharon, [REDACTED]  
Albina Helena Shinkus, [REDACTED]  
Mary Ellen Shull, [REDACTED]  
Flora Mary Smothers, [REDACTED]  
Mary Helene Strong, [REDACTED]  
Ruth Ellen Vorkoeper, [REDACTED]  
Ruth Lamar Williams, [REDACTED]  
Jean Smollen Wilson, [REDACTED]

(NOTE.—Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Joseph G. O'Rourke, St. Joseph's Church, Marshall, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, with our whole soul we thank Thee for the great gift of the holy year. Heavenly Father, Thou who seest all things, who searchest and dost guide the hearts of men, make them responsive, in this time of grace and salvation, to the voice of Thy Son. May Thy grace unkindle in all men love for the many unfortunate people, whom poverty and misery reduce to a condition of life unworthy of human beings. Arouse in the hearts of those who call Thee Father a hunger and thirst for social justice and for fraternal charity in deeds and in truth. Grant, O Lord, peace in our days—peace to souls, peace to families, peace to our country, peace among nations. May the rainbow of peace cover with the sweep of its serene light the land sanctified by the life and passion of Thy Divine Son. God of all consolation, deep is our misery, grave are our faults, countless our needs. But greater still is our trust in Thee. Conscious of our unworthiness, we lovingly place our lot in Thy hands, uniting our weak prayers to the intercession and the merits of the most glorious Virgin Mary and all the saints. Grant to the sick resignation and health; to young men, the strength that is born of faith; to young girls, the gift of purity; to fathers, prosperity and holiness for their families; to mothers, success in their mission of rearing their children; to orphans, affectionate protection; to the refugees and prisoners, their fatherland; and to all men Thy grace, in preparation and in pledge of the unending happiness of heaven. Amen.